

Wednesday 22 May 2019

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

QUESTIONS

Tasmanian Economy - Debt Status

Ms WHITE question to TREASURER, Mr GUTWEIN

[10.03 a.m.]

Before the last state election, in yet another of your endless series of glossy brochures, you made sweeping promises to Tasmanians in relation to the Tasmanian economy. Increasingly it is not difficult to find that you have broken those promises after such a short time.

In this document, Building Your Future, last year you promised Tasmanians that the state would remain net debt free. It was number five of your goals. Your own revised Estimates report in fact shows that Tasmania will have \$343 million in net debt within two years.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. This has got off to a really shabby start and on both sides of the House. I am not going to put up with it. Show some respect when someone is asking a question.

Ms WHITE - Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I will just read the last part. Your own revised Estimates report in fact shows Tasmania will have a \$343 million in net debt within two years. Why have you broken your promise to the people of Tasmania to keep the state out of net debt?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question and her interest in this.

The simple answer to the question is that we are not in net debt. We actually hold cash and investments right now. The state is not in net debt. It surprises me that the shadow treasurer - well no, that was an over reach on my behalf then. It is of no surprise to me that the shadow treasurer does not understand that we still hold net cash and investments. It is a statement of fact that our financial position is vastly different to what it was when we first came to government: \$1.1 billion worth of deficits across the forward estimates; an economy that had been in recession.

Members interjecting.

Mr GUTWEIN - Say 'not true' to that, former economic development minister. I bet you cannot.

Mr Bacon - You are transitioning the economy.

Mr GUTWEIN - 'Transitioning the economy', says the former economic development minister. It is not that long ago that he said he inherited the best unemployment rate in the country back in 2010 and look what he did with it over four years.

I have made it clear to this House that we have lost \$500 million of revenue. More than half a billion dollars' worth of revenue has been written down in terms of stamp duty and GST.

We have already made it perfectly clear on this side of the House that we will maintain the momentum in our economy and we will invest for growth in this coming budget. We will not take a backward step when delivering the infrastructure that Tasmanians need and deserve.

What will be of key interest to me, is what the alternative budget will look like on Tuesday. Then Tasmanians will have an opportunity to understand clearly what that side of the House stands for. On this side of the House, we stand for growing the economy, keeping the budget in the black, and investing for growth.

Tasmanian Economy - Debt Status

Ms WHITE question to TREASURER, Mr GUTWEIN

[10.07 a.m.]

You have claimed that the state is going into net debt to fund the infrastructure and your revised estimates report show that the state is going into net debt and you cannot deny that. In your glossy brochure titled 'Financial Policy' also released last year, you claimed -

The Government is in a very strong fiscal position with no net debt and a positive net cash and investments balance. Future infrastructure commitments will be funded from existing net cash and investments and future revenues.

Why have you broken your promise to fund infrastructure without going into net debt?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question and her renewed interest in this matter.

We make no apologies on this side of the House that we are going to build the Tasmania of the future. We make no apologies for having one of the fastest growing economies in the country, and make no apologies for holding net cash and investments.

In terms of the question that has been asked, and again I point to the fact that on Tuesday of next week the Opposition will have their opportunity to respond to the budget which I will bring down tomorrow, which will maintain the momentum and it will invest for growth. I will make the point that we will not take a backward step in delivering the infrastructure that this state needs.

Tasmanian Economy

Mr TUCKER question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.09 a.m.]

Tasmania's economy is stronger, there are more jobs, more visitors, more exports and more investment. Can you update the House on what action a Hodgman majority Liberal Government is taking to ensure more Tasmanians have the opportunity to participate in the benefit from a strong economy?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his excellent question. I thank the minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management for his tie on this day when we recognise our emergency services workers.

I welcome the opportunity to talk a little about Tasmania's strong economic performance. What we intend to do through the delivery of our sixth budget to keep our economy strong and to make sure it continues to be one of the best performing in the country. It has not always been that way. Nor has it happened by chance.

We have opened our state for business. We welcome investment in Tasmania. We have backed our competitive strengths and we back Tasmanian businesses to get more business. We have also worked very closely with the federal government to deliver on our shared plans - to grow our economy, to create more jobs, to invest more into health, education and the infrastructure that our growing state needs. We welcome the return of a coalition government. It is a very strong endorsement of our plan and ours align.

Since we have come to government our economy is stronger. Nearly 13 000 more Tasmanians are employed. Business confidence is at its highest levels and is the highest in the nation: more trade, more export, more tourists coming into our state than ever before. Our long-term vision is to ensure that all regions of Tasmania thrive in this economic prosperity. We need to invest strategically to ensure more Tasmanians have the opportunity to benefit from and participate in our strong and growing economy, particularly those in regional Tasmania, those younger Tasmanians and those who are the long-term unemployed. We need to strategically break down the barriers to people getting the education, training and skills they need for the opportunity to get to work and have a job in the place that they call home.

We need to meet the needs of the workforce now but also the demands of a growing economy and to support Tasmanian businesses with strategic growth. I am pleased to be able to announce that the 2019-20 budget will contain an initiative and additional funding for TasTAFE to address skills needs in Tasmania's growth industries. This is new, this is in addition to what we have done to support the training, the skills and the education of Tasmanians to make sure they are able to participate in what are not recession industries under your government - the Labor-Greens government - but now are fast-growing industries, such as construction, electro-technology, plumbing, welding and nursing, as well as our strong tourism industry.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr HODGMAN - This commitment will help meet the future skills needs -

Ms O'Byrne - You cannot even meet the current skills need because you under-funded them.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, it is very hard to be heard. It is like being in an election night defeat party. It is very hard to be heard over all the yelling.

Madam SPEAKER - I agree. Ms O'Byrne, warning number one.

Mr HODGMAN - What we intend to do to meet the future skills needs of Tasmania's building construction sector, is to enable TasTAFE, which as the Leader of the Opposition has recognised was damaged significantly by the Labor-Greens government, to employ five additional teachers across the key sectors of building construction and allied trades.

Ms O'Byrne - And absolutely slaughtered by yours. You have five teachers.

Madam SPEAKER - Ms O'Byrne, warning number two.

Mr HODGMAN - A dedicated team of three welding teachers and a dedicated apprenticeship coordinator and industry liaison officer. The budget will also extend our successful payroll tax rebate for new apprentices and trainees to be employed in key growth industries. It has already supported 141 employers to collectively employ 1568 apprentices and trainees and 264 youth employees.

Ms Butler - We have fewer apprentices than before.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Butler.

Mr HODGMAN - These initiatives are essential to helping young Tasmanians secure apprenticeships and match the demand of those industry sectors to give them the skilled apprentices and trainees they need. We are also delivering our Regional Jobs Action Plan - a partnership with TasCOSS and the TCCI to find practical ways to get people, particularly in regional areas, to work or training and to improve things like transport to so do.

Our budget will continue the strong momentum in our economy. It does not happen by accident. It has happened because the Government does all it can to support Tasmanian business to invest, we can attract more investment to our state and we manage our state's finances well.

You certainly know you cannot trust Labor with money. They cannot be trusted with money. The federal election showed that. No one trusted Bill Shorten or Chris Bowen with their money, nor the nation's finances. The coalition government will return the nation's budget to surplus.

Madam Speaker, similarly last year, Tasmanians endorsed our plan. They did not trust the state Labor Party to manage the state's finances because when they were in government they took our state into recession, our state into deficit, into net debt. We have turned that around -

Opposition members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Mr Bacon, warning number one.

Mr HODGMAN - to have the strongest performing economy in the country. We have come a long way over the last five years. There is much more to do and the budget we deliver tomorrow will maintain the momentum and the growth in our economy. It will deliver on our plan to ensure that all Tasmanians, wherever they live, young and old, are able to participate in Tasmania's prosperous and growing economy.

Climate Change Challenge

Ms O'CONNOR question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.15 a.m.]

You were just talking about the future of young Tasmanians. The science and the evidence of our own eyes confirms the planet is hurtling towards catastrophic climate change that threatens their future and the future of civilisation. As Premier of this island state you have been in a leadership position while climate-induced fires and floods have caused devastation and tragedy. As a leader in our community, a Tasmanian, an intelligent person and a father of three precious young Tasmanians, can you show the leadership necessary to confirm the truth, to agree we have a decade to avoid consigning our children and grandchildren to the bleakest of futures? Do you recognise the world is in a state of climate emergency and that Tasmania and its people are not immune?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Clark for her question and the opportunity to speak about what is a very important issue for Tasmanians, for global citizens, for our Government. We are addressing this matter with the priority it deserves. The Government believes in more action and less talk on this matter.

I want to outline to parliament the actions we are taking to address this issue, both locally and with global significance. We are leaders in this space. We should be proud of it. We should embrace all that we do to address this climate change challenge and demonstrate to all people who are concerned, young and old Tasmanians, the leadership position we are taking to deliver on climate change issues.

I want to point to a document that is substantive in its content and contains the actions the Government is taking. As I have said before, they are climate action plan deniers. This Government has not only advanced progress on reducing our emissions to the extent -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker, standing order 45. I asked the Premier a very straightforward question: does he have the courage to confirm we are in a climate emergency?

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you. I will let that stand on *Hansard*. I will let the Premier proceed.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, it should be a source of great pride to all Tasmanians that we are one of the first jurisdictions in the world to be zero net emissions as a state, to be within just a couple of years, 100 per cent renewable energy generated; self-sufficient in renewable energy technologies. These are demonstrative of our commitment and our progress to taking action and to delivering positive outcomes.

Some of the features of Climate Action 21, include additional funding to back it -

Ms O'Connor - So what happens after that?

Mr HODGMAN - We put \$3 million more into new funding to deliver the action plan, a number of key targets and actions that will take us to those targets - establishing a long-term emission reduction target of zero net emissions by 2050. Having already achieved that, it remains

a work in progress. We need to continue to deliver and support the roll-out of massive infrastructure investments into renewable energy, the electric vehicle charging infrastructure, ensuring we have more research into climate change and climate action, which we are -

Ms O'Connor - You do not have an adaptation plan yet.

Mr HODGMAN - world leaders in, a comprehensive and targeted fuel reduction burning program, energy efficiency loan scheme, and investing in our irrigation infrastructure to support our farmers so they can operate with greater assurity in a changing climate environment.

We have nationally accredited training related to climate change issues, we are supporting businesses and households to improve their energy efficiency -

Ms O'Connor - No, you are not, there is no money in it.

Mr HODGMAN - I can speak to you about a number of initiatives. We have the Power\$mart home and business programs, for example, which provide financial support over two years to conduct energy audits for small- and medium-sized businesses.

Ms O'Connor - It is a shadow of the Labor-Greens government program, a pale shadow.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, the member who asked the question should inform herself of the facts of the things that we are doing. We are always prepared to hear what we can do more of or better. I am always prepared to hear new ideas from opposition parties, but for those who suggest we are not taking action to address climate change, it is not true. For those who would like to frighten people or misinform them deliberately to progress their own political agenda, that does nothing.

It is under this plan and this Government's commitment that we have Tasmania in a strong and enviable position as one of Australia's great renewable energy states, a reducer of emissions and a government that I believe is taking very strong action to deal with what is a very, very serious matter to Tasmanians, and it is happening through our plan.

Health - Immunology Services

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HEALTH, Mr FERGUSON

[10.20 a.m.]

Your cuts to Tasmania's health and hospital system are now firmly entered into the history books. The crises in emergency departments at every public hospital in Tasmania are well documented and Tasmanians understand that the \$100 million black hole in health funding has pushed nurses and doctors into a regrettable position where they must place patients in alcoves, on trollies and in storage rooms with handbells to attract attention. In addition to savage cuts, you have neglected important areas of treatment for Tasmanians who desperately need help. As far back as 2015 the Australian Medical Association warned you that Tasmanians were suffering unnecessarily because there are no immunology services in the public health system. Why is there no immunologist or immunology clinic at the Royal Hobart Hospital and how are Tasmanians who require a specialist for either diagnosis of treatment of allergies and other diseases of the immune system supposed to access that treatment in the public health system?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I take the Leader of the Opposition's question on board and I refute the suggestion that the Government has been cutting frontline services. We have been investing in them every year of this Government over the last five years. Every single year we have progressively added more funding and resources to our health and hospital system, and that is in the face of the history that we inherited where you cut Health to the bone. The Labor Party, together with the Greens, took half a billion dollars out of Health and did not protect the front line whatsoever. In fact, they cut the front line. You cut nurses; you took a nurse out of the hospitals every day for nine months. That is the equivalent of what you did. You closed down wards, you slashed elective surgery funding and mental health funding. That is the history of the Labor Party and that is why I refute the opening stanza of that question.

In a range of specialty areas I accept that there are at times recruitment issues that our clinicians and managers have to manage and will respond to. That includes in the area of immunology, where there is a lot of work underway to ensure that we maintain patient access. We do not run away from that whatsoever. I can assure the House and the Leader of the Opposition that we will always do what we can to ensure that recruitment is underway to meet the needs of our community. That is, after all, exactly what we have been doing for five years.

Ms O'Byrne - Is there a clinic? Is there patient access? Do you think you are maintaining patient access?

Madam SPEAKER - Ms O'Byrne, I remind you are on warning two and a half.

Mr FERGUSON - Warning two and a half - fair point.

Madam Speaker, the Government has been restoring staff numbers. We now have 800 more staff in our hospitals than when we came to office. By any measure that is an extraordinary increase in health service.

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Madam Speaker, under standing order 45, going to relevance. I draw the minister's attention to the question which is are there now immunologists or immunology clinics at the Royal Hobart Hospital? I ask if he can address that, please?

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you. I think that is a fair enough question.

Mr FERGUSON - Indeed I have addressed it and have given an assurance to the House that the staff and management are working hard to ensure that we maintain public access to all of our specialty clinics. We have seen some excellent growth in specialists provided in our public hospitals, so much so we are opening new clinics that were not open or available before. One of the greatest successes there is at the Launceston General Hospital where we have recruited endocrinologists and neurologists where we have seen a drought on those for 10 years.

We will maintain the effort as always. In tomorrow's Budget you will see that there is even more support for our health system, as the Hodgman Liberal Government is the biggest ever funder of health and hospitals in our state's history.

Budget 2019-20 - Development

Mrs RYLAH question to TREASURER, Mr GUTWEIN

[10.25 a.m.]

Can you update the House on the development of the 2019-20 Budget and is the Treasurer aware of any alternative vision for the future of Tasmania?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs Rylah for that question and her interest in this matter. Tomorrow I will be handing down the 2019-20 Budget which will be our sixth budget.

Mr Bacon interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr Bacon - warning number two.

Mr GUTWEIN - I make the point that we have come a long way since 2014. When we first came to government the state's finances were a mess. Treasury's advice was that the budget position was unsustainable.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Premier and Leader of the Opposition, you are both senior members of this parliament and you know the rules. I do not expect you to be talking across in front of me. Please proceed, Treasurer.

Mr GUTWEIN - Thank you, Madam Speaker. When we came to government they had wrecked the budget, the economy was in recession, and Tasmanians were leaving the state in droves. We made a firm commitment that we would fix the mess and we have.

Over the course of the first two years, we took the difficult but responsible decisions to put Tasmania's finances back onto a sustainable footing. We returned the budget to surplus four years earlier than expected, delivering Tasmania's first surplus in seven years, the biggest surplus in nearly a decade. Since then we have been progressively investing record amounts back into essential services that those on that side of the House had trashed.

The results are clear for all to see. The Government has now delivered three surpluses in a row and this year we will deliver our fourth. The Budget I will hand down tomorrow will be balanced across the forward Estimates and the Government will continue to achieve our fiscal strategy actions over the forward Estimates period.

We have put forward a plan to grow the economy, to create jobs, to invest in essential services and to put downward pressure on costs of living, and we have delivered. The Budget I will hand down tomorrow will build on that long-term plan, maintain the momentum and invest for growth. We will unashamedly invest in infrastructure for the future. We will create jobs and that investment will provide the revenues we need to enable the investment of record amounts into essential services and protecting the Tasmanian way of life. Tomorrow's Budget is framed to maintain that momentum, invest for growth, and that is exactly what it will do.

The member asked if I was aware of any alternatives.

Mr Bacon - I've got one right here.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr GUTWEIN - Mr Bacon's budget reply is his annual opportunity to present Labor's alternative vision for Tasmania. Those opposite owe it to Tasmanians to explain what they stand for and, importantly, how they would pay for it. As I have said, whingeing is not a policy and complaining is not a platform. Tasmanians deserve to know what the alternative government would spend its money on and, importantly, what it would choose not to spend its money on and how they would pay for it.

Mr Bacon has a blank sheet of paper to start with. They have been ditching policies left, right and centre. They walked away from their health policy but, mind you, why wouldn't you walk away from it? Which political party, which parliament around the world apart from that lot on that side, would introduce a health policy where the funding actually went down progressively year by year, against the laws of economics? Extraordinary.

Those opposite will have the opportunity to bring down their alternative budget next week. We know a couple of things it will include. It will include a 3 per cent wages policy that would impact on the budget to the tune of \$285 million.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Sorry, Treasurer, but I am honestly getting an earache. I do not know what is going on in this House today but I need everyone to calm down. I have just come back from a study tour of four different parliaments and I can tell you, the behaviour of their members is far, far better than what is going on here. You are all experienced politicians and good debaters but we just have a rabble going on at the moment and it is frustrating. People are watching this and they expect better.

Mr GUTWEIN - Thank you, Madam Speaker. For the people who are watching, the point I am making is that next Tuesday is the Opposition's opportunity to bring down their alternative budget and explain clearly to Tasmanians what they agree with in our budget, what they disagree with but, importantly, how they would pay for their promises. They have made a lot in recent months about a 3 per cent pay increase to the unions. How would they pay for the more than \$280 million that would cost the budget over the four years? Yesterday they came into this place and made a point about TasWater and \$70 million for wastewater management.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker, under standing order 48. The Treasurer has been on his feet answering a Dorothy Dixier now for six minutes.

Madam SPEAKER - I ask the Treasurer to speedily sum up.

Mr GUTWEIN - Thank you, Madam Speaker, and just to correct that erroneous assertion, I was actually sitting down for part of that time.

I repeat, for the people of Tasmania who are interested, next week is the Labor Party's opportunity to explain to Tasmanians what they stand for and how they would pay for it. It is

incumbent upon them as a political party to take that opportunity because without it, all they have is whingeing, carping and complaining. At the end of the day, that does nothing for the political debate in this place.

Health - Immunology Services

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HEALTH, Mr FERGUSON

[10.32 a.m.]

In the gallery today is Kate Rickerby who suffers from a hyperimmune deficiency disorder called Buckley Syndrome. Ms Rickerby's immune deficiency is so severe and her condition is deteriorating so rapidly that it is now not unusual for her to sleep for 19 hours a day. She suffers chronic and painful skin conditions, she is losing her teeth, and her hair is falling out. Ms Rickerby has been taken to the Royal Hobart Hospital on multiple occasions and, like so many other sick Tasmanians, has been stuck in ramped ambulances and several times has been turned away because she has not been provided the treatment services she needs. Ms Rickerby urgently requires an immunology specialist and has been told that to access treatment she must travel to Melbourne, but she cannot do that because she requires a referral from Tasmania and she cannot obtain that in the public health system.

What do you say to Ms Rickerby? Will you restore immunology services at the Royal Hobart Hospital so that she and other Tasmanians like her will not have to continue to live in chronic pain and can receive the treatment they require here in their own state?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. I will say from the outset that the Government would have absolute compassion and a desire to do more for people who need health care. That is our legacy. We have worked very hard to bring our hospitals together and we have delivered extra funding so that we have more staff and more services, and that involves more specialist clinics. I can certainly give an undertaking that we will do everything we can to respond to growing demand, including in areas such as the case you have outlined.

Ms White - How can she get a referral?

Mr FERGUSON - I can indicate I do not know the answer to the issue of referral, but I will undertake to see what we can do about restoring any breakdown or barrier there may be so that the lady you have brought into the debate could have access to an appropriate service. I undertake to do that.

Climate Change - Government Response

Dr WOODRUFF question to MINISTER for POLICE, FIRE and EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, Mr FERGUSON

[10.35 a.m.]

We have already increased the planet's temperature by 1.1 degrees and we are seeing devastating impacts in Tasmania. Last summer's massive fires burnt 6 per cent of the World

Heritage Area and threatened communities for weeks. The leatherwood honey industry was devastated and our wine industry was rocked by smoke taint. This summer an El Niño is predicted. Our best response to these life-threatening climate changes is to urgently act and change our business-as-usual approach. Today is the day we recognise our SES volunteers, who are on the ground and seeing first-hand the escalating climate change risks. They protect us from catastrophic fires, clean up after wind storms and floods, and experience exhaustion and burnout. Do you accept Tasmania is facing a climate emergency and that we need to dramatically change our response?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank Dr Woodruff for the question. The Government has already outlined a very strong response to the previous question posed by Ms O'Connor to the Premier. The Government takes climate change very seriously. In fact, while there are national policy debates and responses at a state level, we know we can act in a way that protects our state's interests and ensures we are best prepared for the future.

I will have to commend you at this point to our Minister for the Environment, Ms Archer, who has put together a comprehensive response and an action plan, which your party continues to deny is in existence. It is a strong response and it is practical.

In my portfolio of Police, Fire and Emergency Management I draw your attention specifically to the very excellent work our agency is doing to protect the state from future bushfire risk. In fact our nation-leading fuel reduction program is all about a risk-based and tenure-blind approach so that we are reducing every year the risk of our state to bushfire, including the increased elevated risk due to climate change. I am still waiting for the Greens to say something good about our fuel reduction program because already in the first five years, with more than \$70 million of investment directly going on to the land -

Dr WOODRUFF - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I take offence at the minister making those comments. I have stood in this place for the past four years talking about the importance of fuel reduction burns and community protection.

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you. Minister, could you apologise?

Mr FERGUSON - No, I will not apologise because I stand by the comments.

Madam SPEAKER - I am sorry, I beg your pardon?

Mr FERGUSON - I will not apologise. Why would I?

Madam SPEAKER - Because I have asked you to do so. She said she is offended.

Mr FERGUSON - Well, I apologise, but I will not apologise for criticising the Greens on our differences of policy on fuel reduction. The Greens have consistently opposed measures to protect our state. They talk fuel reduction but they never back us when we need it.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. The minister is misleading the House and I ask him to withdraw that statement. It is false to state that.

Mr BARNETT - On the point of order, Madam Speaker, there is no point of order. It is a debating point that Ms O'Connor is putting. The minister has put his point. It is a different view to the Greens and the Greens are acting in breach of the Standing Orders.

Madam SPEAKER - It is very difficult to get any point of order through this place. I cannot believe it. The member says she was offended and she is offended on behalf of her party. I ask the minister to kindly consider his words when he is approaching this subject.

Mr FERGUSON - I am apologetic for any offence caused to your feelings on this matter but I will be very clear.

Dr Woodruff - It absolutely demeans you. You know you are not speaking the truth.

Mr FERGUSON - If you are prepared to hear, I will be very clear on this. The Government stands by our fuel reduction program. We called for it from opposition. Labor and the Greens in government opposed our call for better fuel reduction measures.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order! For goodness sake, I am turning into a cranky old Speaker here and it is not my fault. I am sick to death of this rabble. Calm down and be civilised and respectful to each other.

Mr FERGUSON - Thank you, Madam Speaker. We are pleased with our agency. The latest advice I have is that pre the 2018-19 bushfire season, as a result of our initiatives, the state's exposure to fire risk has reduced by a net 5 per cent. That is an astonishing reduction. In many Tasmanian communities, because that is a statewide figure, it was double-digit reductions in risk. It is a credit, not just to the Tasmanian Fire Service, but also to Parks and Wildlife Service and Sustainable Timber Tasmania partnering with local government. I thank them for their efforts.

I assure the member that the Government is taking practical steps to protect the state from current and future risks, including that due to climate change.

Health System - Government Investment

Mr TUCKER question to MINISTER for HEALTH, Mr FERGUSON

[10.40 a.m.]

Can you update the House on the Hodgman Liberal Government's investments into the Tasmanian health system?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his question. The Government has a very strong record of investment for growth, including in our health system. It has been a success. The Tasmanian health system is stronger, more resilient and more able to meet the demands of our community. Even with continued challenges, health remains a priority for the Hodgman Liberal Government. Despite all the initiatives, the extra funding, and our reforms, we understand that our hospitals are under pressure due to increasing demand. We are prepared to meet it.

We know how hard our frontline staff are working. We acknowledge we have to do more. This is why we are determined to deliver on our promise to the Tasmanian community for more funding for health than ever before, through our \$757 million plan. It sounds like just a big number but what it means is more new staff, more new beds and more new services. That is what the Hodgman Liberal Government is doing in the health portfolio. I am pleased to tell the House that tomorrow's budget will deliver.

Earlier this year we accepted advice from the Clinical Planning Taskforce for future development and announced stage two of the Royal Hobart Hospital redevelopment. Tomorrow's budget will fully fund stage two of the Royal Hobart Hospital redevelopment. This means \$91 million will appear in the papers to build the infrastructure that our tertiary hospital has been crying out for in line with those recommendations. This is while stage one is being completed. I am sure the members opposite will applaud that.

This investment is crucial. The immediate benefit at the end of stage two is a bigger, better emergency department, with separate spaces for children as well as dedicated facilities for mental health patients for the first time. It also means a bigger ICU to meet future demands. We need to build more spaces to open more beds. That is what we are doing so we can support all parts of the hospital to meet the increasing demand that we know visibly turns up in the emergency department but is a whole-of-hospital challenge.

When these facilities are built we can get on with that job of rolling out almost 300 new hospital beds. Tomorrow's budget will outline \$132 million to open more than 100 beds over the next four years at the Royal. This is the long-term capacity boost our health system has been desperate for. We wish we could have done it sooner but we are constrained by the physical fabric. We are now building that fabric.

It is estimated more than 460 new full-time equivalent staff - nurses, doctors and allied health professionals - will be needed. I can break that down to 300 FTE nurses, 60 FTE doctors, and 40 FTE allied health professionals. A fantastic future. These new services will benefit, not just the Royal, but the whole state because the Royal is Tasmania's hospital. It is Tasmania's tertiary hospital and we cannot wait to fully roll it out.

I was asked about any alternatives. I am disappointed to confirm that Labor has no plan, not even a plan for an alternative plan. They took to the election last year a policy that was \$200 million less than the Liberal promise. It included dangerous initiatives that had no clinical support. I am talking about 'medi-Trivago' hotels. Most incredibly of all, Labor's policy, as the Treasurer has called out, had decreasing funding over the forward Estimates for health. Year on year, the shadow treasurer must have constructed a situation where there was actually less money for health under Labor's election commitments.

They refused to be up front with Tasmania on how many beds they would try to open or even where they would put them. It was a dog's breakfast - all seven versions. Ms White spectacularly walked away from health and was forced to publicly distance herself from the suggestion that Michelle O'Byrne should ever be Health minister again.

Ms White - You are so typical. You do not talk about yourselves and your own policy, you talk about Labor.

Mr FERGUSON - It is a fact that the Opposition is always happy to get in front of the camera and talk our health system down but is never willing to put up practical alternatives. We will get on with the job of building a better health system. The Tasmanian community can look forward to tomorrow's announcement by the Treasurer of the full health budget over the forward Estimates. They will be able to see, as will the Leader of the Opposition, how we are maintaining the momentum and investing for growth in health services.

Health - Immunology Services

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HEALTH, Mr FERGUSON

[10.46 a.m.]

Kate Rickerby, who is in the gallery today, will not be able to receive the treatment she needs for her condition in the foreseeable future, while you continue to blatantly neglect important services in Tasmania's hospital system. An entire generation of Tasmanians will soon also be in her unacceptable position. While there is a paediatric immunologist at the Royal Hobart Hospital, the children under the care of that specialist will soon graduate to the adult system where, as Ms Rickerby can tell you, there is no treatment available in the public hospital. Adults like Ms Rickerby are being failed by you. Will you also fail the children who will soon need the adult service?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I refer the member to my earlier answer.

Ms O'Byrne - Your earliest answer said that you were maintaining services. You said you would maintain the services.

Mr FERGUSON - We will look closely at this area. I am aware of some changes that have been made at the national level but I do not think that the member has fully outlined the situation including what the historical availability of that service has been. I have previously undertaken to take further advice on it.

Ms O'Byrne - You said you were maintaining services in your first answer.

Member Suspended
Member for Bass - Ms O'Byrne

Madam SPEAKER - Ms O'Byrne, I am sorry. I am going to ask you to leave the Chamber. You have done two-and-three-quarter warnings. You are now three, and you are out. You can come back after Question Time.

Ms O'Byrne withdrew.

Madam SPEAKER - Mr Bacon, you are on two-and-three-quarters.

Mr FERGUSON - I advise the member to allow me to get that advice. While you are able to cherry-pick certain areas where there are challenges in the health system, the Government demonstrated -

Ms White - Ms Rickerby is in the gallery today. Do you doubt her?

Mr FERGUSON - Please do not try to twist this. What I am undertaking to do is to see what we can do to support people in that area. You have previously raised with me a barrier on referrals which I have indicated we will look in to.

Budget 2019-20 - Funding for Students with Disability

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

[10.48 a.m.]

Can you please inform the House how this year's budget continues the momentum in education by investing in a needs-based funding model for students with disabilities.

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his question. Mr Shelton has a very personal and particular interest in this matter.

The Hodgman Liberal Government has taken responsibility for ensuring every Tasmanian student can thrive in an inclusive learning environment. One of our top priorities is supporting all students with disability to access, participate and engage in education, as we know that education is the key to opportunities in life.

This is reflected in the Education Act 2016 which states -

The objects of this Act are -

- (a) to make available to each Tasmanian child a high-quality education that -
 - (i) helps maximise the child's educational potential; and
 - (ii) provides the foundation to enable the child, throughout childhood and as an adult, to lead a fulfilling life and to contribute to the Tasmanian community; and

This is why we have committed an additional \$34 million over the forward Estimates to support a new nation-leading disability needs-based funding model in Tasmania.

We came to government and set about listening to parents and disability advocates, conducted an independent review and now we are getting on with the job of implementing the recommendations of the ministerial task force.

To oversee the implementation of the recommendations, we established the inclusion advisory panel chaired by Cheryl Larcombe. I thank Cheryl for her dedication and hard work, with representatives from a broad range of organisations and stakeholders.

One of the key recommendations included moving to a needs-based disability funding model for students. As many members would know, the current disability model was based on entry on the severe disability register or students having an IQ score between 55 and 70. As minister for Education I have heard from numerous families and teaching staff that the medical funding model is sometimes rigid and inflexible, providing limited room for teachers to tailor programs for individual students. Implementing a needs-based funding model will make a huge difference for our students, schools and families by providing resources for what an individual student actually needs, rather than being obliged to conform to a disability diagnosis.

Allocating disability resources in this way is a huge shift in practice and culture for our schools and families and is about ensuring Tasmania has a truly inclusive education system that enables all students the opportunity to participate and thrive in their education. What is really exciting about this model is that the number of students to benefit from disability funding is going to double. To ensure this funding meets the needs of students with disability, extensive consultation is underway with schools, families, teachers, advocates and students.

This nation-leading needs-based funding model takes the total investment being made to support students with disability in the 2019-20 Budget to \$93.35 million. This is an increase of some \$24 million since we came to office in 2014.

The new model is the culmination of five years of dedicated collaborative effort from a significant number of individuals and organisations. I thank all those involved and recognise the extraordinary and critical work of Lynne McDougall in the Department of Education, and Kristen Desmond, who has been an advocate for such a needs-based funding model for some 13 years. I thank Ms Desmond for her advocacy which I am sure will continue, and I also thank every member of the ministerial task force and inclusion panel.

This is a moment when Tasmanians should feel very proud that as a state we have been able to implement a life-changing and long-lasting approach to ensure every student with disability has access to the resources they need to thrive in their education.

Disability Service Providers - Continued Funding

Ms STANDEN question to MINISTER for DISABILITY SERVICES and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, Mrs PETRUSMA

[10.53 a.m.]

At the end of this financial year, your Government will no longer fund 18 disability providers in Tasmania who depend upon and require state government funding to deliver services to 90 000 people living with disability. The groups look after people who are not eligible for the NDIS and you know that, just as you know that they are completely reliant on you as minister. Do you understand what your responsibilities are to these 90 000 people, or are you willing to neglect your responsibilities and let these people fall through the cracks?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to answer this question because it shows that the Opposition - especially the member for Franklin, who was a previous state manager for the Department of Social Services - in fact, no-one in the Opposition remembers the reform they signed up for in 2013 and what the NDIS is going to deliver.

The member quoted a figure of 90 000 Tasmanians with disability. The reason Tasmania has a high rate of disability is because we have an ageing population. Around eight in 10 people over the age of 85 are counted as having a disability, so the vast majority of people in that 90 000 are over the age of 65. The NDIS is for people below 65 years of age. With regard to the 90 000, if we go back to what the previous government was providing services for, in June 2013 before the onset of the NDIS, they were looking after 3364 Tasmanians who were receiving funded specialist support from the Labor-Greens government, not 90 000.

Ms STANDEN - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I am afraid the minister may have not fully understood the question. The question goes to the people who are not eligible for the NDIS and we are looking for her to show us that she understands her responsibilities -

Mr Barnett - You are repeating the question.

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you, Mr Barnett; I am seeking clarification on this.

Ms STANDEN - to the 90 000 people who fall outside of the NDIS.

Madam SPEAKER - You have clarified the question. Please proceed, minister.

Mrs PETRUSMA - Madam Speaker, I am trying to explain it because they obviously do not understand what the NDIS is about. I repeat, people aged over 65 are not in the NDIS, which is a large percentage of the 90 000. The previous government only provided support for 3364 Tasmanians. That goes up to 10 600 Tasmanians who will be looked after under the Government, but the whole ILC framework which was a recommendation of the Productivity Commission to provide what is called tier 2 support looks after everyone with disabilities, so the figure of 90 000 are there to be looked after under the ILC framework.

The good thing about the NDIS is that we have gone from 87 to 1459 organisations now providing disability support services in Tasmania as at 31 March, so there is a vast variety of choice for people with disability in Tasmania. All organisations can apply for ILC funding. Over \$1 million has already been provided for services in Tasmania under the ILCs. Just to name a couple, if we look at the BIAT, under the state Government they only used to receive about \$94 000. The good thing about the ILC framework is that they are now receiving \$194 000, which is \$87 000 more than they would ever have received from the state Government. Another successful organisation is the Tasmanian Amputee Society which only used to received \$4423 under the state Government. Under the NDIS they are now receiving \$96 000.

Another organisation was quoted in the paper when Ms Siejka shamefully said that their funding had been cut by 48 per cent, despite the fact that the same week she had been informed that the Tasmanian Government is going to continue to fund individual advocacy services. Speak Out, for example, on top of its state Government funding, has received additional funding. It received \$180 000 under one ILC round and \$290 000 in another round. They also said in the newspaper

that Speak Out provided services for 90 000 Tasmanians. In fact they provide services to between 200 to 300 Tasmanians - another exaggeration. They need to get their head around the reform that they signed up for.

