



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

REPORT OF DEBATES

Thursday 20 June 2024

REVISED EDITION

Contents

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER.....	1
51 ST SESSION OF TASMANIAN PARLIAMENT PHOTOGRAPH	1
QUESTIONS.....	1
ENERGY SHORTAGE - USE OF GAS TURBINE.....	1
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	2
ENERGY CRISIS - ENERGY IMPORTS AND BACK-UP GENERATION.....	3
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	4
MACQUARIE WHARF UPGRADES - FUNDING ALLOCATION.....	4
HIGHWAYS - ACTION PLANS.....	6
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	8
NUCLEAR POWER - TASMANIAN LIBERAL PARTY'S STANCE	8
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	10
HOBART CENOTAPH - IMPACT FROM MACQUARIE POINT STADIUM	10
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	11
YOUTH JUSTICE - ASHLEY YOUTH DETENTION CENTRE TASKFORCE.....	12
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	13
EDEN WESTBROOK - CORONIAL INQUEST	14
RENEWABLE ENERGY ZONE - ROBBINS ISLAND AND WHALEBACK RIDGE.....	14
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	16
AQUILA CLEAN ENERGY - HYDRO TASMANIA OFFTAKE AGREEMENT	16
STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT REPORT	17
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	18
HEALTH SYSTEM - SPECIALIST