Disability Service Providers - Continued Funding

Ms STANDEN question to MINISTER for DISABILITY SERVICES and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, Mrs PETRUSMA

[10.58 a.m.]

The minister has clearly demonstrated that she does not understand her responsibilities in this area but perhaps she will do a better job of answering this question. Many of the 18 disability providers who rely on state government funding do so because they support and look after Tasmanians who are not eligible for the NDIS and never will be. They include Autism Tasmania, the Independent Living Centre of Tasmania, the Brain Injury Association of Tasmania, Multiple Sclerosis Limited, the Tasmanian Deaf Society, the Spina Bifida Association of Tasmania, the Royal Guide Dogs for the Blind Association of Tasmania and Epilepsy Association of Tasmania. Can you confirm that many of these groups will receive a significant reduction in funding and others will miss out entirely because you have simply not done your job as minister?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, obviously they did not even bother to listen to the previous answer, which shows that they have no idea of the reform that they signed up for under the bilateral agreement signed by the previous government back in 2013. Individual support packages for 10 600 Tasmanians, the tier 2 supports as recommended by the Productivity Commission - otherwise now known as ILCs - are there for the 90 000 other Tasmanians. They are there to support all Tasmanians with disability who can benefit from the ILC framework.

The good thing about the ILCs is that there is more money for organisations than there ever would have been if they had stayed with the Tasmanian Government. The important thing to note is that organisations are already receiving more funding than they ever would under the state Government. Again, I would emphasise that some of the organisations, like BIAT is already getting an extra \$87 000 more than they would have under the state Government. The Tasmanian Amputee Society has gone from \$4400. Speak Out has received funding.

This shows they do not understand the NDIS. I am very happy to organise a briefing for them with the NDIA so they can get their heads around it, because they are causing unnecessary fear and angst for people who do not understand what the disability sector is going to be going forward under the reforms that they signed up for.

They need to understand that there will be more services, more support, there is more funding coming in - there was just a \$51 million round opened recently - so one of the organisations applied for a \$3.6 million grant. They would not have received \$3.6 million under this state Government. Organisations can apply for a lot of money under the ILC framework, which is there to help all Tasmanians with disability.

Time expired.

MOTION

Establishment of Estimates Committees

[11.04 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) (by leave) - Madam Speaker, I move - That -

That Government Business take precedence from such time as the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 2019 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2019 are introduced, until the House has dealt with all business associated with the Budget.

- (a) That all stages of the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 2019 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2019 shall have allotted a maximum total of 97 hours as follows:
 - (i) up to the second reading: maximum 16 hours;
 - (ii) in the Estimates Committees: maximum 63 hours; and
 - (iii) in Committee of the Whole House and third reading: maximum 18 hours;
- (b) on the second reading, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have unlimited speaking time and other members speak for not longer than 30 minutes each;
- (c) when the Appropriation Bills (No. 1 and No. 2) 2019 have been read the second time in the House of Assembly, the Bills be referred to Estimates Committees A and B of the House of Assembly.

Such committees may not vote on, but may examine and report upon the proposed expenditures contained in the bills by no later than 11 June 2019, with such expenditures being considered on an output by output basis, including Grants, Subsidies and Loans and the Capital Investment Program.

The following ministerial portfolio units are allocated to House of Assembly Estimates Committee A -

Date	Minister	Portfolios
Monday, 3 June		
0900-1300: Premier (4 hours)	Hon. Will Hodgman MP	Premier Tourism, Hospitality and Events
1400-1630: Parks (2.5 hours)		
1630-1830: Tourism, Hospitality and Events (2 hours)		
1830-1930: Trade (1 hour)		Trade Parks Heritage
1930-2000: Heritage (0.5 hour)		

<p>Tuesday, 4 June</p> <p>0900-1300: Treasurer (4 hours)</p> <p>1400-1600: Local Government (2 hours)</p> <p>1600-1800: State Growth (2 hours)</p>	<p>Hon. Peter Gutwein MP</p>	<p>Treasurer</p> <p>Local Government</p> <p>State Growth</p>
<p>Wednesday, 5 June</p> <p>0900-1100: Human Services (2 hours)</p> <p>1100-1300, 1400-1500: Housing (3 hours)</p> <p>1500-1600: Planning (1 hour)</p>	<p>Hon. Roger Jaensch MP</p>	<p>Human Services</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Planning</p>
<p>Thursday, 6 June</p> <p>0900-1130: Attorney-General and Justice (2.5 hours)</p> <p>1130-1300, 1400-1430: Corrections (2 hours)</p> <p>1430-1700: Environment (2.5 hours)</p> <p>1700-1730: Arts (0.5 hour)</p> <p>1730-1800: Racing (0.5 hour)</p>	<p>Hon. Elise Archer MP</p>	<p>Attorney-General and Justice</p> <p>Corrections</p> <p>Environment</p> <p>Arts</p> <p>Racing</p>

House of Assembly Estimates Committee B -

Date	Minister	Portfolios
<p>Monday, 3 June</p> <p>0900-1300, 1400-1600: Health (6 hours)</p> <p>1600-1900: Police, Fire and Emergency Management (3 hours)</p> <p>1900-1930: Science and Technology (0.5 hour)</p>	<p>Hon. Michael Ferguson MP</p>	<p>Health</p> <p>Police, Fire and Emergency Management</p> <p>Science and Technology</p>
<p>Tuesday, 4 June</p> <p>0900-1200: Education and Training (3 hours)</p> <p>1200-1230: Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries (0.5 hour)</p> <p>1400-1800: Infrastructure (4 hours)</p>	<p>Hon. Jeremy Rockliff MP</p>	<p>Education and Training</p> <p>Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries</p> <p>Infrastructure</p>

<p>Wednesday, 5 June</p> <p>0900-1000: Building and Construction (1 hour)</p> <p>1000-1300: Resources (3 hours)</p> <p>1400-1500: Aboriginal Affairs (1 hour)</p> <p>1500-1530: Women (0.5 hour)</p> <p>1530-1600: Sport and Recreation (0.5 hour)</p> <p>1600-1700: Disability Services and Community Development (1 hour)</p>	<p>Hon. Sarah Courtney MP</p> <p>Hon. Jacque Petrusma MP</p>	<p>Building and Construction Resources</p> <p>Aboriginal Affairs Women Sport and Recreation Disability Services and Community Development</p>
<p>Thursday, 6 June</p> <p>0900-1300: Primary Industries and Water (4 hours)</p> <p>1400-1500: Veterans' Affairs (1 hour)</p> <p>1500-1700: Energy (2 hours)</p>	<p>Hon. Guy Barnett MP</p>	<p>Primary Industries and Water Veterans' Affairs Energy</p>

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES - HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ESTIMATES

- (1) Estimates Committee A consists of the following members:

The Chair of Committees (Chair);
Mr Tucker (Deputy-Chair);
One member nominated by the Leader of the Opposition; and
Ms O'Connor.

- (2) Estimates Committee B consists of the following members:

Mrs Rylah (Chair);
Mr Tucker (Deputy-Chair);
One member nominated by the Leader of the Opposition; and
Dr Woodruff.

- (3) The Chair of a Committee has a deliberative and a casting vote.
- (4) During sittings, substitute members may be allowed.

- (5) If a vacancy occurs in the membership of a Committee, the Speaker may nominate a member in substitution, but in so doing has regard to the composition of the Committee as appointed by the House.
- (6) A Committee may proceed with business despite a vacancy in its membership.
- (7) The quorum of a Committee is a majority of the Committee.
- (8) If at any time a quorum is not present, the Chair will suspend proceedings of the Committee until a quorum is present or adjourn the Committee.
- (9) Any time lost for lack of a quorum shall be added to the time allocated to that session.
- (10) Members of the House who are not members of the Committee may participate in proceedings by asking questions, but may not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purposes of a quorum.

SITTING TIMES

- (1) Each Estimates Committee meets only in accordance with the abovementioned time-table adopted by the House or as varied by the Chair.
- (2) Estimates Committees may sit only when the House is not sitting.

OPEN HEARINGS

All hearings of the Estimates Committees are open to the public.

PROCEEDINGS OF AN ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

- (1) Consideration of proposed expenditures in an Estimates Committee follows as far as possible the procedure observed in a Committee of the Whole House.
- (2) A Committee will consider expenditures on an output by output basis, including Grants, Subsidies and Loans and the Capital Investment Program.
- (3) A Committee may ask for explanations from a minister relating to the outputs.
- (4) The minister who is asked for explanations may be assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information.
- (5) Officers may answer questions at the request of the minister but shall not be required to comment on policy matters.
- (6) Time limits of one minute for a question and three minutes for an answer shall apply in Estimates Committees.

- (7) Questions may be asked on a ratio of three Opposition, one Government and one other member or in such form as the Committee determines.
- (8) A minister may advise an Estimates Committee that an answer to a question, or part of a question, asked of the minister will be given later to the Committee, where possible that Committee sitting day.
- (9) A minister may provide additional information to a Committee about an answer given by or for the minister.
- (10) Additional information -
 - (a) is to be written;
 - (b) is to be given by a time decided by the Committee; and
 - (c) may be included in a volume of additional information laid on the Table of the House by the Committee.
- (11) If any member persistently disrupts the business of an Estimates Committee, the Chair-
 - (a) names the member;
 - (b) if the member named is a member of the Estimates Committee, suspends the sitting of the Estimates Committee until the Chair has reported the offence to the Speaker; and
 - (c) if the member named is not a member of the Estimates Committee, orders that member's withdrawal from the sitting of the Committee until the Chair has reported the offence to the Speaker;

as soon as practicable, the Chair advises the Speaker who then gives notice that the member of the Estimates Committee be replaced.

- (12) If any objection is taken to a ruling or decision of the Chair -
 - (a) the objection must be taken at once and stated in writing;
 - (b) the Chair, as soon as practicable, advises the Speaker who makes a ruling on the matter; and
 - (c) the Estimates Committee may continue to meet but may not further examine the output then under consideration.
- (13) Television coverage will be allowed, subject to the same conditions that apply to televising of the House of Assembly.

HANSARD REPORT

An unedited transcript of Estimates Committee proceedings is to be circulated, in a manner similar to that used for the House *Hansard*, as soon as practicable after the Committee's proceedings.

REPORTS OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

- (1) A report of an Estimates Committee is presented by the Chair or Deputy Chair of that Committee to a Committee of the Whole House, such reports containing any resolution or expression of opinion of that Committee.
- (2) When the reports of the Estimates Committees are presented they may be taken into consideration at once or at a future time.
- (3) The following time limit applies to consideration of reports of Estimates Committees on each portfolio unit on the question 'That the proposed expenditures be agreed to and that the resolutions or expressions of opinion agreed to by the Committees in relation to those expenditures be noted.'

One minister, the Leader of the Opposition or member deputised by the Leader - 20 minutes; any other member - 10 minutes. A maximum period for consideration of 2 hours for each minister.

- (4) When the consideration of reports of Estimates Committees A and B has been completed, the question is proposed and put forthwith without debate 'That the remainder of the bills be agreed to.'
- (5) When the bills have been agreed to by the House, the third reading of each bill may be taken into consideration at once or made an order of the day for the next sitting day.

The motion has been circulated and includes that government business take precedence during the period of the appropriation bills being considered, the time set out for the establishment of the Estimates committees and the constitution of those committees.

I acknowledge and thank my counterparts, the member for Franklin, Mr O'Byrne, and member for Clark, Ms O'Connor, for their assistance in framing this up. I am sorry that we have not been able to achieve every request but we have done our best to accommodate those requests quite competently. I think we have a good approach here that largely meets everybody's needs. I have had to accept of course that the Opposition is the Opposition but I feel we have solved the Rubik's Cube as best we can.

[11.05 a.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That in the part titled 'Membership of Committee - House of Assembly Estimates' leave out clauses 1 and 2 and insert instead:

- (1) Estimates Committee A consists of the following members:

The Chair of Committees (Chair);

Mr Tucker (Deputy Chair);

One member nominated by the Leader of Government Business;

Two members nominated by the Leader of the Opposition; and

Ms O'Connor

(2) Estimates Committee B consists of the following members:

Mrs Rylah (Chair);

Mr Tucker (Deputy Chair);

One member nominated by the Leader of Government Business;

Two members nominated by the Leader of the Opposition; and

Dr Woodruff.

I thank the Leader of Government Business for accommodating not all of our requests in terms of the timing but a fair whack of them. I appreciate his assistance and the assistance of the Leader of the Greens and member for Clark, Cassy O'Connor, for her suggestions and assistant negotiations, although we have an amendment which I foreshadowed with Mr Ferguson.

What we are seeking to do is to return to the established process in this House over many years where during the Estimates hearings we are able to have two members present and formally recognised in the committee. The two amendments relate to the membership of the committee, effectively allowing the Leader of the Opposition to appoint two members to Estimates Committee A and two members to Estimates Committee B.

Last year, breaking in tradition, the Government used their numbers to deny the Opposition its rightful role of two members of that committee. This was a significant breach of tradition and protocol. Even when we were in government in smaller numbers than the Government has today we acknowledged the right of the Opposition to have two members at the table. It ensures there is an appropriate amount of transparency and we are able to interrogate the ministers in terms of the budget appropriation bills and find out for the people of Tasmania crucial and important information that needs to be reported not only to this House but across the state.

It was an unprecedented act to guillotine our ability to cross-examine and have formal sitting members on that committee. The Government used their numbers to gag the Opposition and to deny us that right, a right that had been given to oppositions for a very long time, so we are seeking as a matter of principle that those numbers be restored for the appropriate running of the Estimates committees and to respect the role of the Opposition. It is our one chance in the year to sit down and have that process followed, so we are seeking this amendment. We think it is crucially important to return that committee to its rightful numbers and we would see last year as an aberration.

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) - Madam Speaker, the Government does not support the amendment. I will outline some reasons why so I can clear up some misunderstandings here. To set the record straight, there has been no gag and that language should not be used. There was no gag exercised last year. That is a poor read of history, to be fair. In fact, what we did last year was relax the allowance of questions so I think the Government gets fewer questions than has historically been the case. I make that point because I believe the member who has resumed his seat might have just said that there was less opportunity for questions.

There was a misunderstanding last year which I thought we resolved very appropriately because there was a clause that threw some confusion into the matter of whether or not any member of the Opposition could sit at the table and participate in the conduct of the Estimates committees, and we dealt with that because I moved and we took out that clause -

Ms O'Connor - But number 10 in the motion provides that opportunity for opposition members.

Mr FERGUSON - because there was an inconsistency which I acknowledged last year. It was a hangover from years past and we dealt with it and the House resolved and actually found a very good landing point. We actually have ensured appropriate representation from this House -that is the first point. Second, if the members of the Opposition feel unhappy that they do not have two members on the four-member committee that perhaps is a reflection that we have ensured the Greens members have a place on each of the two committees.

Mr O'Byrne - We are not seeking to have them removed.

Mr FERGUSON - I know you are not. In all cases we made it clear that the size of the voting members of the committee is really not the point. We ensured that any member of the Opposition, and it is preserved in these words, have the opportunity to attend and participate and ask questions.

Ms O'Connor - We have plenty of power to ask questions.

Mr FERGUSON - That was the point the Opposition had just made. I want to assure the House that we have been faithful to that agreement from last year. I do not appreciate that history being misrepresented. I want to also make the point that we are looking for a strong and appropriate approach to the Estimates process where ministers and their agencies are scrutinised on the budget. This motion before us, without amendment, provides all of the rights and privileges that the Opposition should have and the composition of the committee is preserved and the right of any member of the Opposition who is not a voting member is preserved.

I feel unhappy that the Opposition would repeat that history in that way. That is unfortunate because we have acted honourably and appropriately in the circumstances. We will not be supporting the amendment from the Opposition.

[11.11 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, I thank the Leader of Government Business and the Leader of Opposition Business for what was a cordial process of negotiation over the Estimates schedule, and acknowledge that a number of accommodations were made to satisfy the requests of the Opposition and the Greens. There has been an increase in the amount of time allocated towards examination of the Parks portfolio, which we think is extremely important, given the pressures on the parks and the fires last summer which had such a devastating impact on the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

There has been an increase in time allocated to the Environment portfolio by a full hour. This does not mitigate to the necessary extent the fact that there is no allocation for questioning on the climate portfolio. In the last term of the parliament, even though we did not have a climate minister, as environment minister, Matthew Groom's first piece of legislative perfidy was to disband the Tasmanian Climate Action Council, there was a nod to the fact that we are in a climate emergency and Tasmania is not immune. The Estimates schedule allocated time for examination of the climate crisis portfolio. We do not have that -

Ms ARCHER - Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Ms O'CONNOR - You are not the minister for climate change.

Madam SPEAKER - We will take the point of order.

Ms ARCHER - The point of order is that it falls within my portfolio and the officers from the Tasmanian Climate Change Office will be present at the table throughout my entire output on the environment.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you for that, but I will just make the point, Madam Speaker, it is the signal that is sent when government walks away from explicit examination of the climate portfolio and the state Government's response to the climate emergency.

In the past term of the parliament, under Matthew Groom, at Estimates, we got to examine the climate portfolio. It does not really exist, but we still do have a Climate Change (State Action) Act of 2008. The minister can try to make excuses for the fact that there is no specific climate portfolio examination, but it does not take away from that fact. We will be raising the issue of the climate emergency, not only in the Environment portfolio, but also in the Premier's portfolio, in the Parks portfolio, in the Health portfolio, in the Infrastructure portfolio, as people who care about the climate crisis and our response to it would expect the Greens to do.

There was an accommodation to increase the amount of time allocated to scrutinising the Housing portfolio by an hour. It was a woefully inadequate allocation before then of two hours under the minister, Mr Jaensch. Thankfully, there has been an extra hour allocated to that. We are pleased to see that the Racing portfolio has been reduced from one hour to half an hour.

If anyone wants to understand how wrong this Government's priorities are they only need to look at the amount of time that has been allocated for Infrastructure compared to the amount of time allocated to Education and Training: Four hours for Infrastructure in which, no doubt, we will have many, many questions and much chatter about roads. Three hours to talk about the future education, the preparedness for a rapidly changing world, of our young people. It is very disappointing.

We will not be supporting the amendment, because anyone who looks at the *Hansard* from last year's Estimates will understand that Opposition members had lots of opportunities to ask questions.

Mr O'Byrne - What if we dissent from the Chair?

Ms O'CONNOR - You say you cannot vote, but the Estimates process is about scrutinising Government ministers' portfolios and priorities. When you look at last year's Estimates *Hansard* Labor got more than what we would have thought was their fair share of questions.

Mr O'Byrne - That is not the point. What happens if you are upset with the conduct of the committee? If you want to cosy up to them, go for your life.

Ms O'CONNOR - I am not cosying up to anyone. I am stating it like it is.

Mr O'Byrne - What if you are unhappy with the conduct?

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, you did not make the case to us, Mr O'Byrne. Point 10 in the motion to establish the committees says:

Members of the House who are not members of the committee may participate in proceedings by asking questions, but may not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purposes of a quorum.

If the purpose of members from Opposition and Greens parties is to scrutinise government, the Opposition will have plenty of opportunity this year to scrutinise the Government. As members may recall last year we were in a balance-of-power parliament and there were not enough backbenchers. We had poor old Mr Hidding scooting between Estimates Committee A and B, and that provided plenty of opportunity for Labor and Green members to ask more questions than they have in the previous four years. Mr Tucker will have that exercise regime and there will be plenty of time when Mr Tucker will not be at the table.

Mr O'Byrne - What happens if you are unhappy with the ruling or the conduct of the committee, no vote.

Ms O'CONNOR - Who is to say you would support us in those circumstances?

Mr O'Byrne - Not the point, though, at least there is a debate.

Ms O'CONNOR - And there can be still a debate.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, through the Chair, please.

Ms O'CONNOR - Mr O'Byrne, you should have made your case to us a bit better. We will not be supporting the amendment. We are pleased to see that at least Environment will have more time allocated towards scrutiny. You can be sure it will be us in there asking the questions that need to be asked, not the Opposition.

AYES 10

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

NOES 14

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Ms Courtney
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gutwein
Mr Hodgman
Mr Jaensch
Ms O'Connor
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockcliff
Mrs Rylah
Mr Shelton
Mr Tucker (Teller)
Dr Woodruff

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Budget Speech 2019-20 - Attendance of Members of the Legislative Council

[11.24 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) (by leave) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the House of Assembly request all members of the Legislative Council to attend in the House of Assembly Chamber following the first reading of the 2019 Appropriation Bills (No. 1 and No. 2) for the purpose of listening to the speech by the Treasurer in relation to the Tasmanian Budget 2019-20.

Motion agreed to.

SITTING TIMES

[11.25 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) (by leave) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That for this day's sitting the House not stand adjourned at 6.00 p.m. and that the House continue to sit past 6.00 p.m.

I thank the House for agreeing to the previous motions. We need to get through these three bills today or tonight. I understand that it would not be expected that we would be here for very long after 6.00 p.m. but we need to be able to ensure the timeliness of those bills and given private members' time today there is very limited government business time allowed during the day.

Motion agreed to.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

State Budget

[11.26 a.m.]

Mr BACON (Clark) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the House take note of the following matter: the state Budget.

The state Budget will be handed down tomorrow but already the warning signs are there for this Treasurer. They have been there since this rabble came into government back in 2014 and they were clearly displayed in the latest document that we have publicly available, the Revised Estimates Report including the December quarterly report which was released in January this year.

It shows the deceitfulness of this Treasurer and the way he has conducted himself in the role as Treasurer of Tasmania since 2014. He has not only been determined to keep the truth of the state's finances from the Tasmanian people, he has misled them time and time again at every opportunity. It is a disgrace the way he has conducted himself and the one thing that is becoming

clearer and clearer is that the Treasurer said one thing before the election and has delivered something totally different.

We all know about the glossy brochures put out by the Government before last year's election. We had Building your Future, the financial policy, the fiscal strategy - all jackets off and sleeves rolled up hardworking Liberals there, always good to see, but we know what they are good at is a photo opportunity. I have had some success there myself today, but what we see from this Government is glossy brochures but not doing the hard work when it comes to managing our finances in this state.

We have a Treasurer who has built up a reputation for good budget management but the figures reveal something very different. You only have to look at these brochures. If you start with the Building Your Future document there is a range of 43 targets for the Government to hit in this term. They have not started very well at all, but you only have to go to number five to see exactly where this Government has gone wrong. This was before the election when they came out with point five - 'we will remain net debt-free'. We know that the Treasurer was at pains in question time this morning to say that we have net cash and deposits at the moment. That is all well and good, but in the Revised Estimates Report you only have to go to page four to see that in the year 2020-21 we will have \$240 million worth of net debt and the following year that grows to \$343 million.

It is all very well for this Treasurer to mortgage Tasmania's future and the future of Tasmania's children, but he should at least be honest about it. He should have been honest before the election and told the state he was going to drive us into net debt and he should be honest about it now. He cannot do that. We had the Premier get up in answer to a question today and say that when they came to government the Labor Party had taken us into net debt. That is an outright falsehood peddled by the Government. When the Labor Party first came to government in 1998 the state was in around \$1.5 billion worth of net debt. Labor paid off that debt. In 2005 we went net debt negative so of course that was a positive. Labor built up the cash reserves to over \$1 billion away from net debt before the global financial crisis and we never went back into net debt - not once, even through a global financial crisis.

When did we go into net debt? When are we going to go into net debt? During Peter Gutwein's golden age. In 2018-19, Peter Gutwein delivered his golden age budget, but if you look at the figures he is going to drive us into \$343 million worth of net debt. This is during what he thinks is an economic boom time in Tasmania. The Labor party paid off the Liberal debt back in 2005 and it appears that we are going to have to do that again.

It is the deceit that really drives me crazy, Madam Speaker. It is the outright falsehoods that this Government will tell with no concern at all about transparency and telling the Tasmanian people the truth. Not only did they say we would remain net debt-free, they have broken that promise already. We have had the Treasurer say we are going into net debt to fund infrastructure when before the election, the Government released their financial policy - and I will read a direct quote from the financial policy. It said -

The Government is in a very strong fiscal position with no net debt and a positive net cash and investments balance. Future infrastructure commitments will be funded from existing net cash and investments and future revenues.

There are no words there about taking on debt to pay for infrastructure. This is information that was not given to the Tasmanian people before the election and of course now we see the

Treasurer and the Government determined to drive us into net debt when they said they would not. We know that this is a number of broken promises, and that is before the Budget has been brought down.

They have squandered the good times and Tasmanians will pay the price in the end. We have seen no economic reform from this Treasurer but they say the budget is 'continuing the momentum'. Down the fiscal drain - that is the momentum at the moment - into net debt, hundreds of millions of dollars, and we cannot even get the Government to apologise for breaking these promises.

We know that since that report came out there has been a downgrade in GST receipts and stamp duty of around \$520 million. This is a government that should at least come clean. The Premier and the Treasurer should apologise for breaking those promises to the Tasmanian people. The promise not to go into net debt was number five on the list. Come out today and apologise for that. They should also apologise for saying they have paid for their infrastructure with money in the bank, rather than going to the credit card, but now they have thrown that all out the window.

We know that the state of the health system in Tasmania is a disgrace. We have a rolling crisis in our health and hospital system and it is because this Government will not sustainably fund the health system. We know there is a \$100 million black hole. It is time to fix that.

Time expired.

[11.33 a.m.]

Mr SHELTON (Lyons) - Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise to speak about the Hodgman Liberal Government's record in managing Tasmania's budget. Before I start on that, I need to state a couple of points. Mr Bacon went back in history a little bit but he forgot to mention that Labor was able to pay off the debt because of John Howard's GST and the strength of that commitment by the Liberal government to give that money to the states and then, of course, they did run some surpluses. They put nearly \$1.5 billion into the SPA account but we know what happened to that when Labor was in power - when they got short of cash they spent the superannuation money of the public servants.

I am proud to stand here and support the Hodgman Government's managing of the budget and to commend the Treasurer on the significant work he has done over five years now in delivering budgets. From the outset it is clear that our record of fixing the mess that we inherited and delivering four surpluses in a row is a brilliant achievement. In addition to this, we have a steady hand to ensure our economy is strong, diverse and generating opportunities for all Tasmanians.

The Budget the Treasurer hands down tomorrow will be about maintaining that momentum and investing in growth. It will see the Government continue to manage the state's finances responsibly and sensibly whilst continuing to invest in infrastructure and essential services for Tasmania. The Government is facing a revenue write-down in GST and stamp duty of over \$500 million over the budget and forward Estimates. The Government will need to cut its cloth to suit and will work through these matters responsibly and sensibly, as Tasmanians would expect.

Labor's budget record is clear. We inherited \$1.1 billion in cumulative deficits and out of control debt-funded spending. Labor seems to have found a new interest in financial management of budget matters all of a sudden. We look forward to their alternative budget being tabled next Tuesday. Our balance sheet and our economy will both remain strong and will need to ensure that we are as efficient as possible to limit the impacts. The budget surpluses are important and a

moderate surplus is important because it is our insurance policy against unforeseen events and allows us to respond to circumstances at the time.

Labor has been calling for us to spend more on health and reduce the surpluses. This is exactly what we have done. The Government took the decision to prioritise health and is seeking to appropriate \$105 million in the Supplementary Appropriation Bill, which recently passed the House. There is no reason Mr Bacon should complain. Commenting on the budget in 2017, he said -

There is no doubt that what we have delivered is a smaller surplus than what the Liberals have delivered but what we've done is prioritised health to make sure Tasmanians can get the health care that they need.

That is exactly what has been identified in this budget. The actions the Government took to invest more in health is only possible because we budgeted a surplus in the first place, unlike those opposite.

Yesterday we announced an extension to our housing assistance measures. A strong performing property market is welcome news for Tasmania's economy but it is important that all Tasmanians can afford to buy a home that meets their needs. The 2019-20 state budget is focused on maintaining the momentum in Tasmania's nation-leading building and construction sector to help more Tasmanians into a home of their own.

To assist Tasmanians into their first home, the 2019-20 state budget extends the successful first home builders' grant for an additional 12 months to 30 June 2020. In addition, the 2019-20 budget extends a range of Hodgman Liberal Government's successful housing affordability programs, including the first home owners stamp duty concessions up to \$7000 on established homes until 30 June 2020, the stamp duty concession of up to \$7000 for pensioners down-sizing their homes until 30 June 2020, the land tax exemption for former short-stay accommodation properties that are converted to long-term rental until 30 June 2023 and the land tax exemption for newly built housing made available for long-term rental until 30 June 2023.

There is no doubt that the attractiveness of Tasmania as a place to live and work is driving a strong demand in Tasmania's property market. While great strides are being made in increasing the supply of housing, there is more to be done. That is why the Hodgman Liberal Government remains committed to helping more Tasmanians buy a home of their own as well as improving the supply of affordable rental housing. Yesterday we announced that the funding for housing will be boosted in the 2019-20 budget.

In recognition of continuing high demand for social and affordable housing, the Hodgman Liberal Government will allocate almost \$68 million in the 2019-20 budget to boost the supply of social and affordable homes.

This budget is about maintaining the momentum and investing for growth. The Hodgman Liberal Government recognises the increased demands for housing and we are working through our 10-year Affordable Housing Strategy to address housing stress and reduce homelessness in Tasmania.

Time expired.

[11.40 a.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I am pleased to talk about the state budget because, arguably, there has never been a state budget that will be more important than the one that we have before us. The next three years, the next 10 years, we know are so critical for the trajectory of Tasmania and for the planet.

We all exist on this one planet together and we all play our part. The future we need to move away from is an economic trajectory that is polarising Tasmanians, widening the wealth and opportunities gap so that we have the increasingly less educated, less literate, less job secure, less housing secure, less social welfare secure, less health and fitness secure, and we have those who are doing really well. They are people who are comfortable, looking at their retirement with a rosy glow, enjoying trips overseas and all the good things in life they have worked for. Would we not like it to be the case that every Tasmanian has that future to look forward to? We all would. I am sure everyone in this parliament would.

What we need to do in the next three years is look at the structural things we need to change in order to close the gap in wealth and close the gap in opportunities.

There has been a surge in property demand. We have been reading it on the front pages of the *Mercury* for years. It is hard to comprehend. I did not grow up in Tasmania but for someone who did I am sure they would still find it hard to comprehend when they read the stories in the *Mercury* about prices in Hobart, southern Tasmania, but also in Launceston and Devonport. It is hard to comprehend that we are now pegging with Melbourne, Sydney and Canberra, with the richest cities in one of the richest countries in the world. That means there are many people who cannot access those properties.

There has been a surge in the unregulated short-stay sector. That has been a great boom for the property class who, as I have said before, are looking forward to a rosy retirement.

There has been increasing homelessness, increasing housing insecurity, and tightening of household budgets. 'Tightening' is a euphemism. People often simply do not have money.

The increase in tourism is increasing employment in hospitality and tourism industries. It is contributing to the housing crisis, it is straining our infrastructure, and it is putting the protection of all of our natural resources at risk.

While 'balance' is the slogan that has been deployed by the Liberals, the only thing that is truly balanced is the impact of their decisions on their electoral chances. Did we not see that more than ever playing out in the north of this state in the last election? Shame on the Liberal Party for playing the people of the north and trading away the things that really matter for their long-term wealth and opportunities.

Under the Liberals we have seen industry wishes go unchecked. The result has been a massive increase in homelessness and housing insecurity, a degradation of our parks and the marine environment that will ultimately result in a further downturn in the industries that rely on them and that are already significantly impacting on the health, wellbeing and lifestyles of Tasmanians. Even the Liberal's approach to housing was to provide cash payments to landlords that would allow them to benefit from evicting existing tenants in favour of new tenants.

Labor might be huffing and puffing about this, but they are not offering any alternatives, so this motion is a bit rich coming from the Labor Party who, I understand - correct me if I am wrong, Mr Deputy Speaker - will not produce an alternative budget. They are not offering alternatives and therefore they are not telling Tasmanians how to do it differently.

That is what the Greens are doing. We have a vision based on looking to the future and understanding where we are now. We cannot just keep arguing down in the weeds about stuff. These are the big issues, but Labor does not appear to have any interest in dealing with the difficult choices.

This is a state of climate and environmental emergency we are currently in. When the Liberals came into office in 2014 - take note, the two members who are in the Chamber - your Government axed the climate change portfolio. You disbanded the Tasmanian Climate Action Council and you cut funding to the Tasmanian Climate Office. This at a time when more than ever we need to focus on those areas. The Liberals want to open up old-growth forests for logging, diminishing carbon stores and removing the survival of the habitat of species. We have just heard from the United Nations that there are one million species on the planet at risk of extinction in the very near future. Many hundreds of these are in Tasmania.

We have seen the Liberals' mismanagement of the Energy portfolio in the past with a lack of planning around the energy crisis. The decisions that have been taken today will increase emissions in this state and leave us unprepared for a climate emergency. We expect to see that the Liberals have listened and understand the science and the evidence, understand the truth of where we are as a planet, and will respond in the Budget in a meaningful way that will provide absolute clarity about reducing our emissions, targets with effective measures so that adaptation is not just about changing the situation but is really about making substantial change. We expect to hear they have been listening to those firefighters, the 20 chiefs who got together who have been pleading with us to make these changes and to look at supporting agriculture and protecting the east coast rocky reefs.

Time expired.

[11.47 a.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to talk about the important matter of the state Budget. I must admit this is remarkable. We notified the Government that we would be talking about the state Budget and for this entire debate the Treasurer has not shown it worthy enough to be in the House for it to be discussed. That shows disrespect to this House and the important debates we conduct. For most of this debate we have had maybe one or two government members in the Chamber. It is their responsibility.

There is a reason why we call these matters of public importance. I remember being in government when any matter came across my portfolio, whether I thought it was vexatious or trivial from the Opposition or not, it mattered not. I respected the forms of the House, I respected the debate and I stayed in the House. I listened to the arguments and I rebutted and responded on behalf of the government.

This Treasurer does not have the ticker to stay in here, listen to the debate and be called out on his state Budget mismanagement. He runs away from the House while this debate is conducted. It is an absolute disgrace for this Government to show so much disrespect to the forms of the House and the important debates that we hold. It says everything. Minister, Treasurer, are you there? Not even there, cannot even respond. It is outrageous.

We know that this Treasurer is fantastic at his pea and thimble trick. I reckon he is probably running up to the GBEs, sitting around the table saying, 'I'll have a bit of that from you and a bit of that from you, we need a bit of that. How about we have a one-off dividend? What will we call it? We can't call it loan. We'll call it an efficiency dividend or something like that, or just a rebalancing, a remanagement.' He is probably off up the road to the Hydro or Aurora or any of the GBEs just raking in the dollars to hold up his house-of-cards budget. We know 'Mr Golden Age' over there was confronted by reality straight after he gave that speech last year that the beneficiary of the rivers of gold for the GST uplift he had received over previous years, that tap had started to turn off. Then, suddenly, the credit he was claiming for that piece of the budget which underpinned the rest of his budget fiscal strategy was no longer able to be played. The tap is turning off and he cannot even sit in the House to listen to the arguments and debate it. His pea and thimble trick is starting to run out.

We saw it with the TT-Line - 'Oh, no, no we're not going to spend that dividend from TT-Line. We're just going to put it on our books so that it makes them look better and we'll pay it back to them when they need it', just so they can prop up their Government's fiscal strategy. We know in question time that the Premier misled the House when he said the then Labor government had put the Tasmanian Government into net debt. It is very clear that we inherited back in the late 1990s an appalling set of books from the Liberal Government. Michael Field in the early 1990s had to clean up Robin Gray's mess and premier Bacon had to clean up the mess that premier Groom and premier Rundle had created for our state. I seek leave to table a graph which talks about Tasmanian Government debt.

Mr Ferguson - That is not how we do this.

Mr O'BYRNE - In a debate, I am seeking leave to table a document. That is completely within, thank you. Essentially what this does is show that, during all the years from 2004 until the time that we were no longer in government, the Tasmanian Government was not in net debt, and for the Premier to mislead the House to say that under the previous Labor government that we had gone into net debt is dishonest.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - You are seeking leave? You can speak to the document but are you seeking leave?

Mr O'BYRNE - Yes, I am seeking leave to table the document.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - We need to deal with that now.

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) - It is a stunt and I am not going to waste the House's time.

Mr Bacon - You sit here telling lies. We are trying to help you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Mr Bacon. That is not appropriate.

Mr Bacon - Which bit?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - The bit where you mentioned the word we cannot mention. It needs to be in a substantial motion if you are claiming that. You have a piece of paper there that

you are seeking leave and at the moment the Leader of Government Business is commenting on that document.

Mr FERGUSON - I will try and keep it tidy. Mr Deputy Speaker, this is not how we table documents. I have had a look at it. Obviously it means little in terms of its potential to defame, which we have seen. It is a courtesy that has been longstanding practice that governments and oppositions of all colours at least have the courtesy to distribute documents well in advance so people can have a look at what is being put about before certain -

Mr O'Byrne - The Premier made the statement barely an hour ago that misled the House in our view. We can deal with that in another way, but this is a document which proves out point. Get him a copy.

Mr FERGUSON - I am making the point that you have not circulated that in advance. Documents attract privilege. It is a serious matter to table a document in parliament. It is reserved for statutory documents and matters of significant public interest that deserve parliamentary protection. I do not know if this needed any protection but, in any event, I will not oppose it on this occasion. Doing so will probably just waste a lot of time in the House. In indicating that we will not oppose the giving of leave, I will also table the document with my amendments given the global financial crisis and the failure to include on the document the GST payments introduced by John Howard.

Ms O'Byrne - You can't amend a document.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - I have to deal with this question first.

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. On that question, the minister says he has 'amended' the document. It is a printed document. What amendments has he made?

Mr Ferguson - I said I have tabled an amended version.

Ms O'BYRNE - Which means you have amended the document.

Leave granted.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - The document has been tabled. Minister, you have a document you wish to be tabled.

Mr Ferguson - I have tabled it.

Dr Woodruff - I do not have a copy of that document, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Ms O'BYRNE - No one got a copy of it. While you are seeking advice, Mr Deputy Speaker, the issue we have is that we have gone through the process of the House and circulated a document and sought the approval of the House to table it. The minister has thrown a piece of paper on the desk saying, 'I am tabling this document'. He has not circulated it and that makes a mockery of everything he said.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Ministers do not need a motion to table a document. The minister has tabled another document.

Time expired.

[11.56 a.m.]

Mrs RYLAH (Braddon) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I am proud to rise to outline the Government's record of strong budget management. We are continuing to deliver on our election promises and we will put even more funding into essential services and infrastructure. The budget the Treasurer will hand down tomorrow is about maintaining the momentum we have generated and invested for growth.

Thanks to the Government's strong financial management, Tasmania is in a much better place than under Labor and the Greens. As of April 2019, 247 900 Tasmanians are in work in trend terms. Since we were first elected in March 2014 almost 13 000 more people are employed. That includes 6 200 more women and 1 400 more young people employed since we came to Government. The unemployment rate is 6.7 per cent, down 0.8 percentage points from the March 2014 election.

Labor's record saw more than 10 000 people lose their jobs. This led to an unemployment rate peaking at 8.6 per cent, a result that Mr Bacon merely called disappointing.

Mr Bacon - Well, what would you call it?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Mr Bacon.

Mrs RYLAH - Whereas today, it is more than 1.9 per cent points lower than this.

Mr Bacon - If it is not disappointing, what is it?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Mr Bacon.

Mrs RYLAH - This growth is happening around the regions. In the north west and the west coast -

Mr Bacon - What is it?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. Mr Bacon, I officially warn you for constantly interjecting.

Mrs RYLAH - the average number of people employed is 1700 more than the last year of the Labor-Greens government. The year average unemployment rate was 6.2 per cent. This contrasts with an average 9 per cent during the last year of Labor and the Greens, an improvement of nearly 3 percentage points.

In Launceston and the north-east, the average number of people employed is 3300 more than the last year of the Labor-Green government. The year average unemployment rate was 6.2 per cent well below the 8 per cent average during the last year of Labor and the Greens.

Ms O'Byrne - What are they trending at the moment? Are there 17 500 Tasmanians still out of work?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Byrne, order.

Mrs RYLAH - In Hobart and the south-east, the labour market is booming. New average employment grew 1300, an annual increase of 1 per cent over the previous year. The year average

unemployment rate in this region was 6.1 per cent, well below the average of 7.2 per cent during the last year of Labor and the Greens.

Tasmanian businesses are hiring. The number of internet job vacancies in March 2019 grew 19.5 per cent. To create jobs, in the 2018-19 Budget we included a record \$2.6 billion infrastructure investment. This is to create thousands of jobs and build the infrastructure our state needs in the future.

The Treasurer and the Minister for Infrastructure have indicated that this year's budget is about even more investment into infrastructure. More infrastructure investment for our growing state will create thousands of jobs for Tasmanians. It is why the Government reformed payroll tax last year to make it easier to invest and create jobs for Tasmanians, introducing the payroll tax cut and a new threshold to create around 650 jobs. It introduced the payroll tax exemption for up to three years for interstate businesses that relocate and employ in regional Tasmania.

It is why the Government extended the successful payroll tax rebate scheme and small business grants for apprentices and trainees in skills-shortage areas. It is why the Government has invested in extending all high schools to year 12 and into skills and training programs so that our youth have the skills necessary to get a job.

It is why the Government continues to invest in skills training initiatives like those that were announced with the Commonwealth government in mid-April. A \$3.15 million package will fund nine initiatives that will deliver training and qualifications for 600 north west Tasmanians required in the growth sectors of agriculture, mining, manufacturing, building and construction. All of these initiatives are about investing in an economy where we create jobs for more Tasmanians.

Private new capital expenditure data confirmed investment in the December 2018 quarter was 18.5 per cent higher in real trends terms than the December quarter in the previous year. This was the highest annual growth rate in Australia - significantly out-performing the national average of just 1.2 per cent annual growth.

Tasmania's gross state production figures have recently grown at 3.3 per cent in 2017-18. In 2012-13 under the Labor-Greens government, the Tasmanian economy went into recession. In 2014, Tasmanian businesses were the least confident in the nation. Two out of three small to medium enterprises thought government policies worked against them.

Time expired.

Matter noted.

BIOSECURITY BILL 2019 (No. 15)

Second Reading

Resumed from 21 May 2019 (page 93)

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Mr Deputy Speaker, yesterday I talked about the fantastic consultation from the department and the importance of this bill. The bill will set up the biosecurity system for a substantial amount of time. That is why it is important to debate the bill and go through some of the matters of the bill.

There have been a number of drafts, a number of submissions and a number of changes. In fact, 30 changes occurred after our consultation in February this year. Some of the changes have removed doubt about things like humans as carriers. Other things include the extent of powers being better defined and being more certain around reasonable belief tests. The bill reflects issues such as people requiring a general biosecurity duty. There is also extensive appeals and natural justice provisions, and the duty of inspectors and biosecurity staff to exercise due care.

I will now go through the bill. It is a substantial bill - 342 pages - but I will go through it, starting with the objectives of the bill.

The objectives of the bill in section 3 are to ensure the responsibility for biosecurity is shared between government, industry and the community. Everybody has a duty in biosecurity to protect this state. Being an island state gives us an amazing opportunity to protect what we love in Tasmania and that includes our natural environment and also our productive landscapes - our forestry, agriculture, aquaculture and wild fisheries. It should be everybody's duty to protect Tasmania from pests and diseases, from threats to terrestrial and aquatic environments to risks to public health and safety arising from pests, diseases and biosecurity matters, and protecting Tasmania from pests, diseases and other biosecurity matters that have a potential to adversely affect public amenities such as community activities and infrastructure.

In the first consultation I had with the department over this bill in, I think it was November 2017, one thing that I was surprised about was that in the biosecurity principles, preparedness was not listed. Being an agricultural scientist and having had some interest in biosecurity before I was elected to parliament, I was, and remain, of the opinion that biosecurity preparedness is one of the key planks in any biosecurity program.

The key to a biosecurity program is preventing stuff getting into the state. That is obviously the number one. Number two is rapidly dealing with it when it arrives and then what happens after that, but we need to be prepared for emergencies. We need that if something untoward happens. We cannot have a zero-risk biosecurity system. There is no doubt about that. The only way to have a zero-risk biosecurity system is to shut down all imports into this state and we cannot do that. In a risk-based system we need to be prepared that if something goes wrong we have the tools already developed and at hand so that we can deal with that biosecurity issue.

I am very pleased to see in clause 3, Objects of this Act -

- (c) to provide a regulatory framework in relation to biosecurity that -
 - (i) facilitates emergency preparedness and the effective management of biosecurity emergencies that may affect Tasmania;

I reiterate that I am very pleased that the department has gone through this process and recognised it when issues like this have been raised. They have taken it on board and changed the bill to reflect that. This is the way bills should be constructed. It should not be adversarial. It should be in the best interests of the community because this bill is in the best interests of the community.

Other objectives are to provide a regulatory framework that -

- (ii) takes account of regional and local differences in respect of biosecurity risks and biosecurity impacts; and
- (iii) supports an evidence-based approach to the assessment, prevention and management of biosecurity risks and biosecurity impacts;

It is important to have an evidence-based system, not a fear-based system or a zero-risk-based system. Also, it 'does not require a biosecurity risk to be proven with full certainty before taking reasonable and practicable measures to prevent, eliminate or minimise the risk;'. That is a very sensible thing to have in the objects of an act.

Also, we need to facilitate trade - as I have highlighted, we cannot have a zero-risk system - and 'to promote compliance with the general biosecurity duty through emergency preparedness, effective enforcement measures, and communication and collaboration between government, industry and the community.'.

The objects as written are very well constructed and will serve this act well.

I will move on to clause 4, Principles for performing functions under this Act. This brings in some of the protections that the industry was desiring. As I highlighted, when I first came into this place and became the opposition primary industries spokesperson, the issues with the act were things like what was reasonable, about access and the operation of this bill. What we have seen throughout this bill is a series of protections and clarifications, and things like the 'reasonableness test'. This is outlined partially here, that -

- (c) in the reasonable opinion of the person, the manner of performing the function is no more intrusive, restrictive or expensive than is required in the circumstances; and
- (d) the performance of the function does not, or is not likely to, unreasonably endanger the health and safety of a person; and
- (e) if the performance of the function involves an animal, the performance of the function does not, or is not likely to, cause unreasonable and unjustifiable pain or suffering to an animal.

This bill is very clear in outlining the extent and application of various powers.

There is a substantial section in this bill with definitions. With a bill that is 342 pages long, there are a lot of definitions but there are also some new meanings that had to be created, including defining the meanings of 'carrier', 'deal', 'pest' and 'invasive pest'.

The meanings of 'pest' and 'invasive pest' are in section 16:

- (1) In this Act, a non-indigenous animal, or non-indigenous plant, is a pest if it has an adverse effect on or is suspected of having an adverse effect on the environment, the community or the economy -

'Non-indigenous' gets back to the point where they remove the reference to 1770 as a point in time when if it was present in Tasmania before 1770, it was indigenous and if not, it was non-indigenous. They have removed that reference and this is an improvement as well.

It goes on to say -

- (3) For the purposes of this Act, a pest is an invasive pest in relation to Tasmania, or a specified part of Tasmania, if -
 - (a) before the discovery of the pest, the pest is not known to have been introduced to Tasmania or that part of Tasmania; or
 - (b) the pest is not otherwise known to be established in Tasmania or that part of Tasmania; or
 - (c) the pest is prescribed as an invasive pest.

That was quite a neat way to get around that and the department has done a fantastic job clarifying that issue - well done.

It goes on to talk about the various classifications. As the minister highlighted in his second reading speech, this is going to a permitted list system. If it is not on the permitted list, then it is not allowed into the state, rather than having the opposite.

The only issue I have with this is that there needs to be an appropriate streamlined process for approvals. The last thing we need is for trade to be impacted by having an overly bureaucratic process, which means that even a minor change in something like a plant-naming convention - some plants or common products might have a change of name - we do not want that to have to go through an overly bureaucratic process for the import of a product to be approved. For example, if there were a particular strain of cereal that has had its biological name changed because there is some scientific debate about which family it sits in or something esoteric like that, all of a sudden it cannot be permitted to be imported into Tasmania because it does not sit on the permitted list. We need to have a very significant streamlined process that can take into account changes like that.

In discussions with the department, I raised the issue of importing food products, for example, and the department talked about how there is a potential for a class of products to be on the permitted list such as cooked, steamed et cetera. However, we do need a system even there that is flexible enough to take into account issues like importing salmon into the state. We do not want salmon imported into the state.

In saying we allow any smoked product to come into the state, in that instance we would have to have a system that would take into account that we do not want smoked salmon coming into the state.

There is a bit of work and more thinking to be done about having a permitted list system. That is something we may have to revisit if it is not working.

I do not have problems with a permitted list system. It does stop the opposite happening. If we did not have a permitted list system, then people might say, 'that's not banned, therefore we can bring it in'. That is the opposite, which can be difficult itself.

I reiterate that the system of approval for something to be on the permitted list cannot be overly bureaucratic and needs to be risk-based. There needs to be some investment in time and effort to get that right.

The prohibited matter is one that cannot be imported or possessed without a permit, and then 'restricted matter' cannot be imported without a permit but it is not restricted; you can actually still have it in Tasmania but you just cannot import more without having a permit. That is the difference between 'restricted matter' and 'permitted matter'.

I will go on to talk about some of the protections. One of the protections is in clause 24, which is about reasonable suspicion. It puts in a 'reasonableness' test.

For the purposes of this Act, an animal, plant or other things may be reasonably suspected of being a carrier of a biosecurity matter if there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that -

and the bill is very clever in the way that it constructs this reasonableness test.

- (a) biosecurity matter is present in or on the animal, plant or other thing; or
- (b) the animal, plant or other thing is or has been ... a flock, group or herd, or is travelling or has travelled on any land or place, or in a vehicle, on or in which there is or was an animal, plant or other thing that was a carrier of the biosecurity matter;

That is covering things like if there was, heaven forbid, a foot and mouth outbreak, anything even closely associated with a truck that had carried one infected animal could then be coming within a reasonable suspicion test, et cetera. This is very clever the way that this spells things out.

It goes on in clause 25 to talk about a reasonable suspicion of infection which has a similar reasonableness test, a reasonable suspicion of infection and then there is also a reasonable suspicion of infestation, talking about the difference between an infection and an infestation. The reason this bill is so big is because the department has gone through and been very diligent in the way that they have constructed this.

One of the issues here is about the qualifications under Part 3 - Officers under clause 31, Authorised officers. This may be open to challenge, hopefully not, but subclause (3) says:

The Secretary may only appoint a person as an authorised officer under subsection (1) if the Secretary is satisfied that the person -

- (a) is a suitable person to be appointed as an authorised officer; and
- (b) holds the qualifications, skills, knowledge and experience to perform the functions of an authorised officer; and
- (c) holds any qualifications, skills, knowledge and experience that are prescribed for this purposes of this section.

I like the idea of having a description of the skills the authorised officers must have. However, I suspect that this may be subject to challenge. It might be something we have to revisit if somebody goes down the line of challenging a biosecurity find et cetera, and they are arguing the qualifications of the officer were not up to scratch. We will just have to see how that operates, but that is a potential concern that the minister may wish to address.

I go to covering off some of the issues raised by industry throughout the development of this bill. One of the major concerns industry had, not just one but many different industry groups, was about the powers of the authorised officers to enter the premises. The department has covered off on these concerns very well and that is why we now have full support from the industry, as outlined in the second reading speech, and in my consultations with industry, because it spells out the powers of authorised officers. Clause 50 reads:

- (1) If an authorised officer reasonably believes that entry into premises is necessary for an authorised purpose, the authorised officer may enter the premises -
 - (a) in an emergency, at any time; and
 - (b) in any other case, at any reasonable time.

Again putting in a reasonableness test. Subclause (2) reads:

A function conferred by this Act that authorises entry into premises authorises entry -

- (a) on foot, by vehicle, vessel or aircraft, or any other reasonable means; and
- (b) by drone or any other pilotless vehicle or equipment under remote control.

So the department has gone through and thought about all the different ways that properties may be accessed and thought a bit laterally by including things like drones, which no doubt will have a role in the future.

Subclause (3) reads:

Entry into any premises ... under this Act may be effected -

- (a) only with the use of reasonable force;

Again we are talking about a reasonableness test, so this bill adds a number of protections which has helped assuage the concerns of the industry. This is a very good construction.

Clause 53 talks about general functions of an authorised officer. It says:

- (1) An authorised officer may, in any place or premises lawfully entered, do anything that the authorised officer reasonably believes is necessary to be done for an authorised purpose.
- (2) Without limiting subsection (1), an authorised officer may do one or more of the following in a place or premises lawfully entered:

It then lists activities such as examining a thing, taking samples, erecting signs, moving or mustering any biosecurity matter, stopping, moving, searching, examining, inspecting a vehicle or directing a person in control or in charge of the vehicle to stop or move a vehicle, et cetera. There is a number of powers. It goes all the way down to (w), which is 'do anything else authorised, or prescribed, by or under this Act.'

Clause 53(3) says:

The power of an authorised officer to examine and inspect any thing includes a power to use reasonable force to break open or otherwise access a container, vehicle or other thing being used, or suspected of being used, to hold or contain any thing.

Again the department has inserted a reasonableness test to make sure that this very powerful bill, to the best of the drafter's ability, is not used for unintended purposes.

Clause 69 is about care to be taken by authorised officers. It says:

In the performance of a function to enter or search premises under this Part, or to do anything else on premises under this Act, an authorised officer is to do as little damage as is reasonably possible in the circumstances.

Again, a reasonableness test.

I will move on to Part 5 - Biosecurity Duties and Dealings. This goes on to set in place a general biosecurity duty, which is a significant change from the past. As I said earlier, it is everybody's responsibility to ensure that Tasmania's biosecurity is world-leading and we do not have issues that impact industry, the environment or the community. Clause 70 reads:

- (1) A person has a duty ... to take all reasonable and practicable measures to prevent, eliminate or minimise, biosecurity risk when dealing with biosecurity matter, or a carrier, if that person knows or reasonably ought to know that the biosecurity matter, carrier or dealing poses a biosecurity risk.
- (2) Unless otherwise specified and without limiting the general biosecurity duty, a person fails to comply with the general biosecurity duty in respect of biosecurity matter, a carrier or a dealing if the person knowingly, or negligently, fails to comply with any applicable specified biosecurity requirement in respect of the biosecurity matter, the carrier or dealing.

That is putting in place another test that if a person knowingly or negligently fails to comply then there is trouble.

It goes on to describe failure to comply with a general biosecurity duty and lists the fines. There are substantial fines now in place. We heard in the minister's second reading speech that the fines in Tasmania were very small but now they are very large, with a body corporate fine of 10 000 penalty points, which is a substantial amount of money, or an individual fine not exceeding 2500 penalty points. That was not highlighted in the minister's second reading speech. In the second reading speech the minister spoke of corporate fine and jail time for individuals but did not specify the maximum fine for an individual as 2500 penalty points. That is a substantial fine that an

individual, not a company, may be subject to. That was an omission from the second reading speech.

Mr Barnett - There was not much missed, however.

Dr BROAD - No, but I did point it out in the briefing. I know that your second reading speech went for 50 minutes or whatever but that was something I thought may be a good idea to clear up because it is an important point that a company can be fined 10 000 penalty points but an individual can be fined 2500 penalty points and, indeed, for a significant breach, end up in jail for 48 months. That is a substantial penalty. That is how seriously biosecurity should be taken.

Part 6 - Biosecurity Registration. This came up after the blueberry rust. The main issue there was the Government, the department, did not have a handle on how many blueberry growers there were in the state. I am not sure if that has been rectified. A serious amount of work needs to be done so the Government and the department knows how many producers there are of each different product if there is a disease outbreak in a nightmare scenario. We had fruit fly but there are others, such as spotted-winged drosophila. You have issues like phylloxera in grapes and the tomato-potato psyllid in potatoes. If they came into the state, could we locate every potato grower. Do we know where every vineyard is? These are things we need to know.

This bill goes part way. Registration is required in regulated dealings, so it sets in place a mechanism. The way it is constructed leaves a lot of it up to industry rather than requiring growers to self-register. It needs to be industry driven.

I urge all industries to undertake this registration process for not only the properties but for the growers. There is a significant issue if something pops up. We need to have better information so that we can control any outbreak. The briefing from the department said this issue will require policy from government to get industries registered, otherwise it is a process where the industry needs to self-register. This is an important part of being prepared for emergency outbreaks.

If we had the nightmare scenario of foot and mouth, how many cattle producers are there and where are they? We need to know that at a moment's notice or at least have more up-to-date data than we already have. We do not have full knowledge. I said to the department, I have four sheep and a cow and nobody knows that. I put that on *Hansard* so if you want to track down four sheep and a cow, you can come to my place.

We need to have a register of more significant owners of stock than myself. At the moment, we do not have that information. We need to get it. We need to have resources allocated to regularly update that data. Proxies such as the National Livestock Identification System do not cover all stock. It covers cows, but where are our pigs and sheep? We need to have better information. I urge the Government to put money into identifying where particular products and stock are kept, so that if anything, heaven forbid, happens we are well prepared. That is the preparedness I am keen on.

This bill sets out new ideas, such as Biosecurity Zones in Part 8, clause 128. This will be done via regulations. This gives the department and the government powers to isolate particular areas, whether it be an island or a section of Tasmania. This is very well thought out and much appreciated.

The section on Biosecurity Programs and Agreements, Part 9 clause 131, is very important. This clause says -

- (1) An entity representing the interests of any industry, or of any part of the community, may prepare a draft program relating to the prevention, elimination, minimisation, control or management of a biosecurity risk or biosecurity impact.

This allows industries like the salmon industry, for example, to create a robust biosecurity system. I have reiterated in this place that biosecurity is probably the biggest risk to the aquaculture industry because it is biosecurity issues that have wiped out industries and resulted in significant declines in industries around the world. That is the number one issue for the salmon industry. This section, I am led to believe, allows an industry like aquaculture to develop a biosecurity program without being subject to ACCC action. That is a significant step forward and from what I can gather leading Australia.

Correct me if I am wrong, minister. I think that is a substantial step forward.

Part 10, clause 139 gives the department the ability to recognise existing industry accreditation systems. The last thing we want is duplication. In some circumstances, biosecurity audits and so on are required but there are current certification systems. There are a number of them across industries and this bill can recognise those certifications. That is well thought out.

We then get to emergencies. We have seen an emergency with blueberry rust; however, the biggest emergency since potato blight arrived in 1900 was the fruit fly. We have learnt lessons about emergency orders and their duration. This bill set out a number of particular strategies such as emergency orders, emergency zones, emergency measures, and so on.

The bill authorises the secretary to recover costs. Recovering costs is important. If someone has acted inappropriately then it gives government the ability to recover costs, under clause 174. Under clause 218, the bill allows eligibility for reimbursements. In the past payments have been ex-gratia. With blueberry rust, for example, ex-gratia payments were made for destruction of blueberries. There is an argument that those ex-gratia payments were inadequate for the growers who were impacted. The payments were substantially less than what it cost them in both the efforts that they put into planting and lost income. This allows reimbursements if plant, animal or property is destroyed under an approved biosecurity program.

What we really need is industries to develop their own biosecurity programs so that if an issue arises then how costs are recovered or how reimbursements are made and how that is paid for is known. For example, if there is an outbreak that is declared an emergency by the federal government and it results in the destruction of the property or a bunch of animals, there is a process in place at the federal level in which those costs can be recovered from the entire industry through a voluntary levy. That is a very good thing. If one individual or a group of individuals lose their livelihood in the process of protecting the entire industry then the entire industry should bear those costs. We have seen with Panama disease in bananas that the destruction of the diseased plants was refunded by the entire industry through a levy.

This bill itself does not allow for that. However, it allows for an industry to develop their own biosecurity program. Industries should do that due diligence because the last thing we need is for there to be inertia or delays if we have a nightmare biosecurity disaster. We do not want any dilly-

dallying about who is going to cover the costs. It would be nice if that work was already done. For example, if phylloxera arrived, and we do not want any of this to happen, we would want that particular vineyard destroyed immediately, and we would want that vineyard owner to know that they are going to be reimbursed for that. That their sacrifice of blood, sweat and tears and investments and so on to save the industry, is compensated.

I urge industries to go about the process of thinking through the diseases and the potential impact of a massive biosecurity issue and how they would pay for that, rather than doing it on an ad hoc basis or after the fact.

Moving on to natural justice provisions in the bill. I am going through the bill from front to back. What we have here starting in clause 244 is a number of legal defences; Part 14 in Legal Proceedings. Having undertaken due diligence is a legal defence. The bill says -

It is a defence in proceedings for an offence under this Act if the defendant establishes that the defendant has taken all reasonable precautions and exercised all due diligence to prevent the commission of the offence by the defendant or any other person under the direction, or supervision, of the defendant.

What we are doing in approving this bill is also approving defences such as due diligence. A defence also of lawful excuse -

It is a defence in proceedings for an offence under this Act if the defendant establishes that the conduct of the defendant was authorised by, or under, this Act.

Actions done under direction of an authorised officer - that is a protection as well as is a burden of proof in certain circumstances. It sets out a test in clause 247 -

In proceedings for an offence under this Act, the obligation is on the defendant to prove -

- (a) that the defendant was exempt from a requirement imposed by or under this Act; or
- (b) that the defendant was authorised by or under this Act to engage in any conduct so engaged in by the defendant.

That puts the burden of proof on the defendant for proceedings for an offence under this act.

It goes on to talk about orders for restoration, et cetera, and there is a long section on legal proceedings. This is very relevant. What we have seen in some issues in the past is where a biosecurity matter can become a legal nightmare. The worst example of that was citrus canker where we saw that the destruction of citrus became a massive issue.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - The member's time has expired.

Dr BROAD - Could I have an extension of time to finish? It is a very substantial bill.

Ms O'CONNOR - Madam Speaker, I move that the member be now heard to conclude his contribution.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Can you specify the time please that you are allowing to finish.

Dr BROAD - Five minutes.

Motion agreed to.

Dr BROAD - Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will highlight in the time I have left, the addition of a Biosecurity Advisory Committee is a substantial step forward. That was not present before and is a good step forward.

An important point is protection from liability of a person who provides, while acting in good faith, any information to the secretary or authorised officer, about a biosecurity risk, biosecurity impact, biosecurity event or a biosecurity matter.

Thank you for giving me the time to make this point. What this does is it is a defacto whistle blower protection. It will stop people thinking, 'If I say that the neighbour has a biosecurity issue, I am going to get sued'. This is a substantial protection and it is worth highlighting because we do not want people to be thinking about being sued and indeed the citrus canker issue showed that if you have somebody who is a serious litigant then it becomes a legal nightmare.

Further on in clause 279 we have an in good faith test. This is about putting in appropriate protections. In clause 279(1) -

The Minister, the Secretary, an authorised officer or any other person does not incur any personal liability in respect of any act done or omitted in good faith -

Also -

- (2) A civil liability that would, but for subsection (1), lie against a person, lies against the Crown.

This allows civil action against the Crown. That is important. For growers or people who believe that they have been wronged, this bill allows civil action against the Crown for recompense.

There are a number of things done in regulation. It talks about things like animal feed, which is quite important when it comes to things like swill. You do not want swill feeding of pigs, for example. This particular section in the miscellaneous section of regulations talks about the regulations that can be put in place. As framework legislation, the regulations are going to be very important. It also says that regulations may be put in place for evidentiary presumptions in respect of any biosecurity matter. The regulations will spell out some evidentiary presumptions.

This is clause 281(4), on page 306 -

Without limiting the generality of this section, the regulations may provide that any one or more of the following is authorised for the purposes of Part IV of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* of the Commonwealth:

- (a) a dealing or class of dealing;
- (b) a biosecurity matter or carrier, or class of biosecurity matter ...

- (c) any other act or thing, or kind of act or thing.

That is the section I was referring to earlier about the Competition and Consumer Act, allowing industries to not have to worry about that particular act when constructing their own biosecurity plants.

In summary, this is a well-constructed and well-consulted bill. So much work has been done yet I suggest there is actually so much work to be done post-royal assent and I urge the Government to provide the appropriate funding for enacting this bill. Preparedness, especially in preparedness projects, that is the key. We do not want to see other incursions such as myrtle rust, blueberry rust and fruit fly. We want Tasmania's biosecurity to be protected. This bill is a substantial step forward.

[12.43 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I thank Dr Broad for a very thorough and well-argued contribution.

The Greens strongly support the new Biosecurity Act of 2019. We recognise that it is the product of about five years in total of very thorough work on the part of the department working with key stakeholders like the Tasmanian Farmers & Graziers Association, the Tasmanian Beekeepers Association, the Tasmanian Conservation Trust, Fruit Growers Tasmania, and other stakeholders who have a critical interest in the health of our systems here in Tasmania and in making sure we have very strong biosecurity protections.

The Greens would argue, and I am sure the minister and Dr Broad would agree, for an island with a clean, green brand and reputation we have a lot to protect and we have a lot to lose if our biosecurity framework is not strong and well resourced.

The world has changed considerably since work on this new biosecurity legislation began in 2014. Back in 2014 global atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were at about 400 parts per million. We have just ticked over into 415 parts per million of atmospheric CO₂ and CO₂ equivalent. The world is in a state of climate emergency and that will place enormous pressure on our ecosystems and our capacity to be resilient and adaptive. That is why having a strong biosecurity framework is so important to protect not only our producers but also our environment and public health.

Tasmania's biosecurity has historically benefited from cold winters and long, mild growing seasons that make it difficult for pests to maintain a population, for example, the fruit fly. As we know, the Pacific oyster mortality syndrome and blueberry rust are both more prevalent in warmer temperatures. Fruit flies struggle to establish populations at low temperatures. Tasmania's 2017 fruit fly strategy identifies fruit fly as the variable of most significance in Tasmania. POMS was first detected in Tasmanian waters in 2016 and the most recent blueberry rust incursion was also in 2016-17. The climate emergency results in higher temperatures that makes the Tasmanian climate more suitable for pests and diseases previously not present in Tasmania.

Cuts to climate research and action on a climate emergency pose a significant threat to Tasmania's future biosecurity efforts. It is a fact that some of the most significant biosecurity events that are now defined in the legislation that we are talking about today, such as fruit fly, POMS and blueberry rust, can be directly linked to global heating. We have a fruit fly strategy for Tasmania that ends in two years, so I would certainly be looking forward to seeing the work that Biosecurity Tasmania undertakes in order to contemporise that fruit fly strategy for a warmer climate. We have a fruit fly strategy that ends in 2050 and a climate strategy that ends in two years.

There are a number of provisions in this legislation that are extremely important and give Biosecurity Tasmania clarity around the powers they have to prevent biosecurity events and damage to Tasmania's producers, exports and human health. The provision of a general biosecurity duty is an extremely important modernisation of the biosecurity framework in Tasmania. I understand that Biosecurity Tasmania wants to ensure that we have a culture in Tasmania of safeguarding our biosecurity and by having a general biosecurity duty defined in law that should drive cultural change.

The point I would make here though is that while it is a criminal offence to breach that general biosecurity duty, in Tasmania we have an unfortunate history of allowing industry to get away with not meeting their legal or community responsibilities. The most obvious and recent example is of the damage that has been done by the fish farming industry in Macquarie Harbour, D'Entrecasteaux Channel and now moving into Storm Bay. It has been failure of the regulatory authorities in this state to hold industry up to the law and community standards for their conduct.

I hope first of all that there are no breaches of the general biosecurity duty and that all producers and importers take that duty very responsibly, but if there are, Biosecurity Tasmania feels that they have the political support to take the action that is needed and of course they will need extra resourcing. There are requirements in this legislation that will demand of Biosecurity Tasmania more people and more resources in order to meet their obligations under this act. We have not seen a substantial increase in the resources into Biosecurity Tasmania for some time and it is necessary that Biosecurity Tasmania has those extra resources allocated to it and we will certainly be looking for that in the state Budget tomorrow.

We need more biosecurity staff, we need more detector dogs and we need to be realistic about the threats that are coming down the line and the risks, for example, that are associated with the Hobart runway extension and the fact that we will be taking international flights into Hobart Airport. That will require a much stronger Biosecurity Tasmania and Customs presence at Hobart Airport. I would like to ask the minister on the record now what kind of forward planning has he initiated and is Biosecurity Tasmania undertaking for the introduction of international flights to Tasmania? Just as imports to Tasmania over sea can present the risk of a biosecurity event, international flights can be vectors for biosecurity threats. If the minister could apply his mind to that and provide an answer that would be good.

I also have a question for the minister in relation to permitted matter under the legislation and the level of resourcing that will be allocated to permitted matter. In Part 2, clause 19, it says:

The Minister may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, declare any biosecurity matter, or class of biosecurity matter, to be **permitted matter** ...

Could the minister outline to the House the process for determining what is a permitted matter and what level of resourcing will be allocated to this regime? That would be helpful.

I also note, as Dr Broad and the minister pointed out, that this legislation applies the reasonableness test, that an animal, plant or other thing may be 'reasonably expected' to be a carrier. There is allowance for a reasonable suspicion of infection and infestation. That is a really important tool if we are going to apply the precautionary principle to biosecurity matters in Tasmania to enable Biosecurity Tasmania officers and their delegated persons to apply that reasonableness test.

I want to thank the department for the thorough briefing. I did not ask for three briefings as Dr Broad did, but Dr Woodruff and I had a good couple of hours with the department and talked

through this very substantial legislation and came away from that briefing more convinced than ever that this is good, strong legislation. It clarifies the powers of Biosecurity Tasmania and the responsibilities that are on all of us to protect biosecurity in this state but it also brings together about seven pieces of legislation under this act.

I would like you to provide some clarity on clause 36, Entry to premises by a biosecurity auditor, which says:

- (1) A biosecurity auditor who is also an authorised officer may perform his or her functions as a biosecurity auditor on premises entered under his or her functions as an authorised officer.

Subclause (3) says that:

Nothing in this section prevents a biosecurity auditor from -

- (a) entering or remaining on any premises, or doing anything else on premises, with the consent of the occupier of the premises; or
- (b) entering or remaining in any public place while that place is open to the public.

Could the minister provide some clarity about the circumstances under which an auditor or another authorised person may enter a premises without the consent of the producer or the property owner?

Clause 38 of the legislation talks about the processes for accrediting people as biosecurity certifiers. Could the minister provide some information to the House on what sort of qualifications a biosecurity certifier would be required to have?

From Biosecurity Tasmania's point of view, what kind of monitoring process is there of the work of biosecurity auditors?

With the enactment of a general biosecurity duty, while ignorance is never a defence under the law, this duty requires of the government and Biosecurity Tasmania a very thorough community education and engagement process. We did touch on that in the briefing the other day. Could the minister outline to the House what steps will be taken to inform the broader community, as well as importers and other producers, of their general biosecurity duty? What level of resourcing will be allocated to that community engagement process? Dr Broad noted that the failure to comply with a general biosecurity duty can lead to, for an individual, a fine not exceeding 2500 penalty units or a term of imprisonment, not exceeding 48 months. That is a remarkably strong penalty for someone who does the wrong thing by Tasmania's brand, by its exporters and by its people. We are pleased to see that it is a criminal offence for someone to wilfully or negligently breach their general biosecurity duty.

Would the minister provide some clarity, in the form of an example, to clause 73(5) -

It is a defence to proceedings for an offence under this section if the defendant establishes that he or she did not notify an authorised officer in respect of a biosecurity event, as required under this section, because the defendant had

reasonable grounds to believe that the biosecurity event was widely and publicly known at the time the defendant allegedly committed the offence.

While that seems clear in the way it is described, I would like to understand what those circumstances might be? Is it that, if there is a biosecurity event, for example, a fruit fly incursion in the north of the state and on Flinders Island and another grower in the region detects fruit fly on their property and does not notify Biosecurity Tasmania under the provisions of this act by exercising their general biosecurity duty, is that a defence? That is what I want to understand.

There are important transparency provisions in this legislation that require Biosecurity Tasmania to either publish, in the *Gazette* or on the website, certain permits.

At the moment, under Permits clause 99(2) -

Despite subsection (1) [a permit which is issued by the secretary or an authorised officer under this section], the following types of permit may only be issued by the Secretary, the Chief Veterinary Officer or the Chief Plant Protection Officer:

- (a) an emergency permit;
- (b) a prohibited matter permit;
- (c) a prohibited dealing permit;
- (d) a group permit.

Clause 242 talks about the Evidence of publication of instruments on website -

(1) The Secretary is to cause a record to be kept of the publication on the Department website of the following:

- (a) an emergency order;
- (b) a control order;
- (c) a general biosecurity direction;
- (d) a group permit;
- (e) any other notice, order, declaration, instrument or document that may be made or given under this Act by publication on the Department website.

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

MOTION

Climate Emergency

[2.31 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens - Motion) - Mr Deputy Speaker, it gives me no joy at all to read out the text of our notice of motion. I would like to acknowledge the presence

in Parliament today of many young people, climate and environmental activists, people who spend large parts of their lives standing up for a safe climate and a healthy environment.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the House:-

- (1) Acknowledges that the world is in a state of climate emergency.
- (2) Recognises the critical work of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- (3) Agrees that global temperature rise must be limited to 1.5 degrees to minimise the worst impact of global heating.
- (4) Commends the United Kingdom, Ireland, the ACT Assembly and the five hundred and twenty eight councils that have recognised the climate emergency.
- (5) Further agrees that Australia and Tasmania must take stronger, sustained action to lower our emissions and adapt to the reality of a world in a state of climate emergency.
- (6) Declares a climate emergency and calls on the Tasmanian Government to adopt strong targets backed by effective measures to reduce Tasmania's emissions and ensure that strong climate adaptation measures are implemented.

What the Greens are asking parliament to do today is simply to acknowledge the truth. The truth of it is that the world is in a state of climate emergency and that is why the United Kingdom Parliament, the Irish Parliament, the ACT Parliament and 528 councils around the world have acknowledged the truth and declared a climate emergency.

The science is oxygen clear. We have a decade to turn this sorry ship around. Global temperature has already increased due to human activity by over 1 degree Celsius. We are feeling the effects here in Tasmania. We have had floods that claimed lives. We have had fires caused by an increase in dry lightning strikes, most recently in 2016 and 2018, that have devastated the Tasmanian wilderness world heritage area and large chunks of our natural environment. We have had fruit fly incursions into Tasmania compromising our brand and our fruit fly free status. They are here because Tasmania is warming along with the rest of the world. We have experienced a marine heatwave on the east coast of Tasmania where waters are warming faster than most other places in the world and that will have an impact on aquaculture industries. It is already having an impact on the industrial salmon farming industry.

The world is in a state of climate emergency and that is why young people are rising up. They are standing up and demanding action. They are demanding action from their leaders. They want to know we will stand with them and that we have a path forward that gives them hope for the future and hope through action is what is required.

I am certain there will be members in this place who have had some really difficult conversations with their children because young people are informed, engaged and connected through social media with information and facts in a way they never have been before.

As parents, those conversations are extremely difficult. I find it extremely hard to talk to my kids about their future in a climate emergency. I ask members of this place to reflect for a moment on how different their lives are from ours were when we were their age. We were dreaming of careers, of travel, love and family. We believed we could look forward to a comfortable old age if we worked hard and were good people.

Young people today have a very different future in front of them. We have to acknowledge that. You have young people who are making decisions about their future based on their terror of what is going to happen to this planet. How do we deal with that acute state of mental stress amongst young people? We give them hope by taking their fears seriously, by being honest about the scale of the problem, the challenge but also the actions we can take and the opportunities that come out of that action.

We cannot give up hope because our young people, our children, are counting on us to stand true, to stay strong and to not give in to despair. That starts with leadership across political parties, across philosophies and belief systems. We need to show leadership, acknowledge the truth and acknowledge the science.

Last weekend, Australians voted and they voted not to change government. They voted for a Prime Minister who took a lump of coal into the Australian Parliament and chortled gleefully. They did not vote for the Australian Labor Party. Part of the reason they did not vote for the ALP is because the ALP was half pregnant on climate change. On the one hand you were prepared to say we have a plan to tackle climate change, and good on you, because at a state level, you did not take a climate plan to the state election. On the other hand, like the Liberal Party, Labor is backing in the Adani Mine. Only today, the Queensland Premier Anastasia Palaszczuk is demanding the federal LNP Government hurry up with the approval of the Adani Mine.

You would think there might be a lesson in last Saturday night's election result for Labor on climate because do you know whose vote went up? The Greens, in the Senate. That is because people who care about real action on climate change needed to know there were people in the federal parliament who would never let up and who would stay true to young Australians and map out a plan to deal with this existential threat that we face.

We initially drafted this notion. It was little bit political but it was still true, so we amended it. We sought feedback and accepted that feedback. That is why the motion is simply a statement of fact. We want members of this parliament to support our Notice of Motion. We want this parliament to send a message to young people that we hear them and that we are prepared to act.

I am not certain how either the Labor or the Liberals will vote on this Notice of Motion but I urge you to have a look at the people who are here watching today, to think about the thousands of kids who strike for climate in Tasmania, the 1.5 million young people around the world who took part in the last strike for climate.

There are members in this place from the other parties whose children participated in the climate strike. Those kids need to hear from us and they need to hear from us today.

The question has been asked - 'Why declare a climate emergency? What is the purpose of declaring a climate emergency?' The declaration of an emergency drives action. There is an organisation, the Climate Emergency Declaration & Mobilisation in Action global organisation. This is what they say about the importance of declaring a climate emergency -

A climate emergency declaration issued by a body in authority, such as a government or local council, can be a powerful catalyst for community-wide action if paired with a clear action plan.

They quote psychologist, Dr Margaret Salamon, founder of The Climate Mobilization organisation in the United States, who has written a book about leading the public into emergency mode. She uses the term 'emergency mode' to refer to the flow state in which people temporarily set aside business-as-usual and focus intently on determining the safest course of action and doing whatever is required, right now, to deal effectively with a threat. I quote Dr Salamon -

To evaluate whether we are currently in a climate crisis, the public will look to each other - and particularly to the climate organizations, writers, and leaders. Are they calling it an emergency? Does the tone of their writing and statements convey alarm and a passionate desire for massive action to avert imminent crisis? Are they demanding an emergency response? Are they acting like it's an emergency? Are they themselves in emergency mode? If the answer to these questions is 'no,' the individual will conclude that there must not be an emergency, or that emergency action is hopeless because the leaders are apparently unwilling to coordinate emergency action.

Dr Salamon goes on to talk about the thousands of school strikers and many others in the community who are already feeling very afraid - and the word I would put on it is terror - about their climate future. For those people, the scariest thing is that the government bodies that have the most power to make the necessary big changes appear to be ignoring that there is a climate emergency and pursuing policies that put us all at even greater peril.

The current global wave of local councils declaring a climate emergency is finally providing an element of hope and an action pathway thereby channelling the energy, focus and resources of their communities towards resolving the emergency and restoring safety.

It is a fact that human beings have risen to the challenge when an emergency has been declared and worked towards the common good. If there is one issue on which we should be able to put aside all political differences it is this one. Imagine the message that we could send today if the Tasmanian Parliament stood together and said - 'Yes, we accept the science, we accept the facts. We will state the truth and declare a climate emergency.' That sends a clear message to the community that we take their concerns seriously and we will work constructively towards a more climate-resilient Tasmania.

I am sure members of the House have received a number of emails from people about the Greens Notice of Motion that we brought on today. I want to quote Dr Jane Gorman -

The Climate Emergency Motion is critical because -

1. Many of the Australian public do not grasp the enormity of the threat posed by climate change and biodiversity loss. The alarming statements coming from bodies such as the UN, the IPCC, the World Health Organisation,

security agencies, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are not reflected by the Australian media. The declaration of a climate emergency is one step that will help the general public appreciate the threat we are facing.

2. The LNP did not take a credible climate policy into the election and this means that leadership on both mitigation and adaptation must be assumed at local and state government levels.
3. Globally, action on a climate crisis is not progressing at a rate that promises to avoid some of the worst-case scenarios. It is certain that a worsening of climate instability is already locked and Tasmania is at significant risk.

The Tasmanian State Government must look urgently at adaptation measures to protect its infrastructure and the health and wellbeing of its citizens.

Dr Gorman is writing from her background as a medical practitioner which gives her knowledge of -

1. The serious threat to human health posed by fossil fuels, climate change and biodiversity loss. Already the Tasmanian fires earlier this year have had significant effects on the physical and mental health of Tasmanians, not to mention financial losses.
2. Events like this will become tragically more frequent unless urgent action is taken.

She notes the immediate health benefits that arise from climate mitigation and adaptation measures. One of those immediate health benefits applies to the mental health of young people. It gives young people hope to know that their leaders stand with them and take this seriously because at the moment young people, young Australians, are suffering.

As a mother, Dr Gorman writes -

I would like to think that my children - 10, 8, 7 years old - will live to see this world continue in its current format. This seems increasingly unlikely. We have less than 12 years to make a significant difference to our carbon emissions, or the world will enter an irreversible process that will see the population of all living things on Earth decimated.

Here is an email from Carol Benham -

I urge you to support this motion today and to declare a climate emergency. This is not the time for partisanship, it is the time to stand up for our children's futures. You have an opportunity to display true leadership in your community, our state, our country, and the rest of the world. By signing on to this declaration, you will demonstrate that you take the threat seriously and care about the future of our planet and the legacy you are leaving our children.

Mr Deputy Speaker, when we asked the Premier this morning about whether he was prepared to acknowledge that the world is in a state of climate emergency, he talked about Tasmania's emissions profile. It was great to hear that Tasmania is a net carbon sink, but let us be honest about why that is. I go to the paper put out by the, in all likelihood, re-elected senator, Nick McKim during the election campaign, 'A Future For All of Us, making Tasmania a Global Climate Leader by 2030'. It goes to the data around Tasmania's greenhouse accounts.

Tasmania's main achievement to date, net zero emissions, owes far more to the conservation movement and Tasmanians who have supported it than it does to the major political parties. Under Tasmania's Climate Change Act of 2008, Tasmania has a legislated target of reducing greenhouse emissions to 60 per cent below 1990 levels by 2050. However, in April 2018, the Tasmanian Government announced that Tasmania has become the first jurisdiction in Australia to achieve net zero emissions '30 years ahead of schedule'. Net zero emissions means that the emissions produced in an economy are balanced out by an equivalent amount of emissions being sequestered, (drawn out of the atmosphere and stored in forests for instance). Tasmania's net zero emissions statement is the consequence of two historical factors: first, the early protection of large tracts of Tasmania's forests which sequester carbon; and, second, the more recent rapid and wide-scale downsizing of Tasmania's high-emitting forestry industry.

That is a legacy of the Labor-Greens government. Labor might not be so proud of it, but I can tell you we sure are because when we have a look at the greenhouse accounts, the decline in emissions from the forestry sector is profound. That is what has given us the capacity to stand tall in Australia and say, 'We are net zero emissions'.

But let us not shy away from the other realities. Emissions from stationary energy are up 7 per cent. Emissions from industrial processes and product use up 5 per cent. There is a long way to go and, Tasmania, through our history, through our renewable energy, our beautiful carbon sink forests, not only can we be a national leader on climate we can be a global leader on climate action, on mitigation, and adaption. We have more scientists per capita living in and around Hobart than any other place in Australia. We have a wealth of climate expertise right here on our doorstep. Let us really tap into it.

We need to drive mitigation, reducing our emissions in every sector of the economy, and adaptation. It is a matter of concern to many Tasmanians that there does not seem to be a coherent adaptation strategy in place. I know the minister will stand up shortly and make some comments about work that is being done. I acknowledge that the people in the climate office are outstanding public servants, but that expertise at UTAS, which has just established a new faculty of climate intervention, can work with IMAS and CSIRO and the Antarctic Division and the community, industry leaders, small business, all levels of government, to develop a really coherent adaptation plan.

This is the work government must be doing, in this century, at this time. Every responsible government needs to be adaptation planning. We are a vulnerable island community. There was some fantastic work done under the Labor-Greens government where we worked with communities and local council on adaptation pathways. You take people with you, you are honest about the future, you present possible choices, and then there is ownership of the direction that is taken, and a collective will.

I want other members to contribute, and I ask that Dr Woodruff is given an opportunity to wind up for the Greens. This is a matter of climate justice: justice for young people, so we can give them hope for the future. Justice for socio-economically disadvantaged, who we know will be the worst impacted by the extremes of global heating, people who are living in sub-standard housing, young people, the elderly and people who live in developing countries.

Only two months ago, two cyclones in quick succession slammed into the east coast of Africa, into Mozambique, wreaking utter havoc. Nearly at the same time there were unprecedented floods in Iran. Last month, a massive, unseasonal cyclone slammed into India and Bangladesh. When the sea levels rise, it will be the poor and the dispossessed who are the worst affected. The rich will be in their ivory towers. They will have put every measure in place to protect them and their own children. But we have a responsibility as leaders to remember the people of Mozambique and Bangladesh and Iran, communities all over the world that are already feeling the savage impacts of global heating. That is with a temperature rise of just over one degree.

The IPCC is telling us that we are on a trajectory of four to five degrees of warming by the end of this century, of sea level rise of up to two metres. What we know now is that the scientists were wrong about one thing: they were wrong about how fast this would happen. We are not talking about our grandchildren's future, we are talking about our own children's future. Surely, that brings it home for people in this place. We should have a conscience vote on something like this.

The UK Parliament is a conservative parliament. You would not call the Irish Parliament a pack of radicals. We have establishment parliaments prepared to declare a climate emergency. We are in a state of emergency. This parliament should have the courage and be prepared to show the leadership, to declare that, send a message to young people that we care about their future, send a message to the national government that we expect meaningful action on climate change and drive that sense of connectedness and purpose at the local level so that we can all be part of the solution together.

What a world we could make here in Tasmania. How much hope we could give our young people if we vote the right way today.

I commend the motion to the House.

[2.55 p.m.]

Ms ARCHER (Clark - Minister for Environment) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank the member for Clark, Ms O'Connor, for bringing on this motion.

There were two questions during question time today in relation to climate change. The first one was to the Premier. I restate quite clearly what the Premier stated in his answer to the question from the Greens: it is a very important issue for Tasmanians. It is an important issue for the world, but it is an important issue for Tasmanians as global citizens and for our Government.

That is why we have released Climate Action 21. The member for Clark will not be surprised that I will wave around the document of Climate Action 21. I will also wave around the document called 'The Implementation Plan'. Both documents are publicly available. It sets out this Government's commitment on the issue of climate change and all the initiatives and actions we have within Climate Action 21 and our implementation plan for that.

I accept what Ms O'Connor has just said in relation to working together with climate change researchers. That work is being done. We are world leaders in Tasmania. We should be proud of that and we should embrace all that we do to address the climate change challenge. I am again drawing on the words that the Premier used as our party leader and the Premier of this state. It demonstrates to all people concerned and especially, as Ms O'Connor has highlighted, to younger Tasmanians. We have to show leadership. That is why we need to be very careful about the language we use.

Ms O'Connor - What language would you use?

Ms ARCHER - I will get to that.

Ms O'Connor - Change is not a word that applies.

Ms ARCHER - I will get to that. The very first paragraph of this motion acknowledges that the world is in a state of climate emergency. That is the most heightened, emotive type of statement I think you could make.

Ms O'Connor - It is a statement of fact.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor. You were listened to in silence.

Ms ARCHER - In my foreword as the minister, if I can complete my sentence so it is not broken in the *Hansard* and taken out of context, in Climate Action 21 I said -

I view climate change as a serious and urgent challenge and I am committed to the whole-of-government activities and approach outlined in Climate Action 21. The actions under Climate Action 21 will support business, industry, local government and the community to reduce emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

I am proud of the achievements the Tasmanian community has made to date in responding to climate change. Of particular significance since the release of Climate Action 21 -

Which I did so last year.

... was confirmation in February 2018 that Tasmania achieved zero net emissions in 2015-2016.

This is a notable achievement, as Tasmania is the first jurisdiction in Australia to achieve zero net emissions. This positive result encourages Tasmania to further its ongoing abatement efforts and to increase production of renewable energy as we work towards our goal to make Tasmania renewable energy self-sufficient by 2022.

We are on track for that. I am going to run through that if time allows. I go back to my foreword -

Tasmania has significant advantages in responding to climate change, including our world class climate science capability located in Hobart and our low carbon economy, with over 40 per cent of our land mass held in reserves and operating as a carbon sink.

The Tasmanian Government is committed to harnessing the opportunities and responding to the risks that climate change presents, as we continue to take practical action to build climate neutral and climate resilient communities.

We will continue to collaborate and work with our stakeholders as we implement the important actions under Climate Action 21, in recognition that all Tasmanians have a role to play in responding to climate change.

I am reading that out deliberately because all too often it is peddled out there that this government does not care about these issues. We do. This is a public document. I urge the public to read it. It is easily available on line. The full title is 'Tasmania's Climate Change Action Plan 2017-2021'. It is prepared within the Department of Premier and Cabinet which is the Tasmanian Climate Change Office specifically. As Ms O'Connor acknowledged, there are some wonderful people who work within that office and I thank them for their continued work in this regard and all of the actions they are implementing.

Ms O'Connor - I wish they would get a real climate change minister.

Ms ARCHER - I don't need another title. As I have said in this House, I have six titles already.

Ms O'Connor - You are not the minister for climate change.

Ms ARCHER - It does fall within Environment. If climate change does not fall within Environment, I do not know where it falls.

Ms O'Connor - It should fall under the Premier actually.

Ms ARCHER - It is the most appropriate title. It is the most important aspect within my Environment portfolio. Members will have the time within the Environment allocation we agreed on this morning; two and a half hours during Budget Estimates. I have confirmed to the House that I will have departmental officers relevant to climate change throughout the entire time.

Mr O'Byrne - It is pretty telling that you removed the word 'climate'.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Mr O'Byrne.

Ms ARCHER - If you want to chop and change, that is fine by me. I will answer questions within Budget Estimates on this important area within my portfolio. We do not shy away from our responsibilities.

I want to get back to my notes as it is important to get on record exactly what this Government is doing, and that is action. We are not only talking about these things. We are not going to use language but I appreciate the sentiment of the motion. I will be moving an amendment to the motion. If members could bear with me because there are some important points I want to get on record. Labor has not spoken on this and Dr Woodruff wishes to speak as well.

It is important to acknowledge that we are responding to climate change, especially in the area of climate science and research, renewable energy and clean energy in this state and we have a commitment in that regard. We have what the rest of the nation wants and needs. That is low cost, reliable and clean energy and much needed energy storage. The minister for Energy has stated at numerous times in this House, the commitment we have in relation to being the Tasmania first energy policy and we are on target to deliver full self-sufficiency in renewables by 2022.

We have facilitated major wind farm developments at Cattle Hill in the Central Highlands and Granville Harbour on the West Coast. Together, this will inject an additional 260 megawatts of capacity into our system increasing our wind energy by 80 per cent. Our north-west region is classed in the top four renewable energy zones in the nation. UPC Renewable plans to develop the area with prospect farms at Robbins Island and Jims Plain. This is exciting, with even grander plans to develop the north east.

There is the \$30 million investment for the first phase of Battery of the Nation by 2022 with the support of the federal government of the \$56 million it committed to the development of the second inter-connector between Tasmania and the mainland.

There is an amendment I will move -

Mr O'Byrne - With indulgence, is there an amendment?

Ms ARCHER - There is an amendment I will move.

Mr O'Byrne - Can I see it?

Members interjecting.

Ms ARCHER - I have not moved it yet. Members, if you stop interjecting on me I will be able to make my points and then I will get to the amendment. I highlighted for the benefit of the Greens who moved the motion -

Mr O'Byrne - The conventions are that you share the amendment. We have to have a consideration of this.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. The Attorney-General has the call.

Ms ARCHER - I am quite prepared for you to see it but I have not formally moved it. I cannot hand around an amendment that I have not formally moved. The longer you interject on me, Mr O'Byrne, the longer it will take.

Mr O'Byrne - Will it change between now and when you formally move it?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Mr O'Byrne.

Mr O'Byrne - You know as well as I do, you circulate it so people can have a look at it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Mr O'Byrne.

Mr O'Byrne - If you do not want to do that.

Ms White - Glad you are on the record about that Attorney-General.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Ms ARCHER - Labor is policy-less in this area and they are trying to cover up by delaying my contribution, so they do not have to make a contribution, so they can justify presumably voting down this motion.

Dr Broad - Just get on with it.

Ms ARCHER - Dr Broad just says, 'just get on with it'. I am happy to stand here. You can keep interjecting on me, Dr Broad. I did say I wanted to run through some important initiatives of Climate Action 21 because it is important the Tasmanian people understand our Government's agenda for action on climate change. It reflects the Government's commitment to addressing the serious and urgent issue of climate change.

Under Climate Action 21, actions focus on climate change research, improving energy efficiency, reducing transport emissions, and supporting business, local government and communities to take action. Members heard from the Premier this morning in relation to establishing a long-term emissions reduction target of zero net emissions by 2050. I will have more to say about that target in future. I believe that is probably even a conservative target for this day and age in relation to what we are doing here in Tasmania, particularly in relation to supporting the roll-out of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in Tasmania. Climate Action 21 addresses what we are doing in that regard. Also the funding to undertake a business resource efficiency program that will assist small- and medium-sized businesses to reduce their emissions and operating costs through resource efficiency initiatives and building industry capacity.

We have also provided funding for the PowerSmart home and business programs, working with local government and regional bodies to embed climate change consideration into strategic and financial decision making, one of the important factors in that regard. Our Government allocated \$3 million in the 2017-18 budget which was \$750 000 per annum over four years to deliver a number of new initiatives to respond to a changing climate and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This was building on over \$400 million already invested by our Government to support action on climate change including a comprehensive targeted fuel reduction burning program which has been significant: the Tasmanian Energy Efficiency Loan Scheme, modernising and upgrading our renewable hydroelectricity assets, investing in our irrigation infrastructure to provide greater surety for farmers in a changing climate; nationally accredited training related to climate change issues and supporting businesses and households to improve their energy efficiency. Additionally, at a national level the re-elected Morrison Government will continue the Liberal National's strong record of supporting practical meaningful environmental action that gets results and continues -

Ms O'Connor - Absolute rubbish. You were going quite well until then.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Ms ARCHER - It does continue. They have provided significant resources to this state, as I said of \$56 million for renewable energy. There is a commitment in that regard, the significant investment in irrigation which I have just mentioned earlier.

Members, I would like to move my amendment.

Members interjecting.

Ms ARCHER - We were going so well because Ms O'Connor, I thought, was very respectful in her debate. We are on a Greens motion with Labor being antagonistic in a debate that is important to this House. We do have a position, so at least the Government has a position on this. We will be really interested to hear what Labor's position is on this.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I move -

Leave out paragraphs (1) to (6) and insert instead the following new paragraphs -

- (1) Acknowledges that climate change is a serious and urgent challenge that requires immediate and practical action from local, national and international Governments;
- (2) Notes that Tasmania must continue to be a leader in responding to climate change, especially in the areas of climate science and research and renewable energy;
- (3) Recognises that Climate Action 21: Tasmania's Climate Change Action Plan 2017-2021 sets the Tasmanian Government's agenda for action on climate change and articulates how Tasmania will play its role in the global response to climate change;
- (4) Notes that Tasmania was the first jurisdiction in Australia to achieve zero net emissions in 2016 and the Government's Tasmania-First Energy Policy is on target to deliver full self-sufficiency in renewables by 2022, with the Tasmanian Government investing up to \$30 million for the Battery of the Nation project and, with support from the Federal Government, \$56 million to progress a second interconnector.

Ms O'Connor - You don't want us to support your amendment, clearly, because of the way it is written, just like Labor - it's all politics to you people, all the time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Ms ARCHER -

- (5) Notes that the Tasmanian Government has committed \$3 million in funding to support the delivery of the Climate Change Action Plan and that these actions include:
 - a. establishing a long-term emissions reduction target of zero net emissions by 2050;
 - b. supporting the rollout of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in Tasmania;
 - c. delivering a business resource efficiency program that will assist small and medium-sized businesses to reduce their emissions and

operating costs through resource efficiency initiatives, and building industry capacity;

- d. funding for the Power\$mart Home and Businesses programs, which provide financial support over two years to conduct energy audits for small and medium-sized businesses to identify opportunities to improve energy efficiency, and to reduce power bills and emissions, and helping low income households reduce their energy costs through support and education, energy efficient audits and low-cost upgrades; and
 - e. working with local government and regional bodies to embed climate change consideration into strategic and financial decision making.
- (6) Notes that the \$3 million in funding builds on over \$400 million already invested by the Tasmanian Government to support action on climate change including:
- a. a comprehensive targeted fuel reduction burning program;
 - b. the Tasmanian Energy Efficiency Loan Scheme;
 - c. modernising and upgrading our renewable hydro-electricity assets;
 - d. investing in our irrigation infrastructure to provide greater surety for farmers in a changing climate;
 - e. nationally accredited training related to climate change issues; and
 - f. supporting businesses and households to improve their energy efficiency.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I know that other members wish to speak. It is important to note that the state Government recognises that climate is a serious issue that requires local community and international action.

Ms O'Connor - So you've cut and pasted the QTB to turn this into a political exercise.

Ms ARCHER - No, we have had no QTB.

Members interjecting.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. Through the Chair please, minister. The minister has the call.

Ms ARCHER - Mr Deputy Speaker, the allegation has been put that I have just read out a reproduced DD. I have not reproduced a DD. The question from the member for Clark, Ms O'Connor, to the Premier this morning - is she calling her own question a DD now? I do not know.

Ms O'Connor - No, this is written so we can't support it, and you know that.

Ms ARCHER - No, it is not. It is important to know what Tasmania is doing as a global leader in this space.

Ms O'Connor - Oh, for heaven's sake, it is anti-science.

Ms ARCHER - It would be nice to have the Greens' support for exactly what Tasmania has achieved and is continuing to achieve in accordance with Climate Action 21.

Ms O'Connor - Give us a break!

Ms ARCHER - I have said it is a serious and urgent issue and we need to act on these things. We are leaders and we need to be careful about our language. Saying that the world is in a state of emergency - our wording, our preference, is that this is a serious and urgent issue.

I have said what we are prepared to agree to. The amendment is there. I am not going to fall into the trap of what Labor is trying to do so that they do not have to get a position on the record - they want to run out of time. I am going to finish my debate so that Labor can actually state what their position is on climate change because the Government clearly has a position on climate change. I have just put the amendment to the motion and urge members to seriously consider agreeing to that.

[3.14 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Mr Deputy Speaker, speaking on the amendment, what we have before us is a shopping list of pretty much talking points that have been used in this place a number of times. I was seeking the call and made the jump so the idea that we did not want to have a say on this is factually incorrect and you should withdraw that statement.

We were seeking to amend - but we will not have the opportunity now in the limited time left - to strike out clause 6 and instead insert the following clause, which is -

- (6) Acknowledges that the scientific evidence of climate change is overwhelming.
- (7) Notes that forestry will play a key role in replacing carbon-intensive products like concrete and steel while also acting as carbon sink.
- (8) Notes that Tasmanian mineral resources like zinc, nickel, tin and copper will be increasingly important for transitional technologies like batteries, solar panels and electric cars.
- (9) Agrees there is a responsibility for Government to ensure there is a just transition for working people that rely on carbon-intensive industries for their livelihoods.
- (10) Reject political stunts that divide our community, for example the car convoy during the federal election that enraged and polarised communities and delivered a political victory for those that oppose any action on climate change.

- (11) Calls on the Government to report twice yearly to the Parliament on progress to meet strong targets backed by effective measure to reduce Tasmania's emissions and ensure that strong climate adaptation measures are implemented.

By leaving in paragraph (1) we acknowledge that the world is in a state of climate emergency, but what we want to see -

Ms O'Connor - But you couldn't bring yourself just to play this straight, could you?

Dr BROAD - Okay, so we have the Greens demanding action here. Well, history will -

Ms O'Connor - No, it is the community that is demanding action, it is human beings.

Dr BROAD - Madam Speaker, history will judge that when there was an opportunity for climate action in 2008, with the carbon pollution reduction scheme, what the Greens did, through politics, is knock that off. That was 10 years ago. There has been 10 years of inaction on climate change because that decision -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. Dr Broad seems to have forgotten his history and is misleading the House. Prime minister Julia Gillard worked with the Australian Greens to deliver a price on carbon that brought down emissions by about 7 million tonnes of CO₂ in a year. Have you forgotten your own former prime minister?

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order but you have it on *Hansard*. Order.

Dr BROAD - You are ashamed of the history of your own party. In 2008 was the opportunity. If we want to make changes on climate change the best thing to do is to start early. We could have started this 10 years ago but politics got in the way, the Greens voted down the CPRS, the carbon pollution reduction scheme, and that delivered Tony Abbott - that is what it did. It knocked off Malcolm Turnbull and it delivered Tony Abbott. We saw again in this election - yes, this election - a former member of this place drove a car from Hobart all the way to Queensland, and that drove a wedge between the people of the town and the city. What it actually did was deliver government to Morrison. The Greens' action, the literal impact of that, was a rout, a massive swing against Labor in those seats. It created a rallying point for all the LNP conservatives, all those coal-loving people who celebrated coal in the Parliament of Australia. That created a rallying point at every single stop along the way and it delivered a Morrison government.

Now we see the result of that. The result of that is three more years of climate inaction. We could have started all this in 2008 but instead what we have again is petty politics. What we actually need is action, and it was great to hear today that Tasmania is a net carbon sink.

Also in our amendment, there was an omission from the Greens' original motion, and that is our point 6, that we acknowledge that scientific evidence of climate change is overwhelming. When people say to me, 'Do you believe in climate change?', I say, 'No', because I do not have to believe. I look at the evidence and the evidence is overwhelming. It is not about belief; it is about evidence. The evidence is overwhelming.

Ms O'Connor - What are you doing about it then?

Dr BROAD - What are you doing about it? What you are doing is delivering a Morrison government, you are delivering a coal-loving parliament. That is, in effect, what your own parties and your own members' actions have done. What we need is real action and what we have in point 11 is a call of action on the Government. What would declaring a climate emergency actually do? We acknowledge that there is a state of climate emergency but we call on the Government to report twice yearly to the parliament about progress.

We have to acknowledge Tasmania's position in the world. One thing not acknowledged in the member for Clark's contribution is the successes of Tasmania. Tasmania is a global beacon; half this state is in some form of reserves. We have had massive investments in hydro energy and we should be proud of that. We have a well-managed forest industry, as highlighted in what we were proposing for products from forests, such as cross-laminated timber which is hopefully going to be built in Burnie and technologies like that. We should have mega buildings made out of timber. The benefit of that would be replacing carbon-intensive building materials like concrete and steel while acting as a carbon sink. The building would act as a carbon sink as would the regrowing forest. These are the sorts of things that we should be proud of as a state. We should be proud of our hydro-electric development.

What we should not be proud of is divisive politics, where instead of getting action on climate change we end up delivering a coalition government.

Imagine if we wound back the clock and in 2008 we reached an agreement on the carbon pollution reduction scheme. We would have had that scheme in place for 10 years. Imagine the reductions we could have seen. What we had was a politic that green lighted massive scare campaigns and delivered Tony Abbott into government. That is the outcome.

I seek to move an amendment to the amendment.

I move -

That all the words from the original motion from point 1 to 6 be removed and replaced with -

- (1) Acknowledges that the world is in a state of climate emergency.
- (2) Recognises the critical work of the United National Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- (3) Agrees that global temperature rise must be limited to 1.5 degrees to minimise the worst impact of global heating.
- (4) Commends the United Kingdom, Ireland, the ACT Assembly and the five hundred and twenty eight Councils that have recognised the climate emergency.
- (5) Further agrees that Australia and Tasmania must take stronger, sustained action to lower our emissions and adapt to the reality of a world in a state of climate emergency.
- (6) Acknowledges that scientific evidence on climate change is overwhelming.

- (7) Notes that forestry will play a vital role in replacing carbon intensive products like concrete and steel while also acting as carbon sink.
- (8) Notes that Tasmanian mineral resources like zinc, nickel, tin and copper will be increasingly important for transitional technologies like batteries, solar panels and electric cars.
- (9) Agrees there is a responsibility for Government to ensure there is a just transition for working people that rely on carbon-intensive industries for their livelihoods.
- (10) Rejects political stunts that divide our community, for example, the car convoy during the federal election that enraged and polarised communities and delivered a political victory for those that oppose any action on climate change.
- (11) Calls on the Government to report twice yearly to the Parliament on progress to meet strong targets backed by effective measures to reduce Tasmania's carbon emissions and ensure that strong climate adaptation measures are implemented.

We also need to acknowledge the scientific evidence. One of the few tricks that climate deniers use is they pick out faults in individual models and then say because the models are not perfect predictors then you throw all the models out. Modelling does not work like that. I have had some experience. I worked with the CSIRO on sustainable ecosystems. I developed rainfall run off models for a whole bunch of catchments in the state. I used gridded climate data, interpolated data. The whole idea of a model is that a model is equivalent to a map. If you read a map, a map can take you from A to B, but the map does not look like the real world. The map does not describe all the topography. It is a guide to get you from A to B, just like climate models. The climate models will never be perfect but what they show, overwhelmingly, is that the global temperature is rising and that carbon emissions are the cause of that.

Ms O'Connor - Yes, and we are in an emergency.

Dr BROAD - Yes, and we are reaching a situation now where there are so many unknowns. We have an ice-free North Atlantic stretching way into the summer and even into the autumn. We have issues like melting of the ice in the Antarctic. We have melting of ice in Greenland. Both those things will raise sea levels. We have massive impacts on local government. In my time at Central Coast Council we had within two years two floods that were well over the one-in-100-year flood. We had to go around the whole state and reassess what our one-in-100-year flood looks like because our models do not predict it any more.

We also need to have a bit of realism in this place, when we talk about issues like forestry, because forestry will be a key point. That is a key point for us.

Ms O'Connor - I made that point in my contribution. Anyway, you might let Dr Woodruff say a few words.

Dr BROAD - I just wanted to make a couple of points. We acknowledge that the world is in a state of climate emergency. I am outlining some of the impacts. The impacts in Tasmania will most likely be felt by local government. We have seen floods here -

Ms O'Connor - There is hot air coming out of you at the moment, because you are not going to support our motion. You have amended it so that we cannot support it.

Dr BROAD - We have amended your motion.

Ms O'Connor - You are playing politics with this. You have let all the kids down. You are a disgrace.

Dr BROAD - We have not let anybody down. We are trying to put in a bit of realism. We acknowledge that the world is in a state of climate emergency. We have left your point in there; we have done that. By maintaining the first five points in our amended amendment - it actually takes action. That was the point I was getting to. When the Greens actually had time, and when they had the ability to actually make some change in 2008 - actually make some change- it was climate inaction for 10 years. That was what has actually happened.

Ms O'Connor - You have forgotten prime minister Gillard, haven't you?

Dr BROAD - Of course, I have not. Prime minister Gillard will go down in history as one of the better prime ministers because of the challenges she had. She did not have the numbers in the lower House, or the upper House, and yet she delivered things like the National Disability Insurance Scheme. What an amazing thing to do in a parliament where you did not have the numbers in the lower House or the upper House.

Ms O'Connor - Yes, a price on carbon.

Dr BROAD - The price on carbon was delivered, and it was reducing emissions. But because of the CPRS election there was a minority government and that ended up delivering Tony Abbott to us. It delivered Tony Abbott just like this last series of stunts. The Greens should be congratulated. They have got themselves their one senator in each state. Well done. But as a result of the Greens stunts along the way you have actually delivered -

Ms O'Connor - Are you blaming us?

Dr BROAD - What you have actually delivered is a Morrison Government. The car rally up western Queensland created a rallying point. Now we are going to see another three years of inaction. We acknowledge the scientific evidence. We acknowledge that there is an emergency. But we also recognise, as the member for Clark recognised, that Tasmania is actually a carbon sink. We should be very proud of that. Probably not a lot of people know that. We are punching well above our weight. Our continued investments in wind farms, for example, will only add to that. We have the opportunity, if we can get another Basslink, to export the vast majority of that new energy from other wind farms to the mainland.

Ms O'CONNOR - A point of order, Madam Speaker. The member is engaging in tedious repetition in an attempt to prevent Dr Woodruff from responding to the amendment. I ask you to pull him up so that at least Dr Woodruff can have a short contribution.

Madam SPEAKER - I do not think that is a point of order. I ask you to be mindful that Dr Woodruff would like to say a few words.

Dr BROAD - Some of the wind farm developments we have on the books are currently being developed. We have been down to Granville Harbour and had a look. There are a couple of really big projects that are on the offing, but we need another Basslink to make that happen. We would encourage this federal government, and indeed members opposite to lobby forcefully, to make sure we can deliver a Basslink or even further Basslinks from that, so we can export our renewable energy and offset coal power, which will further reduce carbon pollution in the country. That is something Tasmania is going to be very proud of.

[3.25 p.m.]

Madam SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff, you have about 90 seconds.

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, what a tragic display from both the Liberal and the Labor parties. I apologise on behalf of everybody who is listening to this debate today - online, by Instagram later - for the lack of unity in this parliament. We simply came here today to move a motion that has been moved by hundreds of jurisdictions around the world that came on the back of the United Nations' incredibly strong evidence about the impacts for the planet of increasing climate heating and the global extinction crisis that is facing us.

One million species. What we are talking about is a state of global climate emergency. What we need today is a signal for young people, for people who survived the bushfires this summer, that their leaders acknowledge the truth, understand the science and are prepared to work together on a plan for action.

Mr O'Byrne - We acknowledge it is an emergency. We just disagree about how we get there. We are going to bring working people with us.

Ms O'Connor - The reception room is full of young people now. Go down there and show your face.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Dr WOODRUFF - We specifically did not prescribe a partisan plan. We made no mention of what needed to be done other than that we needed to work together. The Greens will continue to work together and continue to acknowledge that we are in a state of climate crisis. We are all going to work together and we have to act now and quickly on behalf of our young people and their future for Tasmania. We will continue to stand up for that.

Question - That the amendment to the amendment moved by Dr Broad be agreed to -

The House divided -

AYES 10

NOES 14

Mr Bacon
Dr Broad
Ms Butler
Ms Dow (Teller)
Ms Haddad
Ms Houston

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Ms Courtney
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gutwein
Mr Hodgman

Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms Standen
Ms White

Mr Jaensch
Ms O'Connor
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mrs Rylah
Mr Shelton
Mr Tucker (Teller)
Dr Woodruff

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Question - That the amendment to the motion be agreed to -

The House divided -

AYES 12

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Ms Courtney
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gutwein
Mr Hodgman
Mr Jaensch
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mrs Rylah
Mr Shelton
Mr Tucker (Teller)

NOES 12

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

Madam SPEAKER - The result of the division is 12 Ayes and 12 Noes. I therefore have to use a casting vote.

I have to say I am extremely disappointed that we have not had more time to thrash out this extremely serious issue. I do think it is an issue of our time and it is something that needs to be dealt with. Had I still been in council I would have supported the Greens' motion without doubt, but I am not. I am in the parliament. I am a member of the Government and there are bigger issues at play. I thought there were some very good points made in the Labor amendment but I could not agree with all of them.

I want to place on the record that climate change is an issue that I am personally very passionate about. I want to put this on the public record because I believe the threat of climate change is real and immediate. I believe that if the present generation fails to handle climate change threat as boldly and swiftly as possible then we risk leaving our coming generations with catastrophic damage that could be irreparable.

However, I also believe that governments must be careful not to create an unnecessary sense of fear, panic and alarm in relation to climate change.

Ms O'Connor - It is already there.

Madam SPEAKER - It is, and I accept that. I believe that this approach only plays into the hands of the climate change sceptics who will use any overreach such as narrowly missed climate projection targets as an excuse to claim climate change is not real. Instead, I believe it is far better for governments to focus on explaining the impact of climate change in a calm and measured way. This must include governments explaining the real actions they are taking on climate change.

I also believe that everyone must do their bit in the fight against climate change and I intend to use my time in this place to be a champion for change. I will do this by focusing on ensuring the Government delivers on practical and tangible actions to address climate change, including those in the Climate Change Action Plan, which I have been assured is under constant review.

I also believe the Government can and should do more to promote the work it is doing to address climate change, particularly those actions included in the action plan. I urge the Government not to be afraid to champion climate change because no political party - Greens, Labor or Liberal - should have a monopoly on good environmental policies.

I believe climate change actions must begin at home and for this reason I will be bringing forward a range of practical changes to the operations of the Tasmanian Parliament as of today that will help address climate change. These changes will be discussed at the next joint House committee meeting which I have already called for.

Finally I want to say that I respect the Greens' passion and commitment to the issue of climate change and I acknowledge this motion has been brought forward for debate today in good faith and with genuine concern. I would like to place on the record that the Greens, in my time in the Town Hall, taught me a lot and I am very grateful for that.

However, for the reasons that I have outlined I will be supporting the Government's amendment to the motion and cast my vote with the Ayes.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTION

Disability Services - Funding

[3.44 p.m.]

Ms STANDEN (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the House -

- (1) Acknowledges that there are 1 in 5 people living with disability in Tasmania, the highest rate of any State in Australia.
- (2) Recognises in Tasmania there are currently over 10 000 people who are eligible for support for the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), leaving upwards of 90 000 Tasmanians with disability who are not eligible

for NDIS and who rely on services provided by Tasmanian disability support service organisations.

- (3) Understands that under the Bilateral Agreement with the Federal Government, the Hodgman Liberal Government has a clear and undeniable responsibility to provide services for Tasmanians living with a disability and who are not eligible for support under the NDIS.
- (4) Notes that state funding contracts for 18 disability service organisations that provide vital services for people living with disability, their families and carers will expire on 30 June 2019, leaving 90 000 Tasmanians without crucial support.
- (5) Further understands the specialist and critical nature of the work of these organisations, which rely on core funding from the state Government, to do this work.
- (6) Calls on the Minister for Disability Services and Community Development, Hon Jacqui Petrusma MP, to commit to continued funding for these 18 disability support organisations in the state's Budget and provide certainty for people living with disability who rely on these services.

I rise to speak to this important motion in relation to disability services in this state. I will start by noting that Mrs Petrusma in question time this morning failed to answer a couple of questions that had come from not only the Opposition but from Tasmanian disability providers that are facing serious funding cuts. She has demonstrated a confusion and inability to fulfil her responsibilities as disability service minister. In so doing she has demonstrated she is incapable of standing up for vulnerable people.

Despite holding the disabilities portfolio for five years Mrs Petrusma's lack of interest and mismanagement has left Tasmanian disability organisations and people living with disability ill prepared for Tasmania's transition to the NDIS. At stake are upwards of 90 000 Tasmanians with disability who are not eligible for the NDIS and who rely on services provided by Tasmanian disability support service organisations that stand to lose funding at the end of this financial year.

Members may not be fully aware of the background to how we came to this place. Briefly, the NDIS, the National Disability Insurance Scheme was first proposed by Gough Whitlam in 1974. Prime minister Julia Gillard in November 2012 introduced a bill to parliament, the National Disability Insurance Scheme Act that was eventually passed in 2013. The NDIS commenced being rolled out nationally on 1 July 2016. We were told and Tasmanian disability service organisations were told that no one would be worse off under the NDIS. That was the express intent of the agreement at the time.

The National Disability strategy is due to expire in 2020. What is the minister doing about that?

All governments are committed to a national approach to supporting people with disability to maximise their potential and participate as equal citizens in Australian society. The development of this national disability strategy is the first time in Australia's history that all governments have committed to a unified national approach to improving the lives of people with disability, their

families and carers and providing leadership for a community-wide shift in attitudes. While having a national focus the strategy builds on existing efforts under state and territory plans. It will ensure that each level of government retains the flexibility to respond to the unique characteristics, priorities and challenges of their individual jurisdictions.

Under the agreements there is a clear human rights imperative. People with disability must be afforded the same rights as all other Australians. Australia formerly recognised this by ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, or CRPD, in 2008 and acceded to its optional protocol in 2009. People with disability are citizens with rights, not objects of charity.

Another issue at the core is around advocacy and the ability for disability organisations to advocate for people with disability. It is important that people with disability have the opportunity to participate in decisions that affect their lives. For some people this participation is supported by advocacy services. Disability advocacy enables and supports people with disability to safeguard their rights and overcome barriers that impact on their ability to participate in the community.

At the core of this, disability organisations are essential in promoting the rights of people with disability and in helping people with disability to reach their full potential through participation in all aspects of Australian life. Here governments at all levels, whether commonwealth, state, territory or local government develop policies, deliver programs and services and fund infrastructure. They have a responsibility to ensure inclusion, accessibility and connection across levels of government in all matters affecting the interests of people with disability.

The strategy does not change the specific roles and responsibilities of each level of government across the range of policies and programs that impact on people with disability, their families and carers. The strategy seeks to create a more cohesive whole of government approach. Implementing the strategy will assist governments in meeting their obligations under the following -

- (1) The United Nations Convention on rights of persons with disabilities.
- (2) The National Disability Agreement.
- (3) The Disability Discrimination Act of 1992, a Commonwealth Act and related disability standards.
- (4) The Commonwealth Disability Services Act 1986 and complimentary legislation.
- (5) Equal employment opportunity legislation.
- (6) Other state or territory legislation, including the ACT and Victoria and charters of human rights, and
- (7) Public Service acts.

The motion states that the House acknowledges that there are one in five people living with disability in Tasmania, the highest rate of any state in Australia. This includes the highest rate of autism, cerebral palsy and multiple sclerosis in Australia. These rates are likely to only increase.

The second part of the motion is -

recognises in Tasmania there are currently over 10 000 people who are eligible for support for the NDIS leaving upwards of 90 000 Tasmanians with disability who are not eligible for NDIS and who rely on services provided by Tasmanian disability support service organisations.

We understand that there is a range of eligibility criteria for the NDIS, including those aged between seven to 65 years of age. It provides funding and support for those with permanent and significant disabilities. In Tasmania, approximately 10 000 people are eligible for the NDIS. This leaves a number of gaps in eligibility, in particular children below age seven and adults over 65. It includes advocacy support and episodic disability, for example, some psycho-social illness, cancer or less severe disability. This includes conditions such as stroke. The issue with stroke is that it is sometimes unclear what the chance of recovery might be. This leaves open questions as to longer term prognosis.

Clinicians are reluctant to diagnose conditions with the possibility of permanent disability like autism in children less than eight years old and sometimes a little older. It includes people with diabetes because for some it is unclear whether there will be vision or circulatory compromise leading to amputations of limbs and therefore permanent disability.

In Tasmania, upwards of 90 000 people are estimated to not be eligible for the NDIS yet still require support for their daily living to participate in the community, social and economic life. People with Disability Australia has said -

Many thousands of people with disability will not meet the eligibility requirements but will still have disability support needs.

I turn to the bilateral agreement which is the subject of clause 3 in the motion which -

Understands that under the bilateral agreement with the federal government, the Hodgman Liberal Government has a clear and undeniable responsibility to provide services for Tasmanians living with a disability and who are not eligible for support under the NDIS.

The bilateral agreement between the state and federal governments clearly outlines that the government has a responsibility to provide continuity of support for clients of Tasmanian specialist disability programs who are found to be ineligible for the NDIS, to assist them to achieve similar outcomes.

This is outlined in page 3 of the current bilateral agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of Tasmania on the National Disability Insurance Scheme, which refers to shared responsibilities and 10(h) on page 3 of that document reads -

where required, provide continuity of support for clients of Commonwealth or Tasmanian specialist disability programs who are found to be ineligible for the NDIS to assist them to achieve similar outcomes.

Paragraph (o) of that same section says -

provide access to other services provided by the Commonwealth and Tasmania to all people with disability residing in Tasmania, in accordance with the agreed responsibilities of all governments.

Madam Speaker, it is clear under the bilateral agreement that the state of Tasmania has a very clear responsibility for some 90 000 people who fall outside of the scope of the NDIS because they are ineligible under that scheme. The question is, what will this minister and this Government do to ensure continued support for those Tasmanian people supported through specialist disability programs to assist them to achieve similar outcomes in terms of health and wellbeing?

Paragraph 4 of the motion says -

Notes that state funding contracts for 18 disability service organisations that provide vital services with people living with disability, their families and carers, will expire on 30 June 2019, leaving 90 000 Tasmanians without crucial support.

No. 5 says -

Understands the specialist and critical nature of the work of these organisations which rely on core funding from the state Government to do this work.

I have a table outlining those 18 organisations that support people who cannot currently get support through the NDIS, and I will speak briefly to that. These specialist organisations service people living with a disability right across Tasmania. Many of these organisations rely on core funding from the state Government to operate. Others receive very small amounts of state funding that only covers their overheads, such as the insurance costs for their volunteers.

Many of the people that these organisations service are not eligible for any other support, such as through the NDIS, because of the nature of their disability. These organisations include Autism Tasmania, the ParaQuad Association of Tasmania, Epilepsy Association of Tasmania, TADTas, Brain Injury Association of Tasmania, Multiple Sclerosis Society, Royal Guide Dogs Association, Spina Bifida Association, and Tasmanian Acquired Brain Injury Services.

As an example, TADTas currently receives \$43 000. This organisation provides technical advice, support, design, construction and installation of aids to support people with disabilities and their carers, and it relies heavily on the support of volunteers. They modify equipment to suit people living with a disability that is not otherwise available. An example I have here is of a young woman with a newborn who was unable to hold and nurse her child from her wheelchair. The TADTas team were able to provide a solution to her problem by constructing a cradle to attach and swivel to her wheelchair, changing the life of both the mother and her baby.

These services are available to people with a disability based upon their need and are extremely purpose built. If TADTas no longer receives funding there is no other service available in Tasmania for people needing this kind of support.

The Tasmanian Amputee Society currently receives \$43 000. This society relies on volunteers to provide support groups, coaches and guides for recovery for people. The Spina Bifida Association receives just over \$1500 per annum. This is a volunteer-run organisation that provides support and assistance to parents of children with a congenital spinal defect. The ParaQuad Association of Tasmania receives \$30 000 and supports people living with spinal cord injuries. The

Brain Injury Association of Tasmania receives \$95 000. This provides statewide services to people with acquired brain injuries, their family, and other stakeholders.

Paragraph 6 of the motion calls on the minister for Disability Services, Jacquie Petrusma MP, to commit to continued funding for these 18 disability support organisations in the state's budget and provide certainty for people living with disability who rely on these services. The state Government has a clear responsibility here to provide support services for those who are not eligible for the NDIS. Mrs Petrusma in this place has on a number of occasions, not just this morning, failed to recognise her responsibility and to understand this clear fact: How will the needs of the 90 000 Tasmanians living with disability who are not eligible for the NDIS be met moving forward? This is the key question.

I know that in this place this morning the minister tried to outline a couple of suggestions. So far, the Government has made two suggestions, both of which will not fix this problem. I want to be clear about this. First, these organisations have been told to apply for ILC, or Information Linkages and Connections, grants through the NDIS. The problems with this are several and they include that these grants do not provide core funding. As a former general manager of a small charitable organisation, I can tell you that it drives you mad to have to continue to apply for project-based funding without the possibility of core funding to run -

Mr O'Byrne - It almost cripples the organisation.

Ms STANDEN - It does, that is right, Mr O'Byrne. It literally cripples some organisations. That is exactly part of the intention of some of these shifts, I am sure, to consolidate some of the service delivery in other sectors perhaps. The problem in the disability services area is that these services not only need to be statewide for people in rural Tasmania but they are also highly specialised. These small organisations many times have come about as a result of mums and dads who have direct experience of children with disability and over 30 to 40 years have provided unbelievable service and dedication to that cause, driven of course by personal and family motivation in the belief that their organisation is providing irreplaceable service in that particular area.

The very viability of these organisations is undermined when grant funding does not provide core funding that these organisations need to exist because the funding for these information linkages and connections grants is project based. Many of these organisations are small and without the core funding simply do not have the capacity to even apply for grants. In the larger organisations, it might not be clear, but they have grant-writing units that are specifically set up for this, but not so these small organisations. These ILC grants are also nationally competitive, putting Tasmanian-based organisations at a disadvantage.

I acknowledge and thank the minister for recognising my experience in the past as a former state manager of the Department of Social Services. I have long experience in grants management, both at the Commonwealth and state level, and I well recognise that very often in nationally competitive grant rounds sometimes there can be a notional, regional or state-based allocation, but not always. It is not guaranteed so there is no guarantee in the case of these ILC grants of Tasmanian disability support organisations being successful.

A number of these organisations support disabilities which are not covered by the NDIS. These grants do not provide a viable solution for these organisations to continue to operate and serve people living with a disability who are not eligible for the NDIS.

The Government has made two suggestions. The first relates to information linkages and connection to grants. As I have outlined, there are number of reasons why that is problematic. Second, organisations may be offered a piece of a \$500 000 funding pie to be split on a pro rata basis between them. There are 18 organisations with their funding at risk as of today. Together, they are currently receiving and reliant on much more than the \$500 000 that is available through the state Government. If that pie were to be split up on a pro rata basis, that would amount to less than \$30 000 for each organisation. It does not take a mathematician to realise that will not be enough money to allow these organisations to continue to operate. Neither of these options provides a solution.

Through this motion we want to offer the minister an opportunity to offer the people of Tasmania, particularly those 90 000 people living with disability who fall outside the eligibility requirements for the NDIS, some sort of assurance that these 18 organisations will continue to be funded by the state Government.

This is an urgent issue. The National Disability Strategy will expire in 2020. The strategy currently ensures that states meet their obligations under six different acts and the United Nations Convention. We are not talking about the NDIS here, we are talking about the people who fall through the cracks - the 90 000 Tasmanians who are currently at risk of major gaps in service delivery if this state Government does not step up to its responsibilities under the bilateral agreement that it signed with the Commonwealth of Australia confirming the state's obligations.

[4.07 p.m.]

Mrs PETRUSMA (Franklin - Minister for Disability Services and Community Development) - Madam Speaker, while I acknowledge that there are some organisations that do have genuine concerns, I place on the record that we will not be supporting the motion. Any motion that is passed in this House must be factual. It is also important that if a motion is fundamentally flawed, as this one is, the reasons as to why we will not support it are articulated.

There are so many important reforms under way with regard to the NDIS. There is so much work going on. For people who will be participants of the scheme, whether they are the 10 600 Tasmanians who will come under the individualised support packages or whether they are Tasmanians with disability who are also beneficiaries under the scheme, I want to articulate the reasons why we do not support this motion.

As I outlined this morning, it is important that we understand that when people talk about the 90 000 people with disability in Tasmania, we have an ageing population which gives us a higher disability prevalence rate. This is because about eight out 10 people over the age 85 are counted as having a disability. A large majority of people with a disability counted in the 90 000 are aged over 65 years of age. What the Opposition is failing to take note of is that as a part of the NDIS reforms the previous Labor-Greens government signed up to in 2013, it is the role of the Commonwealth to be a provider of support for people with disability over the age of 65, as the NDIS is for people below 65 years. The Commonwealth is the main provider of supports for those over 65, which is the majority of people with disability in Tasmania.

What concerns me with the motion today is that it was the Labor-Greens government that signed Tasmania up to the NDIS. It is disturbing to see how little the Labor Opposition actually understands and remembers how the NDIS, a reform that they signed up for, is supposed to work.

I assure everyone in this House that we are 100 per cent committed to our responsibilities under the bilateral agreement. I will articulate what those roles and responsibilities will be, including

under the National Disability Strategy. I assure the house that the National Disability Strategy is being renewed. In Tasmania, we have Accessible Island, Tasmania's Disability Framework for Action. The Government is 100 per cent committed to undertaking the actions that are articulated in that strategy.

With regard to roles and responsibilities, the introduction of the National Disability Insurance Scheme in 2013 changed the role and focus of the Tasmanian government in relation to the provision of specialist disability services and programs. This change in role and focus was originally agreed to in the agreement signed by the previous Labor-Greens government in 2013.

The provision of specialist disability services and ILC-type services in Tasmania, as is the case in every other state and territory except Western Australia, will be from 1 July 2019 the function of the NDIS and the administrative responsibility of the NDIA. This approach is designed so that no one is worse off. In fact, people with disabilities will have more choice and more control by transitioning from the traditional block-funded supports to a self-managed funding model, as well as increased access to better quality services and more supports for Tasmanians with disability.

Tasmanians with disability not eligible for an individual support plan are still able to take advantage under the NDIS of the broader systems of information, connections and support, including mainstream and universal services, cohort-specific information and linkage to services otherwise known as information linkages and capacity building programs.

ILC programs were a recommendation of the Productivity Commission as part of the NDIS approach so that all people with disability right around Tasmania, right around Australia, can be a beneficiary of the NDIS even if they do not have an individual disability support plan.

It is important to reflect on how far we are coming under the National Disability Insurance Scheme to ensure that no Tasmanians with disability do actually miss out. Prior to the introduction of the NDIS in Tasmania as at 30 June 2013, there were only 3364 Tasmanians receiving a funded specialist support from the Labor-Greens government whether that was accommodation support, in-home personal care, community access and respite and there was a total of 6547 Tasmanians receiving any type of disability support. That includes children's therapy, service coordination, ILC type services such as information and advocacy.

There were not 90 000 Tasmanians receiving support. However, all Tasmanians will receive support under the National Disability Insurance Scheme. The previous government never provided nor funded the type of support and services that they are now saying will not be delivered for 90 000 Tasmanians. Far from it. There were 83 453 Tasmanians who did not receive services that will now into the future.

The greatest benefit of the NDIS is that it is estimated that up to 10 600 Tasmanians will be eligible for the individualised specialised support plans. On top of that, all Tasmanians with disability can benefit from it.

The member referred to episodic disability. I assure you that ILCs and the way the NDIS is set up is that it will support the remainder of Tasmanians with disability and will assist them to access information referrals to mainstream and universal services which are also there to support everyone who needs them, whether they are a person with a stroke, with diabetes or episodic mental health episodes. That is what the NDIS is there for.

In regard to continuity of supports, in accordance with our bilateral agreement with the Australian Government we are very committed to continuing to fund individuals under the continuity of supports, individuals with disability who are receiving funding for supports, either not eligible for individual support packages through the NDIS, or who require support that are outside the scope of those funded under the NDIS. This continuity of support obligation is an important element of the bilateral agreement and we are 100 per cent committed to funding and providing that service.

We will be funding continuity of supports under the bilateral scheme.

Ms Standen - How?

Mrs PETRUSMA - Just wait - it is part of the bilateral. We have signed up to it and are funding it. From 1 July we will be funding continuity of supports.

It is important to note that this continuity of support obligation is also separate to the mainstream and community services that are accessible to all, including ILC-type services. We will also continue to fund individual advocacy services and mainstream children's therapy services.

The ILC approach has been planned for several years and is in keeping with the agreement that the former Labor-Greens government signed up for. We are committed to playing our part in the full rollout of the NDIS in line with the agreement signed by the previous government, but it does concern me that Ms Standen, who raised this motion today, was a previous state manager for the Department of Social Services, so it is concerning that she does not have an understanding of what was happening when she was the manager at the time at the DSS.

It is very important that we get the facts out here today. On the day that Ms Standen and the member for Pembroke, Ms Siejka, got a briefing on the Disability Services Act, we provided information to the member for Pembroke in regard to individual advocacy services. We assured her that we were going to be funding those, and then she went to the *Mercury* and said that Speak Out, an advocacy organisation, will lose 48 per cent of funding but still need to serve 90 000 people living with a disability. The fact is, as was well explained to the member for Pembroke on 29 April - and this story appeared in the *Mercury* on 2 May - the Tasmanian Government had already advised the three specialist disability individual advocacy organisations in Tasmania that they will continue to be funded by the state Government in the upcoming 2019-20 state Budget. So her statement that Speak Out will lose 48 per cent of their funding was a blatant mistruth. In fact, Speak Out's funding in 2019-20 will continue, as I have said before, but this is to service around 200 to 300 clients the organisation itself has indicated it assisted. I am not sure how they thought that Speak Out ever serviced 90 000 people. They have only ever serviced 200 to 300 clients a year so that was another big exaggeration.

Speak Out has also been successful in the most recent National Disability Insurance Agency ILC round, where on top of the state funding they will be getting from 1 July, they also received \$180 873 in one ILC program and on top of that \$290 000 in the National Disability Advocacy Program round.

The Brain Injury Association of Tasmania secured \$194 332 under the recent DPFO funding round. Keeping in mind that under the state Government they received, including GST, \$107 000, in just one round BIAT received \$87 000 more than they were receiving under the state Government.

With regard to bridging funding in the ILC rounds, while commissioning has commenced for the ILC rounds, since we became aware that commissioning may not be complete before the end of this financial year, this Government has been working very hard and has already negotiated and received a grant agreement with the NDIA to provide and distribute transitional bridging funding to our existing eligible organisations for a period of time while the ILC commissioning process is resolved. A total of \$570 000 has so far been committed by the NDIA for eligible Tasmanian ILC-type organisations to guard against any funding gaps emerging. The Tasmanian Government will continue to monitor the ILC program rollout over the coming months and will work with the Australian Government and the NDIA to ensure there is an orderly transition from state-based funding to the NDIA-administered ILC grant programs.

If the amount of bridging funding is not sufficient, we will then be negotiating with the NDIA and the Australian Government for further funding. This is because we are committed to representing the interests of Tasmanians living with disability and ensuring that they benefit from the NDIS, be it through individualised support packages or ILCs. We are equally committed to ensuring that organisations intending to commission for ILC-type services are supported through the transition and realise the benefits from the opportunities available to them under this national form.

I fully acknowledge that the transition to the NDIS is also a significant change for organisations which is why the disability and community services have been working with this sector and providing information and support to these organisations for the past three years in preparation for the full scheme NDIS.

We have to remember that this is national, once-in-a-generation reform that involves complex and difficult work. Australia went through a similar reform with the introduction of Medicare in the 1980s, which I acknowledge today was one of prime minister Bob Hawke's greatest legacies. That is the journey we are on with regard to the NDIS.

With regard to the 18 ILC-type organisations being discussed today, to assist them with commissioning for the NDIS, DCS has continuously supported these providers through the transition period, in particular with organisations such as BIAT and Autism Tasmania. With the Multiple Sclerosis Society, for example, DCS has brought the NDIA national ILC branch down to do workshops and provide documentation material to assist. They have undertaken mapping to review those organisations providing ILC-type activities and their alignment to the ILC policy framework in order to assist them in smoothing transition under the NDIS. They have also assisted all providers considering commissioning for ILC within Tasmania to understand the outcomes framework and how they relate to the ILC and to support Tasmanian ILC-type providers to align their activities with the NDIA's ILC framework and outcomes.

Disability Services has also undertaken a suite of other activities to support providers including targeted support for existing ILC-type providers, leading up to the commencement of the ILC commissioning process. DCS is continuing to work with and support organisations that currently deliver ILC-type activities with the move to the ILC policy framework.

There is no evidence to date that the NDIA's commissioning for ILC services because of this bridging funding will mean that any person in Tasmania will be disadvantaged or worse off, despite what the member is alleging today. In fact, there is every reason to believe that there will be a greater range of services and supports that may be more readily available through the application

of the NDIA's ILC investment strategy because Tasmanian organisations have already been successful.

So far, just in regard to an initial round, Tasmanian organisations have secured a collective total of over \$1 million in the Disabled People and Families Organisations funding round to assist those entities to build their organisational capacity, to focus on peer support and to foster greater inclusion for people with disability, their families and carers.

Some of the organisations have already been mentioned today that will not be successful in the ILC round but I will go through the ones that have been successful in the ILC rounds. Autism Tas just in this initial round has received \$113 223. BIAT, as I said before, has already received \$194 332. Paraquad has received a \$122 154. Speak Out has already received \$180 873. ACD has received \$129 614, and the Tasmanian Amputee Society went from only \$4423 under the Tasmanian Government to receiving \$96 074 under the ILC round. The Prader-Willi Syndrome Association Tasmania has received \$121 921, and Women with Disabilities has received \$132 000.

The exciting thing about the ILC program, which the member does not seem to realise, is it gives a huge funding pool for organisations to apply for to actually get more funding. Much more funding than they would ever have received under the state Government. There are still four more rounds of the ILC program. The first is a \$51 million program for organisations to apply for and organisations will be able to apply for grants from \$300 000 upwards. BIAT, for example, told me that they had applied for \$3.6 million under this grant round. They would never have got that from the state Government. Tasmanian organisations can apply for bigger amounts of money than they had ever been able to apply for or receive from the state Government.

We need to wait until all four rounds have been fully commissioned to know if there are going to be any gaps at all. I am committed to meet with the ILC organisations after each round to see if they have been successful - and so is the department - to see how we can assist them with the next funding round. We are committed to hearing from them and to working with them. But we have to go through all four ILC funding rounds, which is a huge amount of money that is potentially available -

Ms O'Connor - What is the time line?

Mrs PETRUSMA - The time line is the next few months, but we are getting bridging funding for all our organisations to keep them going along until those ILC funding rounds are completed. None of them are going to suddenly not have any money from the state Government until the results of all those ILC funding rounds are known.

The good thing about the ILC funding rounds is it allows for different services to be commissioned than have ever been available in Tasmania. Organisations can produce innovative, different services that people with disability in Tasmania can go to get the services they have always needed but that the state was unable to fund or provide. The NDIS is a different way of working, it is a different way of operating, and it ensures that all Tasmanians with disability will be able to receive services.

I encourage the Opposition to try to understand the NDIS and the bilateral that they signed up for and the opportunities it actually affords to people with disability and disability service providers. It is sad and disappointing that they do not understand anything about the reform that they signed

up for. I can indicate that I will be moving an amendment to the motion because the motion is inaccurate and it is fundamentally flawed.

Madam Speaker, I move -

In paragraph (1) leave out all the words after 'Australia' and insert instead -

... due to our ageing population, with a large proportion aged over 65 years of age.

- (2) Acknowledges that an estimated 10 600 Tasmanians under 65 years of age will be eligible for individual support plans under the NDIS and that all Tasmanians with disability are eligible to access support and services offered by organisations that are funded through the National Disability Insurance Scheme Information, Leakages and Capacity Building programs.
- (3) Understands that under the Bilateral Agreement with the Federal Government that state and territory governments retain responsibility for providing continuity of supports and mainstream services such as health, education, housing, transport and safety for people with disability.
- (4) Acknowledges that as per the Agreement signed by the previous Labor-Greens government, from 1 July 2019, the provision of specialist disability services and ILC type services in Tasmania will be a function of the NDIS and the administrative responsibility of the National Disability Insurance Agency and that the Tasmanian Government invested \$878.7 million in the 2018-19 budget and forward Estimates towards the scheme.
- (5) Recognises the critical nature of the work disability services and support organisations provide and that the Government will continue to advocate for and to work closely with Tasmania's organisations in accessing the new and larger ILC funding streams available through the NDIS.
- (6) Acknowledges the Tasmanian Government's work in successfully securing 'bridging' funding from the Commonwealth to provide additional support to organisations seeking to transition and commission to the new ILC model.

The National Disability Insurance Scheme is one of the biggest and most important reforms that Australia has ever seen. The NDIS is, despite what the Opposition is claiming, revolutionising the way that people with disability are able to participate in the broader community. It is providing people with disability greater choice and control over their disability supports and assisting them to achieve their goals and aspirations.

That is why it is important that this House knows what the facts about the scheme are. My greatest concern is that people will be concerned or worried or not know that for them, from 1 July, ILCs are there to assist all Tasmanians with disability. We do not want confusing messages being put into the media that there are not going to be services for all Tasmanians with disability from 1 July. This is a once-in-a-lifetime reform that will help to assure a more equal and inclusive Tasmania which is why we are providing significant investment into it.

Implementing the NDIS is complex and a difficult task, especially due to the sheer scale and size of the reform and while there are inevitable challenges associated with transitioning to this scheme, this Government, along with every single other state and territory government, is committed to making sure we get it right. If it is an issue in this state, it is an issue in every other state and territory.

If at any time any member has any person with disability contact them and, if my office can assist, we are only too happy to raise the concerns with the NDIA. We want to get the scheme right and we want people with disability in Tasmania to be able to live in a state that offers them the best supports and services possible.

[4.33 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on Ms Standen's Notice of Motion Number 64 that relates to service providers who have fallen between the gaps in the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

I listened very carefully to what the minister said and have the proposed amendments to Ms Standen's motion before me.

Before I go to those amendments, I acknowledge the outstanding work of disability advocacy organisations, Speak Out, Advocacy Tasmania, the Association for Children with Disabilities and the critical work they do, working with people living with disability, their families and carers, to advocate for systemic change but also to represent people who are coming up against obstacles in the system.

I acknowledge the incredible, relentless tenacity and advocacy of Deb Byrne from the Brain Injury Association of Tasmania and her ongoing efforts to have government acknowledge the hidden impact of acquired brain injury on individuals as well as on our systems - our health system, our housing system, justice system and in our schools. Certainly, in the 11 years I have been in parliament, Deb Byrne has been one of the strongest and most tenacious advocates for a new way of looking at the impact of acquired brain injury, an often hidden disability on individuals and services in Tasmania.

I acknowledge the fantastic work of Tas Deaf, one of my favourite stakeholders. One of the most pleasant AGMs to go to is the Tas Deaf AGM. That organisation provides support, inclusion and, significantly, advocacy for Tasmanians who are hearing impaired.

There is a range of organisations that are not listed in Ms Standen's motion that have experienced acute funding uncertainty as a consequence of the rollout of the National Disability Insurance Scheme. The uncertainty is being experienced also by service providers because of the transition to a more market-based model where demand is driven in a large part by people living with a disability, so there have been some real challenges for service providers, and because of the way the NDIA pays out there has been huge lags in the financial viability of service providers that have long standing in our community and have provided decades of support to people living with a disability.

It is regrettable that we have got to this point where we have Labor saying one thing about organisations that have been block-funded in the past, the minister saying quite another, and clearly in the middle there are organisations who are not certain about what the future holds. It was only about six weeks ago that I had my last meeting with a key stakeholder in the disability advocacy

sector who was extremely concerned about the future of that organisation which gives people with disability a voice and an opportunity to convey their concerns, hopes and aspirations for the disability service system in Tasmania but also for their lives. There has been a substantial communication failure on the part of the NDIA and the state Government because we are at a point here where the Budget is being delivered tomorrow and there are questions unanswered about the future of these organisations.

I acknowledge the amendment put forward by the minister that self-congratulates over securing transitional funding for some of these organisations, but by the same token the minister did not acknowledge that for at least 18 organisations the future looks extremely uncertain. While there might be four grant rounds that have yet to be finalised, we are still talking about a grant allocation. We are not talking about a commitment to ongoing funding of, for example, Speak Out, Advocacy Tasmania or the Association for Children with Disabilities. It is not a great comfort, I would say, to sector organisations who have clearly expressed concern now to all parties about what their future holds.

Mrs Petrusma - Those services are being funded. ACD is being funded by us. Individual advocacy services continue to be funded by the state government.

Ms O'CONNOR - When was that commitment?

Mrs Petrusma - Weeks ago. For ACD, Advocacy Tasmania and Speak Out, the funding they receive from the state government for individual advocacy services are funded next year.

Ms O'CONNOR - Next year. What about the year after?

Mrs Petrusma - We are committed to funding individual advocacy services into the future.

Ms O'CONNOR - For how long? Will it be in the forward Estimates?

Mrs Petrusma - We are committed to funding individual advocacy services. It is our responsibility ongoing.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you for that, minister. By admission, what you are confirming is that BIAT, Guides Dogs Tasmania and Tas Deaf Society will be at the whim of the NDIA's grant funding.

Mrs Petrusma - Many of those are individual service providers so they are providing individual services. BIAT has already been successful in that they have doubled their funding under just one round of the ILC. That is why we are helping those organisations to gear up to the ILC framework.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you for that, minister. I have said all I really want to say on this notice of motion but I will close with these words. I had the great privilege of being Minister for Human Services when Tasmania signed up to the National Disability Insurance Scheme, and the most profound element of that privilege was the opportunity to engage with people living with a disability, their families and carers, and to have a really deep understanding of how badly the system had let them down in the period before the NDIS was agreed between most state governments and the Commonwealth.

We went from a situation where disability services were not allocated on the basis of need but were apportioned on the basis of available funding and the most desperate need. For people living with a disability the NDIS provided real choice and, to the greatest extent possible, control over the services they access.

The original intent of the National Disability Insurance Scheme was to empower people living with a disability and the foundational philosophy was 'nothing about us without us'. We had gone from a disability service system that used to pack people away in Willow Court and Royal Derwent where the service system providers were block-funded and people had to take what service the government told them was available to them, whether it was appropriate or not, or whether or not it provided those recreational and learning opportunities that we all need. It is a concern that the original quite generous and extremely inclusive intent of the NDIS has been eroded by a closer eye on the money than the human beings. It is a matter of recent historical record that \$2.6 billion of the re-elected Prime Minister's purported surplus for next year actually comes out of an underspend on the National Disability Insurance Scheme. That is shameful.

I have spoken to people living with a disability, people who are absolutely stoked with the level of service and opportunity they have under their plan under the NDIS, but I have also spoken to people who are languishing on waiting lists for equipment, who have not heard back from the NDIA about their plan. I have heard from people who are concerned that the goals in the original NDIS - the individual goals - have been undermined and it is less about the goals of the person than it is about the funding that is allocated by the governments of the day.

As we know, Madam Speaker, this is a Commonwealth and state initiative that is profoundly life-changing for people with a disability and it was always going to cause sectoral disruption because we were moving from a block-funded model to a market-driven model and there was always going to be some providers who would not be able to survive in the new environment. When people living with a disability are empowered to make those choices about the services they access, there will be choices made about providers who have not provided the best service. At its best, that market-based model, if it is truly driven by choice, is extremely empowering.

I am not uncomfortable with the Government's amendment. I have not had an opportunity to talk to Dr Woodruff about it yet. We have been out there dealing with hundreds and hundreds of distressed young people. I need to say this now because this is my opportunity to do so. We went downstairs to the reception room after that vote and there were kids there in tears because they could not believe that this Tasmanian Parliament did not have the courage to acknowledge that we are in a state of climate emergency. As a mother, I found that very distressing. We walked out the front of the building. There were mothers of young children in tears. It is extremely disheartening to be in this place and to see all of my colleagues, except Dr Woodruff, vote the wrong way.

[4.45 p.m.]

Ms HADDAD (Clark) - Madam Speaker, like the member for Clark, Ms O'Connor, I too have heard lots of success stories about the NDIS and some stories from individual people living with disability who have had a really positive experience of being assessed for NDIS packages and plans. Likewise, I have also heard many stories about people who are missing out or who are living with great uncertainty, as I am sure all members of parliament have.

It is incumbent on governments to step-up and recognise that this is a huge change and teething problems are likely. Moving to a totally different system of funding disability services would inevitably mean that some people are going to fall through the cracks. It is simply unfair for any

member of parliament, or any minister or any government to pretend that this is not possibly going to be the case.

That is why Labor, at the recent federal election, took a commitment to the people to review the NDIS in its initial stages of operation now that states are looking towards transitioning to full scheme of NDIS. Labor has been involved, and the Liberal Party as well, with the nationwide campaign of NDIS Make it Work grassroots, bottom-up campaign to expose and highlight the difficulties with NDIS and to make sure that people do not fall through the cracks. That is not the purpose of this motion.

The purpose of the motion that Ms Standen has moved is to recognise that there is an incumbent responsibility on Government for those people who are ineligible for NDIS services, many of whom rely on services from organisations that will not survive the transition to a market-based model. This has been known by Government since before the trial phase of the NDIS began. Before that time, it was known within the Tasmanian disability sector and within the Tasmanian Government that there would be organisations who would not survive the transition to a market-based model.

I agree with the minister when she says that she does not want there to be mixed messages sent out there, but I argue that the minister has made it unclear for the public when she says that ILCs will be there to support all Tasmanians with a disability, which is what she said in question time today and now on the debate on this motion. The truth is, ILCs are not a service provider. ILCs are not going to be an organisation that somebody can walk into and seek supports that are no longer available to them because the service provider they used to rely upon does not receive funding anymore, or who has not survived the transition from a market-based system.

It is true that those organisations that we have mentioned in the motion will be eligible to apply for those grant rounds through the ILCs, but they will not all be successful. There was an organisation in Launceston that recently applied for funding through the ILC grant rounds and did not receive it. They did receive a one-off boost of funding from the federal Liberals during the election campaign of \$450 000 to stay afloat. That is a recognition of the federal Liberal Government that there are organisations who are going to apply for and be denied ILC funding.

I take some comfort in what the minister said, that she does not want anybody to miss out and wants to assist these organisations. The professional people I worked with within the Department of Health and Human Services, who are now in DCS, are working extremely hard every day to help those organisations transition through into a market-based system.

The truth is that ILC grants are specific, they are targeted, they are project based, and they are short term. There are also nationally competitive. A small organisation that might only have received a few thousand dollars in block-funding in Tasmania will be up against organisations around the nation and will quite reasonably be fearful about their likelihood of being assessed as eligible for ILC funding.

There will be organisations that will not survive the transition to the NDIS. I put on the record today, on this motion, my concern about that. It would be a nicer response to hear from the Government that they share that concern, and that they have a plan for what happens when those organisations that apply for and do not receive ILC funding potentially close their doors because the reality is that that might indeed be the case. When that happens, there will be gaps in service provision.

We also know there are services that are not part of NDIS at all. There are (inaudible) supports and others that were being provided by community organisations, block-funded through the state, that will not be able to provide some of those services that they used to receive block-funding for.

It needs to be recognised that, yes, this is a major move and a complex move from block-funded systems to a system where people living with disability should have that empowerment to be able to choose where and how they receive their services. I share the concerns of many in the community sector who are reasonably very concerned about those organisations that may not survive the transition. Those organisations were described by Deb Byrne from Brian Injury Association of Tasmania, who has received much positive praise and quite rightly so in parliament today. In her opinion piece recently in the *Mercury* she explained that the majority of those organisations are really small in size but big on reach. That is one of the beauties of Tasmania's community sector. The community sector is made up of many small organisations that have the ability to provide niche services to specific sets of clients or for particular kinds of services. Many of those tiny organisations will not be competitive on a national scale when applying for ILC funding. I wanted to put on the record today my concern for those organisations.

[4.52 p.m.]

Ms HOUSTON (Bass) - Madam Speaker, we are reliably informed that there up to 103 000 Tasmanians living with a disability; 10 600 of these are eligible for the NDIS. That leaves more than 90 000. This 90 000 are not all over 65 years of age; many of them are children under school age.

Mrs Petrusma - We never said they were over 65 years of age.

Ms HOUSTON - We do not have a figure on how many are over 65, and you did say earlier that some of them are. There is a cohort in there who are not eligible for the NDIS and who are not over 65.

Eighteen organisations with funding at risk - most of them are small, community-based, dependent on volunteers and have intimate relationships with the families they work with. Federal funding is often one-off, short-term, non-continuing and organisations and people need certainty. Many of these organisations have been informed that they can apply for ILC, or Information, Linkages & Connections, grants through the NDIS. There are some problems with this though. These grants do not provide core funding. Core funding is essential to small organisations in order to have administrative staff to have a governance model that makes them competitive for grants. They are project-based.

Many of these organisations are too small and do not have the capacity to apply for grants unless they have this core funding. I have some personal experience with this because often I have worked voluntarily with small organisations to help them apply for grants so that they can function. There is no mechanism in this to do that. It is largely dependent on them being able to build relationships with people who have the capacity to write grants.

These grants are nationally competitive, putting Tasmanian-based organisations at a disadvantage. These organisations are small and very local. If they have to compete nationally they are going to struggle to do that and particularly to have the structures within them - the financial management structures, the government structures - that make them appealing to be eligible for funding. There is no guarantee of being successful for these grants.

A number of these organisations support disabilities which are not covered by the NDIS, so they are outside of scope. These grants do not provide a viable solution for these organisations to continue to operate and serve people living with a disability who are not eligible for the NDIS.

Organisations may be offered a piece of \$500 000 funding pie to be split on a pro rata basis between them. Again, there is a lack of certainty there. There are 18 organisations that together are currently receiving and reliant on more than that \$500 000. This will clearly not be enough money for these organisations to continue to operate. Some of them could get as little as \$30 000. That is not a lot of money to run an administrative pool, or to run financial services, or to do audits, or to develop structures that are required even for small organisations to ensure they are safe.

The organisations need core funding to do the work to provide certainty for clients. These small organisations are essential to the people that use them. They are often their key point of contact. They are the reason they get out in the community and that they engage. It is essential that we review this and look at a way to ensure their certainty and their future for the sake of their clients.

[4.55 p.m.]

Ms STANDEN (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, the Opposition will be opposing the amendments proposed by the Government. It is disappointing that the minister has once again challenged the numbers and the responsibility of people who will potentially fall between the gaps.

The minister has conceded that there are only 10 600 Tasmanian people living with disability who are eligible under the NDIS. That means there are around 90 000 Tasmanians who are not eligible for the NDIS and 18 organisations that will not be receiving funding yet will be still expected to continue to provide support to Tasmanians not eligible for the NDIS.

The ILC funding grants are specific project- and short-term-based. They are nationally competitive. There is no guarantee that the organisations will be successful or that they will be eligible for funding. The grant rounds may have specific criteria that means they are irrelevant, even to their work.

The minister has talked about there being a number of funding rounds left to run. I do not have information in front of me about how much funding or the time frame for that. The minister has indicated, and the amendment they are proposing indicates, that there will be bridging funding available to those organisations, but I have no information about how long or how much funding will be available for these organisations. If she is talking about periods of time as little as three or four months, I can tell you as a former community sector organisation manager that is virtually meaningless. When you are running these sorts of organisations and you are coming towards the end of short-term funding grants what tends to happen is that the staff delivering those services, without job security, will start to look for other jobs.

We need to accept that, in a small state like Tasmania, there has been significant potential for market failure in the roll-out of the NDIS from the beginning.

I draw the minister's attention back to the bilateral agreement that says that this state is obliged, has signed up to provide continuity of support for clients from Tasmanian specialist disability programs who are found to be ineligible for the NDIS to assist them to achieve similar outcomes.

The minister in her contribution today has failed to convince me that she has any plans to support these 18 organisations that stand to lose their funding. Therefore, there is no way the Opposition can support the amendments to the motion.

The House divided -

AYES 14

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Ms Courtney
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gutwein
Mr Hodgman
Mr Jaensch
Ms O'Connor
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mrs Rylah
Mr Shelton
Mr Tucker (Teller)
Dr Woodruff

NOES 10

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

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTION

Federal Election 2019 Results

[5.05 p.m.]

Mr SHELTON (Lyons) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I have the pleasure to move this motion, standing in my name, which reads -

- (1) Congratulates Prime Minister Hon. Scott Morrison MP and the Federal Liberal Party for the outstanding result in the Australian Federal election held on 18 May 2019.
- (2) Further congratulates, subject to final confirmation, the election of Tasmanian Federal Liberal representatives in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.
- (3) Notes the strong relationship between the Hodgman and Morrison governments, working together to deliver a stronger economy, real investment in infrastructure and better health and education services for all Tasmanians.

It is a real privilege, after the election, to move this motion. I congratulate the Prime Minister, Scott Morrison MP, on his remarkable election victory. He called it a miracle on the night, and I was reminded at the time of sporting prowess when people have said, 'You were lucky to win'. What I have reflected on over my lifetime is that luck just does not happen. Luck comes to those who work at it and the more you work at it, the luckier you become. I congratulate the Prime Minister for his campaign, his total energy through that period of time, his commitment to the

election, to the cause and to winning the election. It was remarkable. All of us in this House are politicians and we have to acknowledge the work that every contributor to the election put in, but the Morrison Liberal Government won the election and I particularly congratulate him on that and the work and effort he put in. A fantastic job. When reading this motion people would have to agree that we need to congratulate the Prime Minister for the work and effort he put in.

In particular, I congratulate the newly elected members, our federal representatives from Tasmania, and we must not forget that Senator Richard Colbeck was re-elected, a new senator in Senator Claire Chandler was elected and down in Braddon Gavin Pearce did a marvellous job in his campaigning. We still have one count going on in Bass with Bridget Archer and it is my hope that she remains in front and becomes the member for Bass in the federal parliament. To all those people for their efforts throughout the campaign, it was a truly fantastic effort.

We have talked about women in this parliament and we have two women elected into the federal parliament: Claire Chandler as a senator and, fingers crossed, Bridget Archer, so the female representatives from Tasmania are growing in our federal parliament.

What we saw last weekend was voters endorse the Liberal Government which has demonstrated that it can deliver on the things that matter most to Australians. It was an endorsement of the Morrison Government's focus on managing the budget and the economy, building infrastructure to set up the country for the future generations and investing heavily into essential services and supporting businesses and industry to grow and create jobs. These are the things the majority Liberal Government has focused on in Tasmania and the voters strongly endorsed at a state level in the last state election and have endorsed again in the federal election. Just as they have over the past five years, every region in Tasmania will continue to benefit from the Tasmanian Liberal Government working closely together with the Coalition government in Canberra.

We have secured major funding commitments for important road infrastructure including \$130 million for the south-east traffic solution, \$25 million for the congestion-busting initiatives in greater Hobart, \$40 million for the Sideling upgrade in the north-east, and \$64 million for Illawarra Main Road, just to list a few. Anybody involved in the north and the north-east would appreciate the upgrades that will happen now to the Sideling in -

Quorum formed.

Mr SHELTON - I was talking about the issues around the Sideling and the brilliance of the money that has been allocated to that and the north-east community, particularly the Scottsdale community. For people who travel backwards and forwards and the freight that happens to go over the Sideling it will make it a very much safer road and particularly ease congestion on part of that road. That is a fantastic initiative.

I also mentioned the \$64 million upgrade to Illawarra Main Road, in my patch. Illawarra Main Road is that short section that connects Perth just out of Hadspen heading down towards the north-east. It is the main freight corridor but it is not the main highway. It is a 100 kph limited road and narrow. We have thousands of vehicles travelling it every day but more importantly every single bit of freight that travels from the north-west coast to Hobart on the two major highways has to travel through that narrow section of road. That will be much appreciated by the locals, particularly the farmers who need to carry on their businesses that have access on and off that road. Safety concerns are a major part of that piece of road and these upgrades will substantially overcome a lot of the issues there. It is very important; critical, to regional Tasmania.

We have secured \$30 million for affordable housing for Greater Hobart; \$100 million for irrigation schemes; \$56 million to progress our renewable energy vision, \$70 million for the Blue Economy CRC, \$107 million in major health commitments and \$30 million for the Tasmanian defence initiative and design precinct. The list goes on.

To talk more about health because it is the subject of notoriety and concern for all members in this place and state-wide. The Australian and the Hodgman governments have been able to invest record levels of funding into health, thanks to proven strong financial management. Last month we welcomed the Morrison Government's Tasmanian Health Plan. On the weekend the Tasmanian people overwhelmingly endorsed that plan. That plan gives a \$117 million boost to Tasmania's health system and is very welcome. We know the benefits that will be felt right throughout all regions of Tasmania.

The centrepiece of the significant package was the \$34.7 million to help more Tasmanians get specialist care and the surgery they need. Under the program there is \$20 million for thousands of additional surgeries, procedures and appointments.

Quorum formed.

Mr SHELTON - Madam Deputy Speaker, the Tasmanian Health Plan also includes significant investment in crucial infrastructure that will provide a new level of service for Tasmanians: an eating disorder clinic, a walk-in mental health clinic and vital equipment to boost access to scans and cancer care.

There is a \$4.7 million linear accelerator which will double the capacity for this service in the North West Cancer Centre. The new public MRI service in Devonport will mean less travel for locals to access public system scans. Tasmania has long had a significant gap in public diagnosis for mammography. It has taken the Morrison Government to fix it, with \$3 million to invest in services in the north and south so that Tasmanian women will be able to access these services in the public setting.

We will also see \$10 million to redevelop and extend the Kings Meadows Community Health Centre, \$10 million for improvements to the acute care facility at the North West Regional Hospital and \$4.5 million for a new parental, infant and mental health mother-babies' services in the Launceston General Hospital and the North West Regional Hospital. There was \$1 million towards allied health and aged care in Queenstown. Two mobile buses supported by Rotary Tasmania and the Flying Doctor Services received \$100 000. These initiatives represent a real boost for Tasmanian's health system, built on the strong partnership between the state and the federal government.

There are significant developments coming our way from this federal election. That is why we need to congratulate the Prime Minister Scott Morrison on the efforts he put in through the campaign. There is a lot more to be said on that point. Our democracy is a marvellous thing. It is the centrepiece of how we live. Not everybody takes it to its fullest extent. I was on the booths last Saturday and not everybody was as committed to voting as those of us who were on the booths. The number of people who just want to get their name ticked off is minor. We have compulsory voting and the majority of people go into an election with their eyes open. They are sick and tired of the campaigning by the time election day comes, but our democracy, at the end of the day, is basically a two-horse race which elects one party over another party based on the information that has been disseminated over the campaign.

I had a conversation with a Labor member last week, prior to the election, who indicated that where the polls were he thought Labor was going to win. My assumption of elections and campaigning is that even though the government might be behind in the polls, as you get to polling day it always comes back towards the government. I commented on it on the day and to a number of people prior to the election that I predicted it would be very close. At the end of the day it would come down to only a few seats around Australia and within those few seats there would be only a few votes to determine the outcome. That is where we are now. I wish all the people involved in this counting all the very best in that process, particularly the Liberal members.

The Australian Government can work through the issues before them and do what they believe under their philosophies is better for all residents of Australia. To continue on with what the Morrison Government has indicated it would deliver for Australians, the first one mentioned is lower taxes. Under a Liberal government I am sure that commitment will take place. Mr Morrison is trying to get that through before the end of the financial year.

Small and medium businesses are playing a bigger part in our economy. The Morrison Government indicated there would be asset write-offs for small and medium businesses and assistance for those businesses. For Tasmanians there would be some assistance for first home buyers which will be a benefit to all Tasmanians and all states. That is why we welcome the result of the election, which is also another rebuff to the Labor Party that is simply unable to connect with the voters. It was a very good win to the Morrison Government.

Clearly, Tasmanian Labor and their deeply unpopular position on issues like mandatory sentencing for child sex offenders played a significant role in the locals' thought processes. One of my reasons that I predicted that in Tasmania we would do better than the mainland was because of the hard work the Hodgman Liberal Government has done in Tasmania over the last five years. Since it became clear that Scott Morrison and the Coalition won the election, we have seen a wide array of reactions from the left, calling voters dumb, stupid and a range of other things. At the end of the election I had a sigh of relief and indicated to my wife that I was glad to see that there is some common sense out there.

It was an extraordinary Saturday night. Like most of us, we were out at different functions. I was at a sporting function where I was able to keep up with what was going on on the phone and when I got home later in the evening, it was compulsory viewing; I could not turn the television off. Mind you, we had four different channels that you could flick through in order to get an understanding of what was going on. It was a fantastic result considering where the polls had us. The question of course is how the other pundits and betting agencies got it all wrong.

I remind the House that the state Government has helped turn Tasmania's economic fortunes around from the dark old days of Labor and the Greens and for the last five years we have been able to set the financial structure of Tasmania going forward. What we now have is another three years cemented in of good working relationships between the Morrison federal Liberal Government and the Hodgman-led state Government. These next three years will be fantastic, plus more, in Tasmania.

Going back to some of the initiatives through the federal election the commitments from the Morrison Government can be broken up into geographical areas. Around \$264 million has been allotted to the north and the north-east of the state, including \$40 million for the Sideling which I have mentioned; \$70 million on the Blue Economy CRC; \$26 million on important Launceston icons such as the Cataract Gorge, the Albert Hall and the Launceston Community Hub. Around

\$208 million has been committed in the north-west including \$40 million for the Burnie Port for a ship loader and rail; \$40 million for the Cooe Creek; and \$25 million for the Murchison Highway. You would appreciate all of these, Madam Deputy Speaker. There is \$3.5 million to build a headspace in the north-west, and around \$310 million in the south of the state, including \$130 million for the Tasman Highway upgrade towards Midway Point; \$82.3 million for the Hobart Airport; and \$25 million for congestion-busting in Hobart.

We also have a number of notable statewide projects that have been funded totalling \$297 million and these include tranche 3 of the irrigation schemes worth \$100 million and \$56 million towards Tasmania's hydro-powered projects and the new Bass Strait transmission link.

Together they are fantastic commitments to Tasmania that will be very much appreciated by all Tasmanians. The Hodgman majority Government looks forward to working with the Morrison federal Government over the next three years. It was a fantastic effort by him and the commitment that was put in through the total election was a great effort.

I need to correct the record that we will not be calling for a vote at the end of this debate. I indicated that there would be but we are not calling for a division.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - You need to seek leave to withdraw that.

Mr SHELTON - Madam Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to withdraw the question around a vote being taken at the end of this debate.

Leave granted.

Mr SHELTON - I take that sigh from Mr O'Byrne as a pleasurable one. Nevertheless, we are all in this game and as individuals have to congratulate the team that put in the effort, both the Prime Minister in his workings and the individual members who have won positions around Tasmania including Gavin Pearce, the two senators, and from my perspective hopefully - and the indications are hopeful - Bass and Bridget Archer.

Elections are tough on everybody. It is a draining process to go through and to see the leaders of both parties and their commitment was incredible. It is a fantastic vision for any politician who understands a little more to look at what goes on in an election. It is a credit to them, particularly in today's environment where it is all focused on the leaders. I look forward to the comments from the other side.

[5.32 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I acknowledge the gracious parting comments, not so much most of the contribution, Mr Shelton, in terms of the gratitude you showed in terms of anyone who puts themselves forward. Elections are incredibly bruising and can be very tough encounters, particularly for those people who are either in sitting seats and lose their seats, who contest elections and lose them, but even for those people who survive an election, get elected and then have the enormous responsibility of representing the community they seek to represent.

I agree with you and acknowledge and congratulate all of those candidates, be they in the House of Representatives or the Senate campaigns, for putting their hand up and having a crack. Obviously, particularly in the Senate, there was a broad spectrum of views. Some of the more far right parties I did not agree with but we live in a robust democracy where they are able to put their

hand up whether you agree with them or not. Thankfully, the Australian people have sent a very clear message to some of those far right groups that they do not represent mainstream Australia and they should never do so. Some of their views really should be banished to the wastebasket, to the bin.

Having said that though, the election was tough. Whilst it is clear that the Labor Party federally was rejected, and we accept the result, it is no ringing endorsement of the federal Morrison LNP. They have got back into government with barely, at this stage, a one-seat majority. Given the chaos in the federal coalition in the last three years there is no guarantee that they will hold that base of 76 seats. A number of members, including Julie Banks, resigned from the Liberal Party and went to the cross-benches because of the bullying and the misogyny that she witnessed inside the Liberal Party.

It was a hard fight. Lots of information out there in the public domain and this is probably the first election that we have seen social media and some of the mistruths on social media play out in such a way where people were given information across a range of parties that was not correct. Unfortunately, it is very hard to deal with some of those mistruths.

I have seen on social media, the Independent candidate, Oliver Yates in Kooyong, is potentially referring the conduct of Liberal Party campaigning to the Court of Disputed Returns on the basis of Liberal Party bunting being displayed near polling booths with AEC colours. They looked for all intents and purposes like they were Australian Electoral Commission information effectively in Mandarin. They were telling people to 'vote Liberal 1; this is how you vote formally, vote Liberal 1 and then other candidates of your choice up to 6 or 7'. Oliver Yates has announced today that he will be referring that kind of misleading information. All parties, even the micro-parties, use their branding and want to frame issues out but when you have the Liberal Party producing corflute in AEC colours which do not identify as party political, informing with English not as their first language to vote Liberal 1, that is of great concern.

The great thing about this country is we have to respect the democratic process. Like Mr Shelton, member for Lyons, who has resumed his seat, a number of people do not like it. We understand that but in a community, in a country like Australia, democracy comes with responsibility and the responsibility is once every three years you vote for your federal member. It is a small thing to ask to ensure that those who are elected reflect the majority view of that seat and once the seats are decided across the country, the majority view has the opportunity to govern in their own right and make those decisions.

Let us be clear about this. Whilst it was clearly an unexpected victory for the Morrison Government, given the chaos of the last three years, given the change of leadership, change of front bench, given all of the mess on policy, confusion on direction on a whole range of issues - we had an emissions target, we didn't have an emissions target - the LNP were pulling themselves apart federally over key issues confronting this community.

To say you get re-elected on a one-seat majority as a ringing endorsement -no. Majority by one has to be respected. I am not saying we do not respect the result

Mr Shelton - You have to congratulate Morrison for being able to pull it together.

Mr O'BYRNE - When you look at purely political from where he started and where he ended up in terms of the polls and where people thought he would be, absolutely right. Again, going into

the election I was very concerned because we had, for the first time probably since John Hewson's Fight Back, an enormously comprehensive policy agenda, which in some corners of the country was not fully understood. We have to take responsibility for that in terms of our connection.

Ultimately, members of this House should be concerned with the best interests of Tasmania. The Tasmanian campaign, clearly we saw the north and the south, the parochial issue, the issue that all of us should be trying to bury, that there are not two states in Tasmania or three regions. There is one state in Tasmania. It was clear that parochialism reared its ugly head and was exploited, sadly, by the Liberal Party. We have seen that in the papers today: the Treasurer admits Coalition tactic in north glossed over detail, voters misled on football.

The Labor Party federally had a commitment of a \$25 million infrastructure assistance to support Tasmanian football, a team in the AFL. We have been calling for bipartisanship on this issue for quite some time, and we thought things were coming together with a Jim Wilkinson-led committee, that the AFL was finally starting to listen. All the shoulders were being put to the wheel. That commitment was for a Tasmanian team. Not in Hobart, not necessarily in Devonport or Burnie or Launceston, but a Tasmanian team where games will be played north and south and football infrastructure, north, south and northwest would be supported. It was the first time any federal party has put a commitment of that amount to support a Tasmanian team in the AFL. But what did we see? Carpet bombing in the north and the north-west: do not support Labor's commitment for a southern-based, Hobart-based, AFL team for Tasmania.

What a disgrace. That was an absolute mistruth. It was a lie and then it was an absolute lie. At no stage had we said that it would be southern-based. In fact, it is very clear that it was for a Tasmanian team and for infrastructure north and south. Finally, we could unite around a team that was representing Tasmania; something that tens of thousands of Tasmanians have been praying for, hoping for, calling for. We had a federal commitment for \$25 million, yet you chose - and you get a choice, if you like, you play the politics 100 per cent or you put the issue or the people first. On AFL, you have put politics first, and you have set the game back. You have had former Liberal football greats come out and say this. You have had people on the mainland refer to it and say, 'Well, Tassie said this north-south stuff was over. Perhaps it is not'.

So you are giving the AFL and the mainland another reason not to give us an AFL team. This Government, the Premier, the Treasurer and the minister for Sport have said, 'We want a Tasmanian team'. Over there, who does not want a Tasmanian team? Liberal members, for the record, all have their heads down, not answering. Of course we want an ALF team. But you could have blown it. This could have absolutely blown it, because you chose to play politics with it and do this north-south issue. It is absolute rubbish. Then, as a part of your argument, you said, well, Labor wants to put that \$25 million into southern football into a Hobart-based AFL team. We want to put it in health. Well, tomorrow, let us see how that goes.

I will talk about some of the commitments that were made by Labor - for Braddon, for Bass - which was far in advance of what the federal Liberal Coalition did in terms of health. Let us not even talk about Bill Shorten's pledge around cancer treatment which would benefit all Australians and all those people suffering from cancer - one of the biggest commitments cancer treatment this country had ever seen. The biggest commitment. That, sadly, is now lost, at least for three years.

But then, the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party. You would put in over \$100 million on Richmond, Collingwood Football Club - and I declare I am a Collingwood Football Club member - but you said, 'How dare they put \$25 million into a Hobart based team', which was a fallacy because it was

a Tasmanian AFL team. But then the Liberal Coalition go around the country and give over \$100 million to NRL clubs and AFL clubs. People are already playing in the AFL. People are already playing in the top flight. What hypocrisy.

So you are bringing into this House that we are cheering the re-election of a Morrison government and saying what a champion the bloke is. I have heard the saying that he has called himself the Messiah from the Shire. Well I think what is getting traction now is the Liar from the Shire.

That campaign, particularly the campaign north and south, was based on a fallacy. I am the member for Franklin, and over the summer those areas in Franklin down the Huon Valley were fire-affected. From Labor, for the seat of Franklin, there was a package to support fire-affected communities with the economy. The Plenty link road, a forestry road, a road that would assist freight getting out of the Huon Valley into the freight networks to avoid the Hobart CBD which would save money and be more economical for the forest industry and eventually the fruit-growing industry. Then eventually, once you get it up to freight standard, you could look at, a number of years down the track, a tourist road. That was a project. Guess how many projects the bloke you have just cheered made commitments for Franklin infrastructure, anything, fire-affected areas in Huonville? Nada, zip, the big doughnut, nothing. If he governs for all Australians, why did he not visit the south of the state during the election campaign? The closest he got was Agfest and that was a bit awkward with your candidate sacked for appalling comments on social media.

We can come in here with the hubris of the election still waving through and the miracle victory but these are the consequences for Tasmania. These are the consequences for southern Tasmania. Labor had a package of \$75 million for infrastructure to assist with Hobart congestion. The Liberals have nothing in terms of infrastructure - no projects supported, no project identified.

What about the national commitments for early education and child care professionals' wages and conditions? They are some of the lowest-paid workers in the country looking after children. Eighty to 90 per cent of a child's brain development occurs between the ages of zero to five so early education carers are a crucial sector. There was a Labor commitment to fund wages to professionalise that sector, predominantly female - over 90 per cent female dominated. Like educators in the education system, they deserve respect and dignity as well. That is gone because your mob will not match that, not at all.

What about free TAFE? You have made a small commitment today towards TAFE, a system you have run into the ground both federally and locally where you have electrical apprentices being flown to Melbourne TAFE because they cannot access the training here because classes and programs are being cancelled. Yet we had a federal commitment from the Labor Party to provide free TAFE and fund it properly. What a missed opportunity.

You talk about health and listed a number of a commitments you have from federal Liberals and we welcome those, but there is a range of commitments in health. I was jokingly referring to the Treasurer in question time yesterday saying that he voted Labor on Saturday. The reason I said that is because he and at least some people in the front bench know that in terms of the Tasmanian health system, the best thing that could have happened would have been the election of a Labor government federally because the commitments were far in advance of what the federal Liberals had provided.

For example, at the Launceston General Hospital, \$35 million for 32 new sub-acute care units; \$15 million for a walk-in mental health centre in Launceston with 25 acute beds; \$4.5 million for

the perinatal infant mental health service at the LGH and North West Regional Hospital; \$1 million for the LGH emergency department; two ambulatory care centres for Burnie and Devonport with \$20 million to reduce pressure on accident and emergency areas; port dredging at \$25 million; a manufacturing hub mill in Burnie for \$5 million - a range of health commitments that would have been delivered to Tasmania that we would have benefited from.

I challenge those on the other side. We all have a state and a federal caucus. We all have a role to lobby for an improvement because the package that was put forward plainly on the numbers, particularly in health, under Labor was far superior. We see it as a missed opportunity for the country, a missed opportunity for the state and we commit to lobbying the federal Government, and you should as well, to improve their package for Tasmania.

Also, in terms of the nature of the state and how you lead the state and this north-south division, why did the Prime Minister not come to the south of the state? The only time he came to the south of the state since he has been Prime Minister was to fly down to Hobart Airport and do a quick 20 to 40 minute press conference with a gaggle of Liberal politicians. He probably could not see the Hobart Airport roundabout from where he was that was promised by you guys in 2014 and has not even started yet, five years down the track. He announced the Hobart City Deal, which most people have acknowledged is a manifest disappointment. It was a creature of Malcolm Turnbull's prime ministership, Prime Minister Morrison did not want a bar of it, had to try and find his way out of it, flew down for 20 minutes at the airport and then flew away.

How dare that Prime Minister get up and say he governs for all Tasmanians when all he did was visit the north? When he was asked he said, 'Oh well, that's where the votes are, this is where the marginal seats are'. That is not a prime minister for all Tasmanians.

There was this rubbish on football, north and south, and the attack on the MONA announcement, calling it a luxury hotel. That is not what the announcement was. The announcement was for a convention centre that could drag thousands of people to Tasmania. MONA was the one thing in Tasmania, up until this election, that united all parties in terms of what it was doing for the Tasmanian economy.

Mr Shelton - The one thing?

Mr O'BYRNE - In terms of tourism. It is a major project and we were united on it across parties in terms of the amazing commitment to the Tasmanian economy that MONA provided. Both governments have helped fund it. The convention centre would not only create thousands of jobs in the construction phase but hundreds of jobs ongoing in terms of the tourism industry, an industry you championed. Even the tourism industry, that has championed and supported virtually everything that you have done in the last five years, were gobsmacked by the base political games you played on such an important thing for the state.

There are very few things Tasmania has that is unique to the rest of the world. There is the Antarctic gateway, parts of our agricultural industries that are unique, that only we produce -

Mr Shelton - Everything is.

Mr O'BYRNE - No, in terms of economic activity. There is a whole range of tourism markets and a whole range of agricultural markets, either niche products or high volume, so there are very

few things that are specifically unique in terms of economically for Tasmania and MONA is one of them. The project is now at risk. These are the consequences of base politics.

It is great that you can come in here and pat yourself on the back about how great Morrison is and how great the result was. We respect the result but we don't have to be happy about it. We had a different vision for the country and it did not get up, but a one-seat majority with the caucus that Morrison now leads is no ringing endorsement. I give it a year before you are in minority. I give it a year where you are walking across to Mr Katter or Mr Wilkie for a bit of assistance.

It was remarkable earlier this year where there was a vote on dealing with a bill that was coming to the House where the federal Liberals wanted to compel state governments to privatise energy assets because they were worried about energy prices and the politics of energy. Mr Wilkie said he would support it and all of a sudden there were millions of dollars being rained on Clark in terms of sporting precincts before the election was called. Coincidence? I think not.

There is an old saying, 'Be careful what you pray for'. The chaos and the division in your party does not go away because you have been re-elected. You cannot agree on energy, one of the biggest issues facing the Australian economy. You have disagreements between the National Party and the Liberals. You have disagreements between the hard right, the extreme right and the centre right. You do not have people in the centre in the Liberal Party in my view - you are all on the right. You have massive disagreements so be careful for what you pray for, Mr Shelton, when you get up here and say, 'Isn't this a great thing'.

Whilst the election was fought on the issues around the election -

Dr Woodruff - Really? Are you going to talk until six o'clock? I would like to speak.

Mr O'BYRNE - Sorry, I have been going on a bit. Careful what you pray for: good motion; good on you, you have won by one seat; all the best.

[5.56 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Deputy Speaker, the Greens do not support this motion. We cannot congratulate the Prime Minister for the result at the federal election because it was a result that reflects the very deep divisions in the community. These divisions are stoked by money, by lobbyists, funding from corporations, big money that goes into feeding campaigns that are based on lies, falsehoods and divisive attitudes, about how we should live together as a country, how we should see each other and that peddle mistruths about science, about religious beliefs, about morality, about the sorts of things the good-hearted people of Australia have in their hearts and souls.

The election result did not dispirit me. Many progressive voters were dispirited by the election result and felt that it said something bad about the state of Australians. I did not see it that way. I think Australians are good-hearted people, Australians have not changed, but what Australians got at that election was no real information. There is no opportunity to really understand the complexity of the issues that are facing us. Every effort was made by the Liberals and by the Labor Party to avoid grappling with the biggest issues of our time.

The ones that are really are going to drive a wedge between the richer and the poorer people, between the haves and the have nots, between the people who are able to move and adapt and people who, because they have neither the ability nor the fortune to be able to do that, will be stuck in places responding to an increasingly impoverished society: one that is continuing to confront

extreme changes in climate that are already having devastating impacts on society but will continue to have devastating impacts on our economy.

The Coalition is now locked into a stance against climate action. The Labor Party, despite what it said at the election, has reverted to type. It reveals to Australians what the Labor Party stands for, which is continuing to mine coal and export coal. The Queensland Labor Premier a few hours ago was abusing the federal government for the delay in approving the Adani coal mine. Shame on the Labor Party for pretending to the Australian people they actually cared about the climate emergency we are in.

Shame on them for failing to grapple with the future and the changing workforce. Shame on the Liberal Party for also failing to grapple with that. As a country we have to come to terms with the fact that our largest export industry is killing us all. It is killing the planet. Whether we like it or not the world community is not going to keep carving out a special niche for Australia to export coal indefinitely. We will be left in a hole, without a plan for jobs, without a transition to the future and an increasing climate emergency.

A pox on both your houses.

Debate adjourned.

[6.00 p.m.]

**SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIONS AGENTS
AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 51)**

Bill agreed to by the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPREME COURT CIVIL PROCEDURE AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 52)

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

Motion by **Mr Jaensch** agreed to -

That the message be taken into consideration tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

BIOSECURITY BILL 2019 (No 15)

Second Reading

Resumed from above.

[6.01 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Deputy Speaker, before the lunch break, I was talking about some of the transparency provisions in the legislation and was hoping the minister might be able to respond to the question that was asked about the confined publication list, which is the 'emergency order, a control order, a general biosecurity division, a group permit

or any other order, declaration, instrument or document that may be made or given under this act by publication on the department's website'.

In part 7 Permits, what the Secretary, the Chief Veterinary Officer or the Chief Plant Protection Officer only can issue is an emergency permit, a prohibited matter permit, a permitted dealing permit and a group permit.

Can the minister explain why, for example, there would be, under this legislation, no apparent publication of a prohibited matter permit or the declaration of a prohibited matter or a prohibited dealing permit? What level of transparency will there be about those dealings and activities in biosecurity matters that will be assessed by Biosecurity Tasmania auditors or authorised persons?

I would have thought that maximum transparency in this space is in the public interest. It is also in the interest of making sure that producers and all other people involved in those different sectors of the economy that are impacted by biosecurity matter by this legislation are aware of what, for example, is a prohibited matter, what is a permitted matter and so on.

I would like to have some clarity for the House on when the biosecurity compendium might be available and released and what measures will be put in place for transparency around the biosecurity compendium. It is a living document that will reside on the department's website. What are the plans for ensuring all primary producers, importers and other people involved in sectors that are impacted by this legislation are engaged in making sure there is a deep understanding of the biosecurity compendium.

As I mentioned earlier in my contribution, we know that the biosecurity risk to Tasmania has increased as a result of global heating and the current climate emergency, and as I slightly fumbled my contribution earlier, the fact is we have a fruit fly strategy that extends to 2050 and a climate strategy that ends in 2021, so there is huge body of work that needs to be done to make sure there is complete alignment between the work of Biosecurity Tasmania, the strategies it has in place to deal with risks and threats - and also should it come to it, a biosecurity event - and the state's response to the climate crisis.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without mentioning to the House, because no member from either of the major parties in this place had the courage to go downstairs into the reception room where there were hundreds of young people, young mums, grandmothers, granddads, dads and mums watching the debate. This job can be really difficult. Everyone in this place knows that. It is quite difficult at times as well as immensely rewarding and a privilege to be a member of parliament, but I have not had an experience in my 11 years in parliament quite as hard as walking into that room, because there were young people there who were in tears.

I spoke to a young mum of two small children who were with her, both under the age of four, and she was fighting back the tears because she did not want to see those other young people in there see her cry. That is exactly the way I felt when I walked in there - stricken for them that this parliament sent such an appalling message. You can spin it on either side of this House any way you like, but what this parliament did today on the obvious fact that we are in a climate emergency was betray those young people, and they knew it because they had watched the whole bloody debate. They had watched the whole thing. They are intelligent, they are engaged, they are terrified and they saw this parliament betray them.

I hope every member who voted against the declaration of a climate emergency is able to front young people -

Dr Broad - We did not -

Ms O'CONNOR - I am not going to engage with you anymore. You have betrayed young people, you have betrayed my kids. You betrayed the kids who were there from Elizabeth College, Hobart College, Rosny College, Taroona High and primary schools around the south of the state. Labor betrayed them because they are funded, like the Liberals, by the fossil fuel lobby. We had the Queensland Premier out there today saying to the newly-elected coal-loving Prime Minister, 'Bring on Adani, hurry up the approval', so do not lecture us in this place about -

Dr Broad - I am pointing out the fact that we did not vote against the climate emergency.

Ms O'CONNOR - Do not lecture us in this place about how much you care because as elected representatives we can say all manner of things. We can express a view, we can express a concern and we can express support, but when the crunch comes what matters in a place like this, as it mattered in the UK Parliament and the Irish Parliament and in the ACT Parliament and in 528 councils around the world - is how we vote. One of the things Labor has made a hallmark of its practices in recent years is to hand-wring on environmental issues, to virtue-signal to the community and then to vote completely the opposite way.

To be honest, Madam Speaker, I am filled with disgust by this vote today. I have never walked into a room of so many distressed people. I did not know what to say to them because I am as distressed as they are, except I will not be alive as long as they will. They will be dealing with unholy mess we are leaving them long after we are all in the ground. What I said to them is this: we will never give up on the science, on the truth and on the urgent imperative to take strong action on climate change. At times like this, when it is easy to collapse into despair, I remind myself of what the great artist Banksy said, 'If you get tired, learn to rest, not to quit'.

That is our message to the young people who watched this debate today and to all the concerned people who came along today, and I am telling members of this House they were not all greenies. They were not.

Dr Woodruff - Quite a few were Labor people who are never going to vote Labor again.

Ms O'CONNOR - It is interesting the point that you make, Dr Woodruff, and thank you for leading me there, but when you have a look at the booth data from the federal election in those booths where at the 2018 state election people parked their vote with Labor - and these are booths in South Hobart, Hobart City, Glenorchy central, West Hobart - people came back to the Greens. They came back to the Greens because we know we will never let them down. They know we will never pull this sort of stunt that they did in this place today.

I have said it before and I will say it again. People expect environmental perfidy from the Liberals and the Coalition. They have seen the Prime Minister smooching a lump of coal in parliament, but there is a higher expectation in the community on the Labor Party, there just is. That is why at the 2018 state election soft Greens voters went over and parked their vote with Labor because Labor said they would do the right thing on poker machines, those toxic and lethal machines. Now they know that Labor is simply not to be trusted.

Before Dr Broad interjects and has a crack at me, I bet London to a brick I know more about the Labor Party than he. I grew up in a Labor family, I worked for the Labor Party, I worked for Paul Keating and I worked for Duncan Kerr. I understand this machine. I also understand that in the last 10 years or so the machine is rusting and rotten at its core. It stands for nothing except power itself.

Madam Speaker, I have put on the record a number of questions. If I could just be heard very briefly for a bit longer, I want to acknowledge the fantastic work of people in the agency on this legislation and the really collaborative process that has led to the development of this bill. I want to acknowledge that at the front line of our defences every single day are Biosecurity Tasmania staff and officers. It is magnificent work that they do. They are keeping our island, our exporters and our sectors safe. This bill is very much worthy of the entire parliament's support.

[6.15 p.m.]

Mr SHELTON (Lyons) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise this evening to make a short contribution to a very long bill. I need to congratulate all the people, as Ms O'Connor indicated, and congratulate all the people from the agency who have put in a huge amount of work over a number of years to pull this together.

I am a farmer. My brother and I own the property, which my brother runs. From a farming point of view biosecurity has always been critical. This legislation, as we have mentioned, pulls a heap of biosecurity areas together under the one legislation.

For me in my parliamentary secretary role, and as a born and bred Tasmanian who wants to see Tasmania go forward, Brand Tasmania and the brand of Tasmania are critical to where we head in the future. This legislation helps protect everybody involved in that. The House notes that biosecurity is fundamental to the success of Tasmania. It is fundamental to our agriculture, to our aquaculture and to the tourism industry. It is also fundamental to protecting our unique island environment and our way of life.

These industries are core to our economy and therefore it is fundamental to protecting our economy through the fact that according to the Department of Primary Industry's annual scorecard for 2016-17 our agrifood gross value was \$2.4 billion. That is \$2.4 billion worth of income coming in to the state. Our processed food value was \$4.2 billion coming in to the state. We have interstate sales of \$2.44 billion with another \$0.6 billion in exports. At the census in 2016 more than 7500 people were directly employed in agriculture in Tasmania and over 2000 were directly employed in aquaculture and fishing in Tasmania. A further 657 were employed in agriculture, forestry and fishery support industries, with 6300 employed in food and beverage manufacturing.

However, the world is changing. We are seeing an increasing globalisation of trade and with the modern increase in travel comes new pathways for the introduction of pests and diseases into the state. We must ensure that we are able to deal with such biosecurity across the state. This biosecurity continuum is critical. We have the policies in place to deal with risks before they get to the border, at the border and after they pass. Dr Broad mentioned the ability to deal with such issues when they occur. Lessons were learnt by the Queensland fruit fly incursion. I know several people in biosecurity and the extra workload taken on by those members of the public service and others in order to contain that outbreak was truly magnificent. I congratulate the department for all that was achieved.

There are a number of other things I would like to talk about when we are dealing with this bill, but I would now like to highlight some features of the bill. There is a clear extra territorial operation, so that Tasmanian biosecurity can cover the whole biosecurity continuum that approaches. A general biosecurity duty, which imposes a statutory duty of care on all persons to properly manage biosecurity risks when dealing with any animal, plants and related products, criminal penalties that are more appropriate for the nature of gravity of biosecurity offences and better align the penalties with biosecurity offences of other states. There is also the ability for detailed biosecurity measures to be tailor-made for managing specific issues, activities or impacts and implemented by a subordinate regulation and the statutory program.

The new biosecurity bill is more evolutionary than revolutionary. The old one was pulled together over a number of years. Now we bring it into a contemporary bill that will serve Tasmanians well.

It is critical to this Hodgman Liberal Government's vision of achieving \$10 billion worth of agricultural annual farm value by 2050. We need to make sure we protect that through good biosecurity legislation.

For all those people involved, thank you very much for the work that has been put into this. I commend the ministers for the work, particularly the minister for his fantastic second reading speech. I congratulate you for getting through that. Along with a long bill comes a very long second reading speech. I congratulate all those people involved.

We are an island state. It is fundamental to our future that we protect our borders from incursions. We have the ability, because we are an island state, to do it better than the mainland states. It is a critical issue and I commend the bill to the house.

[6.22 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Minister for Primary Industries) - Madam Deputy Speaker, it is an honour to make some concluding remarks and to respond to the queries and questions put by the previous speakers from the Labor Party and the Greens and to note that they have expressed support for this landmark bill.

I acknowledge and say thank you for that support and also, on behalf of their parties, to express support for those who have worked so hard behind the scenes. I note and acknowledge those here in the chamber, specifically Deirdre Wilson, the deputy secretary in the Chamber with me with Lloyd Klumpp and Stephen Hall.

It is a 342-page bill and it is a landmark bill. It is a watershed event that is setting up best practice. There are so many people behind the scenes that have worked on this for so many years.

I acknowledge my previous ministers as has been noted by Mr Shelton and others during the debate. Jeremy Rockliff led the charge soon after we were elected in 2014 and called for a review. There was a review that set in place a train of events to consult extensively with stakeholders and work assiduously over the years since then. Sarah Courtney was the minister who led the charge prior to my involvement at the end of October last year.

It is terrific leadership demonstrated not only by former ministers but by Biosecurity Tasmania and part of the Department of Primary Industries and Water working with the stakeholders. The

commitment was to deliver world-class biosecurity systems to protect our primary industries, our environment, our community and our tourism sector Tasmania. It is part of the Tasmanian brand. That is one of the reasons we are so proud of this bill and the effort that has been put in over that number of years. It is landmark legislation, as has been noted in my second reading speech and by others in this Chamber. It replaces seven current acts with a single modern statute that secures best practice and aligns with other jurisdictions around the country.

It confirms our Government has biosecurity as a top priority and I have said that many times in public, private and in this Chamber and elsewhere that it is a top priority. At Agfest this was demonstrated with the Premier and me with Hunter, one of the biosecurity inspector dogs who had a special retirement celebration. That was a special day. All those there really appreciated the hard work and we have done a lot in doubling the number of our inspector dogs. Hunter was one of those and we celebrated his retirement.

Tasmania has a reputation as a premium producer of agricultural and seafood products and as a tourism destination and we are reliant on a rigorous and effective biosecurity system. We need to be proud of it and we need to all work towards it and that is one of the reasons we have introduced the biosecurity general duty of care that applies to all of us in Tasmania. This legislation, in my view, will underpin what the world values about Tasmania; it underpins the Tasmanian brand. It underpins our \$2.4 billion in agri-food production per annum and over \$3 billion in exports and of course the \$3 billion contribution to the Tasmanian economy from tourism.

Peter Skillern, CEO of TFGA, said in *Tasmanian Country* on 3 May:

As I have said many times we cannot underestimate the importance of biosecurity in terms of its potential impact on the agricultural sector and the Tasmanian economy more broadly. This bill will help ensure Tasmania has nation-leading modern biosecurity laws capable of furthering the Tasmanian biosecurity strategy.

Ms O'Connor indicated that the strategy goes for decades and decades to come. It is a long-term plan, it is part of our long-term strategy -

Ms O'Connor - Talk to your colleague, the Environment minister, about a long-term climate plan as well, hey?

Mr BARNETT - The Hodgman Liberal Government has long-term plans to prosper Tasmania and make this state the best place in the world to live, to work and to invest.

Ms O'Connor - It's already that - it doesn't need you.

Mr BARNETT - I am doing my best to make it even better, Ms O'Connor, in backing this biosecurity bill. We are all doing our best in this Chamber, and that is noted and acknowledged.

Ms O'Connor - I doubt that. You all betrayed those kids today.

Mr BARNETT - I believe that we are all motivated for good for the people of Tasmania. It is just we express that in different policies and in a different way from time to time, week to week, month to month.

We want to minimise the red tape, streamline the processes and support our community in the way we have. It is more than four years of consultation and extensive work and it has received broad support from a whole range of stakeholders. I acknowledge and put on record my thanks. We had the Salmon Industry Growers Association here earlier today and yesterday with other representatives. Other stakeholders have been expressing interest and are following the debate very carefully and I would like to acknowledge them.

Ms O'Connor - Before you do that, minister, are you going to answer the questions I asked?

Mr BARNETT - I will; I have a full list of questions ready to respond to Ms O'Connor.

I want to put on record my thanks to those stakeholders who have expressed support and thank them for their involvement over a long period of time, in fact, years. They include Wine Tasmania, the Tasmanian Salmon Growers Association, Poppy Growers Tasmania, the Tasmanian Seafood Industry Council, the Tasmanian Beekeepers Association, the Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association, the Tasmanian Agricultural Productivity Group and Fruit Growers Tasmania.

The TFGA wrote to me and indicated they were fully supportive of the bill presented to the parliament. The fruit growers likewise said to the secretary of the department:

In consideration of all its improvements over the existing legislation, FGT strongly supports the proposed Biosecurity Bill 2019. In our view it represents a legislative framework for biosecurity management that is transparent and fair, yet also flexible and adaptive to Tasmania's evolving biosecurity needs.

I take this opportunity to thank all the aforementioned stakeholders and indeed many others involved, too numerous to name here. They have been with us all the way on this journey and without them we would not be at this point.

Before I pass on a few other thank yous I will address some of the queries that have been made by Dr Broad and Ms O'Connor.

First I will address the issue of authorised officers. Dr Broad, my counterpart, asked about their role and if an authorised officer was not suitable and did not have the right skills whether their activities could be challenged. The provisions in the bill ensure that authorised officer's functions and powers must only be authorised for a security purpose. It has to be for that particular purpose and consistent with the objects and principles of the act. I note and acknowledge that Dr Broad talked early in his response about both the objects and the principles of the act and that is appreciated.

Dr Broad - I meant potentially open to legal challenge. That question of whether somebody was -

Mr BARNETT - I am coming to that. Hold that thought.

This would prevent an authorised officer, including a police officer, from using biosecurity powers for an ulterior purpose. The bill also imposes a suitability or fit and proper person test in respect of appointment of authorised officers. This will ensure non-government officers will need to comply with the same character and suitability criteria and criminal history checks as government-authorised officers. The secretary must be assured that the person to be appointed as

an authorised officer has the requisite skills and experience as required under the act. That is standard practice.

There was a question about the permitted list. Ms O'Connor asked this as well as Dr Broad. Both members queried how the permitted list will operate. Tasmania has decades of experience undertaking risk assessments across all sectors with the administration of a permitted list system for importing animals and animal products under the Animal Health Act 1995, so that goes back a way. The bill allows a streamlined import risk assessment approach to be applied and is a significant improvement on current arrangements. Biosecurity is a critical issue for Tasmania and other states and we cannot afford to have less robust biosecurity laws than other jurisdictions. We are certainly in line with other jurisdictions under this legislation. Tasmania also has had the benefit of being able to observe the operation of the permitted list systems for plants in other jurisdictions such as Western Australia and New Zealand and this has informed the drafting of the bill and will inform how it will be implemented.

On the issue of penalties, Dr Broad asked about penalties and noted that it was not fully comprehensively outlined in the second reading speech, which I thought was a fair observation. I interjected to that effect so it was a fair acknowledgement. I tried to provide some examples in the second reading speech. In terms of penalties, there are three tiers of penalties in the act including fines for individuals of 2500 penalty units for the most serious, which is \$407 500 on current penalty units assessment, and 750 penalty units for the next level, which is \$122 250, while for the lowest level it is \$81 500. These are at current penalty units and are maximum penalties. Of course they change from time to time on the penalty unit value. In practice, a sentence could be anything from no conviction to the upper end of the range.

There were queries about international flights from Mc O'Connor and how they would be dealt with. To make it very clear, international flights are a responsibility for the Australian Government. Nevertheless, Biosecurity works with the Australian Government to ensure Tasmania's interests are protected -

Ms O'Connor - The question was relating to resourcing to deal with not only the international flights elevated risk but also other risks that relate to climate change. Resourcing for Biosecurity Tasmania.

Mr BARNETT - Yes that is a good question about resourcing. I have touched on that in my last paragraph, which I have not addressed as yet on resourcing issues. With respect to both federal and state inspectors, this is regarding tourists on flights and other passengers on flights, they will be cleared as passengers and cargo for biosecurity purposes in much the same way as is currently done for domestic flights. That is how they will be dealt with. That includes Biosecurity Tasmania. They are heavily involved, so the representatives behind me in the advisers' chairs have responsibility for that. They are heavily in operations at first points of entry including international flights into Tasmania. It is a very important matter and it is taken very seriously by Biosecurity Tasmania.

Ms O'Connor - Minister, can I seek some clarification by interjection. The level of inspection of domestic flights is at a far lower level than it is for international flights. Can you confirm that people arriving at Hobart Airport on an international flight will be subject to the same customs and biosecurity assessment as people who land in Melbourne or Sydney or Brisbane on an international flight?

Mr BARNETT - Thank you for the welcome interjection. I am happy to respond to that with an affirmative response. In terms of the advice I have received the answer is yes.

Ms O'Connor asked some specific questions about clauses 36, 73, and 99, so I will deal with those in turn.

Clause 36: if the auditor is also an authorised officer they can enter using their officer's powers. Otherwise they can only enter without consent to a commercial or non-residential premises while accompanying an authorised officer - have to be accompanying an authorised officer. The clause really is a doubt removal clause. That is the purpose of clause 36.

Clause 73(5): notification of a biosecurity event defence applies if the person can establish they believe that Biosecurity Tasmania already knew that the pest or disease was discovered. There has to be an understanding that they thought and believed that Biosecurity Tasmania already knew that the pest or disease was discovered.

Monitoring of auditors is another query. Biosecurity Tasmania conduct audits in its own right and where third party auditors are used they are in turn audited on a regular basis by Biosecurity Tasmania.

Clause 99(2) with respect to publication of prohibited matter permits. All group permits are required to be published but individual permits are generally not published by reason of privacy, commercial-in-confidence, or biosecurity protection matters. However, the department will consider reporting aggregated data.

Ms O'Connor - A point of clarification, minister. There were a number of matters that permits that are decreed, but there is missing detail for publication that relates to a prohibited matter or a permitted matter as I understand it.

Mr BARNETT - Thank you for the welcome interjection. If there is a permit for a group assessment, it is published. If it is an individual, it will depend on the circumstances. It is subject to commercial-in-confidence, I am advised, subject to the reasons of privacy and it is not generally published. If it is groups it is published, is the advice that I have received. I am getting further nods to that effect.

On the education and training materials, a question was asked how that would occur and roll out. A very important question. It is important to the Government. The department will continue to develop communications, education and training materials, which will inform the community of the significant improvements that the bill presents to our biosecurity system in Tasmania as well as the particular obligations that will apply.

There was a question regarding implementation and resources, which is sort of related. In terms of implementation and resourcing, the House should not be given the impression that we are starting from nothing. We already have resources. Biosecurity Tasmania is already well resourced. We already have existing systems in place to do the job. It is not as if we have had seven acts and we are replacing it with one, and the work is going to be ongoing and it will continue. It does need to be resourced, and it is currently being resourced using those existing systems. The department has been working on this matter for some time and has a well-planned path forward. I am very confident of that because I have had many meetings with the department and the departmental officials. They are determined to roll this out.

This is a legislative framework so there will be regulations that sit underneath it. There will be administrative arrangements that will sit underneath it. There will be a whole range of processes and procedures that will roll out in a transitional way over coming months and years. They will be prioritised, I am advised. Those tasks will be prioritised and will be informed by ongoing consultations with stakeholders. There will be an orderly program of review of existing legislation and regulation that is to be replaced and, again, that will roll out over a period of time.

Ms O'Connor also asked about the compendium. A good question. The bill, as we all know, requires the publication of the compendium on the website, I think you mentioned, Ms O'Connor, to aid in transparency and promote public awareness of Tasmania's biosecurity requirements. The compendium will contain up-to-date lists of all prohibited matter, permitted matter and restricted matter declared under the act. It can also include any explanatory and supporting information concerning listing decisions and other biosecurity requirements that the secretary considers appropriate. A good example would be the information on how to comply with the general biosecurity duty in particular situations.

Access to the biosecurity compendium will be free. It is intended to become an invaluable plain language resource. The departmental officials have raised with me, many times, the importance of plain language so people can understand exactly what their duties and responsibilities are and what functions are to be performed. It is intended to become an invaluable plain language resource, as I said, one that contains forms, guidelines, supporting information necessary to assist the business community and the general public to understand and comply with Tasmania's biosecurity laws.

Already Biosecurity Tasmania has foundational arrangements in place for the compendium. It is expected it will be released in an initial form within 12 months of the bill being passed. There is a lot of work that will need to go into it. There was a mention that it is a dynamic document and it will change over time as new information comes around, new fact sheets come on board, as new guidelines are implemented or put in place.

I hope that assists in responding to your queries.

Ms O'Connor - By way of interjection and thank you for the constructive manner in which you have engaged in this debate. I do not feel satisfied that the resourcing question was answered.

Mr BARNETT - Okay. I can assure you as minister and on behalf of Biosecurity Tasmania that they have the resources to do the job and they will be doing it over a period of time. That will be a transitional arrangement.

You can ask further questions at Estimates in a few weeks' time and I would be delighted to provide further and better particulars regarding that. I will have the secretary and other members of Biosecurity Tasmania to assist in more detail. That is my advice and as minister, I would not want to be in a position where they could not do the job that we have set.

What we are setting up is the framework legislation under which we then have to do the work to pull the regulations together, the administrative arrangements to actually put in place world's best practice consistent with other jurisdictions so we can protect Tasmania's best interests and be free of pests and diseases. I am confident of that. I would be happy to provide further and better particulars at Budget Estimates. That is a commitment I am providing, on behalf of the Government, that the resourcing is there to do the job.

Ms O'Connor - If it is not, you will advocate for there to be increased resources?

Mr BARNETT - Of course. I conclude by indicating that I am very pleased and proud on behalf of the Government to support this bill. We have invested significantly in biosecurity already and that is partly on the resourcing count. We have doubled the number of detector dog teams, as I indicated earlier, and we have invested more to boost frontline services to meet seasonal demand.

We have delivered vital biosecurity infrastructure including state-of-the-art diagnostic laboratories, border signage, and we are investing more to tackle pests and weeds. We are working to protect our industries and the jobs they create. Agriculture, forestry and fishing sectors employ 13 000 Tasmanians, and tourism and hospitality 15 000 Tasmanians. We are wanting to build on that and support that. It is the next step in modernising our biosecurity systems and we are on the right track.

In conclusion, I appreciate the support of all members in this House for this bill, particularly my counterpart, Dr Broad, and Ms O'Connor for their strong support and encouragement. Thanks also to the officials who are with us today. I thank my colleague, Mark Shelton, and all members on the Government side for their strong support for this bill.

My thanks to the former ministers, Jeremy Rockliff and Sarah Courtney. A huge big thank you to the departmental officials who are here today. They put their heart and soul into this over many years, particularly in recent weeks and months. A huge effort. We have consulted comprehensively. I briefed members of the Legislative Council for a short time and then the departmental officers briefed them more extensively. There will be more briefings and more consultations because we have to get it right for Tasmania's sake. To the departmental officers I named earlier who are here today, it is fantastic that you have given us that support and encouragement. You have delivered for Tasmania.

Once again, thank you very much Dierdre Wilson, Lloyd Klumpp, Stephen Hall, Stuart Pedersen from my office who has put in a huge effort to make it all happen.

Members - Hear, hear.

Mr BARNETT - To all the team behind you, I feel like clapping and saying well done. On behalf of all of those in this parliament, thank you for your work.

I commend the bill to the House.

Bill read the second time.

Bill read the third time.

REGISTRATION TO WORK WITH VULNERABLE PEOPLE AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 65)

Second Reading

[6.50 p.m.]

Ms ARCHER (Clark - Minister for Justice - 2R) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the bill be now read the second time.

This bill delivers on the Government's commitment to align the current worker screening legislation with new requirements previously agreed at a national level. It allows for the exchange of information between two new associated national registries. The bill addresses new requirements, streamlines process and clarifies existing legislative requirements in the Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Act 2013.

The recent Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse made various recommendations to worker screening practices for people to be registered to work with children in Tasmania. Broadly speaking, the recommendations were to improve the protection afforded to children by:

- creating a standardised approach so that key aspects of all schemes across all jurisdictions in Australia are dealt with the same way;
- allowing checks to be portable across jurisdictions to avoid complexity, duplication and importantly 'forum shopping', where perpetrators work in locations with less rigorous checking; and
- improving information sharing so that there is continuous monitoring of cardholders' national criminal history records, and visibility of working with children check decisions across all jurisdictions.

These agreements are being enshrined in National Standards for Working with Children Checks (WWCC), and this bill brings Tasmania in line with the agreed standards.

Consistent with the Government's response to the royal commission, the bill:

- allows for portability of interstate checks to Tasmania;
- reduces the number of exemptions from the requirement to register;
- allows for sharing of information with interstate registration bodies, including national databases;
- introduces disqualifying offences which prevent a person being registered; and
- allows for extension of the registration period from three years to up to five years.

In December 2016 the Council of Australian Governments endorsed the National Disability Insurance Scheme Quality and Safeguarding Framework. As we are all aware, the NDIS represents a fundamental change to how supports for people with a disability are funded and delivered across Australia. The framework seeks to promote a safe and competent workforce which includes consideration of worker screening and, as a consequence, Tasmania's endorsement of the Intergovernmental Agreement on Nationally Consistent Worker Screening for the National Disability Insurance Scheme, or IGA. Both the National Standards for Working with Children Checks and NDIS IGA agreements aim to introduce 'disqualifying offences', which are offences that are prescribed within the legislation that deem a person unable to ever hold a registration to

work with vulnerable people. These disqualifying offences will ensure consistency throughout all jurisdictions.

The bill does not list the disqualifying offences; however it enables them to be listed in a ministerial order in the same way that the current act provides for a ministerial order governing the risk assessment undertaken by the registrar. The order is required to be published and available to the public once made. As members would expect, disqualifying offences will include serious sexual offences with child victims and serious violent offences such as murder.

The outcome of incorporating these national agreements into Tasmania's Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Act ensures alignment with the outcomes of the royal commission and the protective integrity of the legislation. Moving into the vulnerable adult space, and particularly NDIS, is indicative of Tasmania's commitment, expressed in this act, to protecting not only children but all vulnerable persons in our state.

By virtue of Tasmania endorsing both national agreements, two new databases will be established, the NDIS Commission National Clearance Database and the National Reference System for Working with Children Checks established within the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission. When established, these databases will give jurisdictions the capacity to have immediate access to the status and status history of an applicant or registered person in real time at a national level. Each screening unit will know immediately if a person has had a refused, cancelled or suspended registration to work with children in another state. Upon request from the inquiring jurisdiction, all relevant risk assessment documents, police files, court documents and other relevant information about an applicant or registered person will be disclosed from the screening unit in possession of that information.

The NDIS National Clearance Database will contain all information relevant to NDIS workers relating to registration status, internal complaints, criminal and civil matters, and will also accommodate the exchange of information about reportable behaviours between all signatory jurisdictions. These databases provide for real-time registration status and subsequent timely exchange of relevant information between jurisdictions upon request. This will ensure that all individuals who are, or seek, registration to work with vulnerable persons in Tasmania have been subject to a more thorough and rigorous assessment.

The bill includes a number of provisions to amend the Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Act so that the information gathered in our process can be shared with all other jurisdictions and create a national net to protect vulnerable persons.

The Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Act came into effect in December 2013, with acceptance of first applications commencing on 1 July 2014. The requirement for registration to work in child-related sectors was phased in gradually through to 1 January 2017. The registration period currently lasts for three years. Since inception, the Department of Justice has registered over 130 000 applications for persons to work in child-related activities. During this time the registrar has refused or cancelled 54 applicants or registered persons, with transparent and defensible decisions which have been upheld when put to judicial review.

Since the legislation came into effect, amendments have sought to provide for continuous monitoring of registered persons by integrating the ICT system with Tasmania Police and child protection services, and to establish provisions for other reportable bodies to provide relevant information in a timely manner.

Given we have now completed the rollout of the registration to the child-related regulated activities, it is now timely to begin regulating for people to work with vulnerable adults. The rollout of the NDIS means that NDIS worker screening will commence on 1 July 2019. The bill therefore both enables the switching on of worker screening for people working with vulnerable adults and for a specific subset of this category for NDIS workers.

To facilitate the national NDIS worker screening process linked to specific NDIS-endorsed employers, separate provisions are included for the purpose of NDIS. The risk assessment process will be the same, but the application process will include an additional step to limit the sharing of the information with the NDIS commission to only those applicants who are employed in the NDIS.

Many of the amendments in this bill are to create categories of registration, including a definition of the various categories to be inserted by clause 6. These amendments will make it easier to administer the act now that it will extend beyond the single category of working with children.

The bill also includes a new provision in section 18 to require employers with an employee working for them in anticipation of registration to have a risk management plan in place for those employees. To enhance the integrity of the risk assessment process, the bill includes provisions to enhance the process:

- to explicitly include the ability to interview applicants or registrants so as to gain additional information relevant to a risk assessment or additional risk assessment;
- to dismiss an application if the additional information is not supplied; and
- to require applicants to keep the registrar updated on where they volunteer or are employed so that if a negative notice, suspension or cancellation occurs all relevant organisations can be advised.

The registrar has become aware that applicants have, after the risk assessment process has begun, intentionally withdrawn their application in such times that they suspect they may be refused a registration to avoid their employer being notified. The bill provides that in such specified circumstances the employer will be notified that the applicant has withdrawn their application.

The bill also contains a small number of amendments to streamline processes, or provide clarification.

This bill indicates that this Government has made a clear commitment to improving the safety of vulnerable persons in Tasmania.

I commend the bill to the House.

[7.00 p.m.]

Ms HADDAD (Clark) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I will begin my contribution by indicating that the Opposition will support this bill. We do not intend to go into committee. I thank the department for the very thorough briefing I received through the Attorney-General's office to explain the background of the bill and the work, which I acknowledge has been a behemoth, to ensure the national consistency across the states and territories. Labor is supportive of the elements of the bill that ensure the national framework which allows for information sharing across jurisdictions.

This bill satisfies many of the recommendations of the royal commission and the inter-governmental agreement following that royal commission to standardise processes of working with vulnerable people, checks across the states and territories. It implements that by including those national standards and nationally consistent worker screenings and allows for national information sharing across jurisdictions. It also deals with disqualifying offences, expands current registration schemes, from working with vulnerable children in Tasmania to working with vulnerable people, including adults by including those adult cohorts. It limits the requirements of those not required to be registered, puts further supervisory restrictions on people's work while applications are on foot, broadens the registrar's ability to request further information from applicants, provides for exchange of information across states, allows the minister to make a list of disqualifying offences by regulation, ensures that employers do a risk assessment for interim periods from the start of employment until registration is achieved and makes changes to the registration scheme as it currently stands to allow someone to be a volunteer in one organisation but employed in another. That can be done through one check, which avoids red tape and unnecessary reapplication processes for people who volunteer and work. This would include most people in the community who choose to volunteer their time.

I note the arrangements around conditional registration and the fact that conditional registration will continue to be possible in Tasmania. As it was explained to me in the briefing there is a very limited number of people who that conditional registration currently applies to. They are mostly people in kinship care where the expectation is that it is better for those people to be in kinship care than not. I recognise that. In talking to stakeholders about this bill, I conducted a fairly thorough consultation process with disability organisations and members of the community who have had feedback on the current scheme and also who have some experience in planning for the NDIS. I thought that I might put some of those on the record of *Hansard*, not so much by way of questions to the Attorney-General but to put those facts on the record from the consultation that I have conducted.

First of all, I want to ask the Attorney-General a few questions arising out of the second reading speech. With the national database providing the ability to share reportable behaviours across jurisdictions, will that also allow for the sharing of information about charges and convictions?

You talked about the very good safeguard to allow for an employer to be notified if someone has withdrawn their application on the suspicion that their employer would be informed of their application and the likely refusal of that application. Is there any ability to prevent further applications from that person or to alert others who may not be aware of that person's likelihood of refusal if they are volunteering or being employed? I suspect not, but that came to mind when reading the second reading speech when the bill was tabled.

Where the obligation is put on the volunteer or the employee to keep the Registrar updated on where they volunteer and where they are employed, what kind of resourcing is available within the department either locally or nationally? Is it a shared responsibility to ensure that employees and volunteers do comply with that expectation? Are there any sanctions or abilities to remove people's registration if they fail to comply with that requirement? I think it is a very fair requirement.

I want to put on the record some of the issues that have been raised with me on consulting. I will start by saying I consulted a number of organisations, all of whom recognised the importance of this legislation. They are pleased to know that the parliament is dealing with this legislation and extending what is already a very good system of working with children checks to working with

other vulnerable people, including adults on the NDIS. I do not profess to be an expert so I will put some of the concerns raised with me onto the record now.

One community organisation that deals with disability clients asked why there is a separation between NDIS and non-NDIS activities? They have been separated into two classes of registration in the act. I suspect this might be because of the part in the second reading speech, minister, where you spoke about the limit of sharing information with the NDIS commission. I was not entirely sure so I committed to putting that question on the record today. This organisation's view was that as the two registration types do not appear to be handled differently in an administrative perspective they were not sure why the separation was necessary.

They also spoke about the ability of the registrar to request specific medical or other reports. They wondered whether there might be an unbalanced burden put on people with disability making applications for registration. The likelihood that a person with a disability may be more likely to need to comply with that request and provide medical reports could be an unfair cost burden on them. I gave the example of an occupational therapist report regarding functional capacity that can frequently cost more than \$1000. Medical specialists reports can cost several hundred dollars or more. Medicare-subsidised psychology or GP reports generally carry high out-of-pocket costs. They were wanting to raise the possibility that people with disability might be disproportionately affected by the requirement to provide medical reports.

They also wanted to check that it will be within the registrar's capacity to request an interview if they choose to do so that it could be by video or phone, recognising that people with disability may feel better represented if they are able to bring a support person with them to such a request for interview. I am sure that would be within the registrar's capacity but I wanted to raise that question on behalf of that organisation. When it comes to the exceptions to registration, it is understood there are very few exceptions at the moment. This disability organisation flagged the possibility that number could arise as the NDIS reaches its full rollout. The reason being, it is likely that there might be more requests of family members to provide care to people under NDIS packages. It is also possible that family members will indeed be providing more services to their family groups under NDIS full rollout.

On the current working with children arrangements, there were some concerns which I raised in the briefing as well with the department. They explained to me the rationale behind them, which I understand, but that is what is colloquially called the seven-day rule around volunteers' involvement with an activity involving children. If that activity results in less than seven days over a year for that volunteer, they do not require a check. There were some members of the community who raised questions with Labor MPs through our electorate offices about people volunteering in children's sporting organisations who may be ineligible for a check. I will ask you minister but I will get to the point of why I am repeating this information.

Ms O'Connor - It is pretty clear in the principal act about the exceptions.

Ms HADDAD - It was explained to me that that is only a small fraction of what an organisation is expected to do when ensuring they operate in a way that is safe for children. The reason I raise this is because I think there is still room for some education in the community around the current regime of working with children and moving forward into the working with vulnerable people in the adult cohort parts of the act, once amended, we are hearing anecdotal examples of sometimes schools advising parents and tradespeople working in schools that anyone who steps foot onto school grounds is required to have a check. My understanding is that is not the case but it is the

case that some people in the community are under that misapprehension. I wonder whether or not amending the bill to include that adult cohort, as we are doing tonight, might be an opportune time to expand some of the education programs around the current operations and the changed operations of the act. It may well already be in the intention of the department and the minister but it is prudent to put it on the record tonight.

Other than that, Labor is pleased to see that it was nation leading at the time that Tasmania introduced the working with children check -

Ms O'Connor - We were the last state to introduce the check but we ended up with the best legislation.

Ms HADDAD - Okay. We were probably talking about it first but we were the last to introduce it but it was nation-leading and that is worth remarking on. It is very encouraging that we are now extending that protection to vulnerable people in Tasmania, including adult cohorts to people volunteering and working in disability organisations and working with vulnerable people in Tasmania.

[7.13 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Deputy Speaker, the Tasmanian Greens will be supporting the Working with Vulnerable People Amendment Bill 2014. It reflects the contemporary reality and certainly the move towards full rollout of the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

We know that Tasmania has, according to the ABS census data, the highest level of disability in the country. It also has the oldest and fastest ageing population in the country and the sector is projecting a worker shortfall over the next decade or so of around 10 000 people in Tasmania to work in those particular sectors. These are growth sectors in our society and economy and therefore it is extremely important that we get the registration regulatory framework around the kind of people we want working with not only children, but people living with disability, the frail and aged, people who are experiencing mental illness, homelessness or people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background. From my recollection, they are particular adult cohorts who are captured by the legislation as it rolls out.

In response to Ms Haddad's contribution, the short history of this legislation - and I know it intimately because I was the minister at the time and I introduced this legislation in 2013 - is that it was a matter of enduring shame on this island that we were the last jurisdiction to implement a working with children registration process, and for the first two ministerial councils I went to I had to sit there at the table and try to justify Tasmania's continued failure to enact this sort of registration scheme through the Tasmanian Parliament. I will be really honest with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, because I like the history to tell the truth, I struggled to get this legislation through Cabinet. It was not until the 2013 state Budget that I was finally able to secure the funds and the approval to bring this legislation into the Tasmanian Parliament.

It was a Greens minister who delivered this legislation in the first place and the fact that we were the laggards gave us an opportunity to look at best practice. The best practice at the time was the ACT legislation which had expanded on the working with children registration process to include other vulnerable people. So we went from being the worst in the country, the most recklessly irresponsible in relation to making sure that the kinds of people we allow to work with children are the best kind of people who are not going to harm children, to having best-practice

legislation in place and at last an allocation of funding in order to implement this legislation. I thought it was important to place that on the record.

Vulnerability, as we know, comes in many forms. We can all agree that children are among the most vulnerable people in our community. The reason this legislation was enacted in the form it was in 2013 was because the parliament ultimately recognised that there were other people who, through their circumstances or by birth, are made vulnerable. I acknowledge that these amendments are in part a reflection of the full rollout of the National Disability Insurance Scheme. If anyone doubts the critical importance of making sure that those who have the honour and privilege of working with vulnerable people in the disability sector must be people of the highest standard, I refer them to the *4 Corners* report and other investigations that show rampant abuse of people living with disability in state- and private-run facilities around the country, just as there has been the neglect and abuse of older people in our community.

In relation to the abuse of people with disability, I am really proud to be part of the Greens where Senator Jordan Steele-John, who lives with a disability, was able to get through the Australian Parliament a royal commission into the lives of people living with a disability. We also have now in place a royal commission into aged care. What royal commissions enable us as a society to do is have a really thorough look at the situation, to have before a royal commission people with expertise and knowledge in those sectors who are required to tell the truth about the circumstances that the people in those sectors are facing.

Both the Australian Parliament and the Tasmanian Parliament have acknowledged that disability comes in many forms and the original legislation allowed for a staged rollout in order to capture those sectors where vulnerable people, made vulnerable by birth or circumstances or age, need caring for. It is an interesting word to use; it is an evolution in relation to the word 'vulnerable' because if you talk to someone living with a disability about that word, people can find it offensive and a bit insulting, as if it is part of a paternalistic state process. I hear that, but we are dealing with legislation that has the word in its title and we need to acknowledge that vulnerability can apply to both children and adults.

I have a couple of questions for the minister. The principal act applied a risk-based analysis of each individual application that came forward for registration to work with children and, at the time, registration to work with other vulnerable people. It allowed for an individualised and tailored assessment of a particular application. I would have thought that the disqualifying offences, which are not fully detailed, but we can understand what they might be, would have been most certainly a part of an individual risk assessment for someone who had applied for registration. Obviously if an applicant has been convicted of child abuse, or neglect, or murder, or manslaughter, that would be a disqualifying offence through that tailored risk assessment process. I understand that it has been more closely prescribed now.

We know that the bill does not list the disqualifying offences, but it enables them to be listed by ministerial order. If the Attorney-General could provide some clarity to the House about when those disqualifying offences will be made by ministerial order and when they will be known, that would be quite helpful. Specifically, in relation to the legislation there is an amendment to section 4 of the principal act and the bill says:

Section 4 of the Principal Act is amended by omitting paragraph (b) from the definition of *vulnerable person* and substituting:

(1) An adult in respect of whom a regulated activity is provided.

For the benefit of the House the principal act talks about: (a) a child; or (b) an adult accessing a regulated activity. Could the minister explain why it was felt necessary to make that change? In typical, legalistic way it does not go anywhere near what vulnerability actually is. I understand that we are dealing with the restrictions of law.

Minister, I am quoting the second reading speech to you now:

The bill includes a number of provisions to amend the Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Act so that the information gathered in our process can be shared with all other jurisdictions and create a national net to protect vulnerable persons.

The Greens support that. One of the issues raised with us, quite strongly, at the time I brought this legislation into the House in 2013, related to the privacy of persons who are seeking registration. From recollection what the principal act gave was a capacity for the assessment to look at matters that went beyond convictions. To look at matters that pointed to a particular type of behaviour, to examine charges that may have been laid but not led to a conviction. This raised some real tensions, I would have to say, with advocates for privacy, but also for civil liberties. It comes to the fore again when you go to the provisions in the legislation that:

The Registrar becomes aware that applicants have after the risk assessment process begun intentionally withdrawn their application in such times that they suspect they may be refused a registration to avoid their employer being notified and the amendments in this legislation provide that in such specified circumstances the employer will be notified that the applicant has withdrawn their application.

I understand that, but here is a scenario: a person with an otherwise clean record, who has lived a blameless life, has not knowingly caused harm to any other person may seek registration. As a result of the interview and questions that might have been asked, for example, about their drug history becomes scared about what that might mean for them in their employment and therefore withdraws their registration application. Can the minister understand that this particular provision takes the effect and potential intrusions of this legislation a reasonably significant step further than was the original intent of the act back in 2013? There may be circumstances where a person simply does not want their employer to know that they were busted with pot back in 1993. It sits somewhere on their record or not, but they have been asked a question about their drug taking and they felt they need to answer it honestly. They are concerned about how that might affect their employment.

I ask the minister to flesh that out a little bit. Also, to provide some reassurance that when any person applies for registration to work with either children or vulnerable people begins that assessment process, it is made really clear to them that should they withdraw from that assessment process their employer will be informed. It potentially has a really significant effect on someone's employment. It is potentially a very significant intrusion into someone's privacy. It is particularly those low-grade drug offences that I am pointing to here, offences that are not going to, in all likelihood, impact on that applicant's capacity to safely care for or work with children and other vulnerable people.

I do not know if the minister has consulted with Civil Liberties Tasmania or other privacy advocates about that provision. Has the minister consulted with the Law Society, the Bar Association about these provisions? Can the minister provide some reassurance that this particular provision in the legislation will not be abused or misused to the detriment of someone who in good faith makes an application to work with a child or other vulnerable people?

When this bill was first tabled I was surprised that we are still very slowly working through that process of implementing the registration to work with vulnerable adults. I would have thought that was in place, or being staged as part of the roll out earlier. It is now six years after the legislation was passed through both Houses of the Tasmanian Parliament. I have not made the time, minister, and I apologise, to go back to my original second reading speech to examine what commitments were made to the roll out of the 'working with vulnerable adults' parts of this legislation, but I think it has been rolled out slower than was the original intent. I am more than glad to be corrected.

Can the minister confirm that it is the intent, when we talk about a regulated activity, that those regulated activities will apply to not only people living with disability but people who are frail and aged, people who accessing homelessness services, people who are in mental health facilities, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and any other cohort within our community who are regarded for the purposes of this legislation as vulnerable?

With those few comments, we do not see any need to go into Committee. We commend the agency for working through these amendments and the minister for bringing it on. We will be supporting the legislation.

[7.31 p.m.]

Ms ARCHER (Clark - Minister for Justice) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank members for their very thoughtful contributions. It is a difficult topic and just taking up that last point Ms O'Connor was making, some of these things can be overly intrusive, particularly in our daily lives, but they are there for a reason. I accept that all members agree with the intent of the bill and it is unfortunate that we live in a society where we have to have these protections, so there always has to be balance between those protections and civil liberties.

One thing that struck me about this whole process and the royal commissions we are about to continue with in other sectors in relation to disability and aged care as well the one we have just had in relation to child sexual abuse in institutional care, is the gravity of what can go wrong and why we do have to have these protections in place. It is quite astonishing when we see the breadth of evidence and some of the really tragic stories that come out of the royal commission that I am more intimately familiar with as Attorney-General; it is really quite shocking. It is what it is, unfortunately, and as members are well aware - and particularly Ms O'Connor, having held portfolios - the department does a lot of work to ensure there is balance and fairness and public interest at the fore at the same time.

It is my practice these days while I think of it to always thank the department because sometimes I sit down and I have forgotten to do it, particularly with a bill like this where you can see the enormity of the work that does go into the bill. I want to thank the hardworking members across departments who have dealt with this matter for some time and indeed the drafting of this bill, because as has been acknowledged the complexity of the work that is required and indeed when it is interjurisdictional, you can imagine the work that goes on amongst departmental officers. It was the subject of ministerial meetings that we hold in relevant portfolio areas and that can explain some of the delays as well.

I will firstly deal with Ms Haddad's questions and I will try to deal with them in order. The first dealt with the ability to share reportable behaviour. Correct me at any stage if I have interpreted questions wrongly because it is easy to not take them down correctly. She asked if that would also allow for sharing of information about charges and conditions. Convictions are shared through the current national police check process which is broader than the standard police check as it includes no conviction recorded as well. Previously that did not occur. Charges are reportable behaviours and will be shared across the states and territories.

The second question was in relation to safeguards and the specific issue of the employer being notified of a withdrawn application. I believe the question was whether there was any ability of other persons to be notified in relation to those volunteer situations. The safeguarding of vulnerable people is achieved by the employer or volunteer organisation advising the registrar who they have engaged and the individual telling the registrar what organisations they are engaged with. There are also audits of organisations to check who is there and whether they are registered. I think that makes sense.

Ms Haddad - It does. Would that be done through the registrar's office?

Ms ARCHER - I am getting a nod, so yes.

Again, keeping the registrar updated, what kind of resourcing is there for compliance? Are there sanctions or the ability to remove them if they fail to comply? The unit dealing with this - we will shorten it to the RWVP unit - is run on a cost-recovery basis. Part of the fee includes the cost of enforcement. Audit and compliance checks are funded and the department has set up a compliance team to undertake this work as well.

Ms Haddad - Great. Thank you for that.

Ms ARCHER - The fourth one I have dealt with - why there has been a separation between NDIS and non-NDIS and the rationale behind that. The NDIS has been split from vulnerable adults to ensure we are aware of the NDIS status and only share information with NDIS where that link exists. This protects the privacy of the non-NDIS cohort, so from an administrative point of view this is a check box on the application.

Ms Haddad - I do not know if I heard right but is that to protect the privacy of the non-NDIS cohort? Yes? Okay, thank you.

Ms ARCHER - The fifth question was in relation to whether it could be done by both video and phone interviews. Yes, we are already doing it.

Ms Haddad - I thought so.

Ms ARCHER - That was a very quick response - no need to pad that one out. The other one dealt with the current working with children checks and the seven-day rule. That exemption already exists in the act and the department has never had any feedback about that, but obviously if an organisation has any concern, or you have any concern, then by all means advise them to get in contact with the registrar, so refer them through the registrar. Obviously we will be happy to hear that feedback if it exists, but it has not been raised in the past.

The other thing was in relation to the education component of that. My advice is that we do it already. We engage with peak bodies, schools and the like. The act requires it so it is part of the department's program.

Ms Haddad - Will there be something specific around these changes?

Ms ARCHER - Around these latest changes - they will be built into the program, yes.

Ms Haddad - Thank you for that clarification.

Ms ARCHER - To Ms O'Connor's questions. The first question was in relation to the ministerial order. We are dealing with disqualifying offences and this enables it to be listed with the ministerial order. The question was when will they be made and known?

Ms O'Connor - Sorry, what was that last one in terms of timing?

Ms ARCHER - No.

Ms O'Connor - There is a ministerial order that relates to the disqualifying offences, or will there be a ministerial order? There is a national standard and the bill is not listed as qualifying offences but enables them to be listed in a ministerial order.

Ms ARCHER - Yes, there will be one but we need to reach a national agreement first. I presume that is for consistency purposes. This goes back to the reason for the delays with a lot of these processes. It is because we are dealing with it on a national basis to get states and territories consistent. There will be a national agreement and they must be publicly disclosed. There will be public disclosure once it has been reached and made.

We would, on advice, be happy to offer further briefings once agreements and disqualifying offences are confirmed. Once that is known.

Ms O'Connor - The question about the change to the definition of a vulnerable person and why that was thought necessary -

Ms ARCHER - Was that one of your original questions?

Ms O'Connor - Yes. Originally it said a child or a person who accesses a regulated activity and now it is simply an adult in respect of whom a regulated activity is provided. Is that a tightening up of subclause (b)?

Ms ARCHER - That was your next question? Yes, it is tightening up.

Ms O'Connor - Okay.

Ms ARCHER - Hopefully *Hansard* got that. I have a slightly different order to what I have written down. You asked something else on risk assessment.

Ms O'Connor - Yes. The concerns that have been raised in the past about privacy and the passing on of the withdrawal of an application to an employer.

Ms ARCHER - I am advised that a risk-based approach will continue except for a small number of serious sexual or serious violent offences, which would lead to disqualifying offences. However, other lesser offences, patterns of behaviour or behaviour which is not proven to the criminal standard will still be subject to a risk assessment.

Ms O'Connor - Is the amendment that flexible? It is not the default position that the registrar will inform the employer every time an applicant withdraws their application?

Ms ARCHER - If the person applies and it triggers a risk assessment because the flag has occurred and the person withdraws the application, the same rule for disclosing to the employer as for a negative notice would apply. That is, the detail is not disclosed; only the fact that the application has been withdrawn. This is important because the employment is a regulated activity requiring registration therefore the employer needs to know that there is no longer an application.

Then, there is the sharing of information with other states. Sharing information will not be an automatic sharing. If the applicant is given a negative notice then that will be a flag and the information only shared if the person then makes an application in another state.

Ms O'Connor - The intent is not to put on the national data base rumours of behaviour that may impact. It is about withdrawal of an application, charges and convictions. What sort of information?

Ms ARCHER - None of the detail behind gets revealed. It is the fact that there is a negative notice or a withdrawal. Is that it, Cassy?

Ms O'Connor - Yes.

Ms ARCHER - Excellent. Having answered those questions, I thank members for their contributions. There was one other thing.

Ms O'Connor - Are we in committee?

Ms ARCHER - No we are not. You asked about consultation on the bill?

Ms O'Connor - Yes.

Ms ARCHER - I thought I would run through what we did in relation to consultation. The Department of Health and Human Services, as it was then was known, was consulted. The Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department Police, Fire and Emergency Management and the Department of Premier and Cabinet were consulted for the purposes of the IGA. The NDIS standards have been developed by the NDIS commission in consultation with the states and territories as required by that legislation. The national standards for working with children are based on the work of the royal commission. The commission issued an interim report for feedback and held a round table before issuing the final version in its completed report. You can imagine the multitude of work that the royal commission did, so this work is based on that. There is an enormity of work and submissions that were made to the royal commission.

In relation to this specific bill it was the departmental work that was done there. The royal commission was very public. Any organisation could make their submissions in relation to that work that was being done on the national standards.

I accept your point about needing to be careful of people's civil liberties, as I did at the outset of my summing up. It is always a matter of balance. It is a difficult one when you are dealing with children and vulnerable people, as all members have acknowledged. I know nobody is arguing that point, but it is a balancing act in this instance. When something goes wrong we do not want to be in a position where we could have had a stronger provision. If anything, we always need to err on the side of strong provisions in this area. I think that is quite obvious to members and the public would understand that we first and foremost need to protect our children and the most vulnerable in our community, which this bill aims to do.

Again, thank you to the department - and indeed across all departments - for all of the work that has gone into this bill. It is drawing together a lot of work that has already been done in relation to previous bills and national meetings, which still continue as this work is ongoing. I should also say in relation to consultation that we did consult with the Children's Commissioner recently, who is fully supportive of this. I am glad I remembered to say that because I felt that was important for the protection of children's interests.

I think I addressed briefly the matter of delays. This has been an ongoing process dealing with all states and territories. We have to align with two national agreements, we have to allow for an exchange of information between the two resultant databases and we also have to enable the categorisation of registration for people working with vulnerable adults in the NDIS as well as children. All of the work that has gone around the NDIS and delays in that regard explain why this process has been a fairly long and arduous one, but necessary.

Bill read the second time.

Bill read the third time.

ADJOURNMENT

2019 Tasmanian Volunteering Awards - Franklin Electorate

[7.53 p.m.]

Ms STANDEN (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, having attended the 2019 Tasmanian Volunteering Awards earlier in the week presented at Government House on Monday 20 May 2019 hosted by Her Excellency the Governor, I wanted to particularly acknowledge a few people from my electorate. Before I do so I want to congratulate all of the 220 nominees in 10 categories, with 36 finalists, individuals, couples, organisations that are doing extraordinary work across our community. Without volunteers I am sure our wonderful state would grind to a halt.

The ultimate overall winner of the Volunteer of the Year was Tania Watson from Share the Dignity, an organisation that does some wonderful work. She is the Tasmanian team leader of Share the Dignity, a charity supporting women and girls in Tasmania who are experiencing homelessness, financial hardship and who are survivors of domestic violence, all causes that are very close to my heart. She believes that no woman or girl should go without basic necessities and, in 2018, Tania and her team collected a phenomenal 5657 sanitary items and 3948 filled handbags for its In the Bag campaign. She is a passionate advocate for the cause. I remember being at various Neighbourhood Houses where these bags were being distributed and they were very well received indeed.

Within the category of the Excellence Award for Best Practice in Volunteer Management I was absolutely thrilled to see Di Mason from Melanoma Tasmania. As a melanoma survivor myself, it

was terrific to see them recognised in that category and one other. There was also Lisa Pohl, the animal evacuation centre coordinator at the Huon Valley Council. I went down in the midst of the bushfire crisis and saw the wonderful evacuation centre she established in Huonville and she evacuated that centre housing over 450 animals and about 12 families, managing volunteers and so on. She was so dedicated and organised in that role so it was wonderful to see her work recognised.

Bethany Innes from the Smith Family was also honoured. Although she is not within my electorate - she works in north-west Tasmania - it was wonderful to see her recognised for her volunteering twice a week in learning clubs in the north-west of the state, supporting students using fun, engaging activities to enhance their school experience and develop their literacy and numeracy skills. I know first-hand how wonderful that program is and I wanted to thank her and acknowledge her for that effort.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly for me, it was great to see the wonderful Edna Pennicott of Kingborough Helping Hands Incorporated recognised amongst six finalists in the inaugural Lifetime Achievement Award for people who have given over 25 years of service in their particular area. I have known Edna for some years. She was nominated by Labor Senator Catryna Bilyk, my friend and colleague. Edna Pennicott has volunteered in the Kingborough community for over 40 years. In 2013 she established Kingborough Helping Hands Incorporated to provide charitable assistance to people in need. The main focus for Helping Hands is to provide food, vouchers and household essentials to people experiencing hardship.

I know that last Christmas she distributed some 300 hampers to those in need. Fundraising has enormous focus for her and at Christmas she raises something like \$17 000 at her amazing Christmas fundraiser, which is just something to behold. Week in, week out she holds stalls for fundraising and I know she also contributes to other causes. From something like 7.30 in the morning to 10 at night she is taking phone calls, day in and day out, and as an older Tasmanian she takes this on with the energy of someone much younger and with amazing self-deprecation and humility.

She runs the Kingston Louie's Van, providing food and information to homeless people and others experiencing hardship. She collects gifts and household essentials to give to people at Christmas time and provides support to Jira House and Annie Kenny Young Women's Refuge. I know these are causes close to her heart and to mine.

Edna organises various fundraising events. She motivates and organises an absolute army of volunteers to get things done and I know she would be angry with me for not acknowledging the many, many people who stand with and beside her in her efforts. During her volunteering years Edna amazingly has raised her own two children as a single parent, but also fostered five children full time and has provided part-time and occasional care to many other foster children. She has a much deserved reputation as a community leader who makes a substantial contribution to community life in Kingborough. She is diminutive in size but, my word, she has a heart the size of the Kingborough community. My heartiest thanks and congratulations go to her on this most wonderful award.

Fingal - Convict Cells

[7.59 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Tonight I rise on the adjournment to draw attention to the convict cells at Fingal. They are located beside the Esk River and were built in 1842 and were specifically used as an isolation cell for recalcitrant prisoners.

They were also used as holding cells for prisoners who were being transported back to Port Arthur. Fingal was a 400-convict probation station in 1842 and became a hiring station in 1847. Not many Tasmanians realise that Fingal, named in 1827 by land surveyor Roderick O'Connor, was established as a convict station in 1827. Fingal was one of four convict probation stations built. The other convict stations in the area being built in Avoca, St. Marys and Falmouth.

Convict labour was used to build roads, bridges, buildings and to assist in the development of farmland grants. One hundred convicts from this station constructed the road to Avoca.

In 1839 Lieutenant-Governor John Franklin stepped up the concentration of labour from the probation system building a complex system in Fingal in 1841. From there many convicts were assigned to the barracks at Avoca to build the first bridge over the St Pauls River at Falmouth Barracks to allow access to begin the convict-built St Marys Pass. The bulk of the 532 convicts who worked on St Marys Pass were housed at another cell named Grassy Bottom, two kilometres from St Marys. We know that 10 convicts died on the construction of the pass and it took three years to build between 1843 and 1846.

Each convict on arrival in the colony was sent to a probation gang for a minimum of two years of hard physical work. After this they became a pass holder and they were then able to be hired by settlers. The station consisted of nine cells housing up to 30 convicts and they were divided into three classes.

I thank Annette Johns, a Fingal resident, for drawing my attention to the current condition of the convict cells. The tourism and heritage value of these cells is currently being underutilised. I am advised that a serious investment was made into the site in the late 1980s when the cells were largely rebuilt with the original bricks. I have, therefore, written to the Premier, as the minister for Tourism as well as the minister for Heritage, and I am asking in relation to the stalls and sites that they need to be repaired. A decent investment needs to be made to ensure that the site is kept in good repair.

I would also like to see the strong heritage value of the Fingal Valley further explored as a potential tourism attraction. Also, for the descendants of the convicts who were stationed at these sites, the upkeep of the buildings in the area is important. It is very much part of our history.

Whilst I was visiting the site two cars of tourists pulled up looking for bathrooms and they thought the stalls were restroom facilities. There is no visible signage from the road and as far as I can ascertain there is barely any information to explain the rich historical value of the area and that particular site. I will continue to seek information from the Government in relation to the strong heritage value of the area and hopefully we will be able to get some funding into the repairs of that site. I will report back to the House.

East Devonport Child and Family Centre

[8.03 p.m.]

Mr ROCKLIFF (Braddon - Minister for Education and Training) - Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to talk about the East Devonport Child and Family Centre. Earlier this month I had the pleasure of calling in to what was a very busy and much-loved child and family centre. It was

terrific to meet some of the families, the children and be reacquainted with the Centre Manager, Jenny Mountney, who has been the leader of the CFC since it started a number of years ago.

One of the exciting initiatives to hear about on my visit was the involvement of the East Devonport Child and Family Centre in our Government's new free preschool program. The East Devonport CFC has been partnering with the Devonport Childcare Centre to participate in the pilot of the free preschool program by providing wraparound support for the participating children and their families. This wraparound support empowers families to receive all the benefits from this great program and I heard how it is really appreciated by families. This support is personalised and varied, and includes a range of actions such as transport for children to and from care, food drop-offs, referrals to other services, and assistance with filling out paperwork.

I also heard from staff how this additional support was able to, in some instances, provide parents with a second opportunity to engage in programs with their children who might not otherwise have been able to do so.

Another valued initiative run by the CFC includes a lunchbox service from its licensed kitchen for all children participating each day. This program has seen an enthusiastic take up by families. I am informed it is also very much appreciated.

I also had the chance to see the new space being utilised by specialist consultants to engage with families at the Child and Family Centre. This is a bright and modern space able to be used for a variety of purposes.

My visit to the East Devonport CFC, and they would absolutely welcome you, Madam Speaker, to visit as well if you are there on the north-west coast, has really highlighted to me again what vibrant and lively spaces these are, and how much value the community places on the child and family centres around Tasmania. They do wonderful work.

I am sure members have all visited their local child and family centre. I went to Chigwell a few weeks ago and launched a project there in combination with Libraries Tasmania, which again is another valuable service in terms of the Book Locker: access to books for families, which is a great initiative as well and great collaboration between Libraries Tasmania and our child and family centres.

Thank you to all our child and family centre leaders and all the staff who work there. They do a wonderful service, which has tremendous tripartisan support and may it long continue.

The House adjourned at 8.06 p.m.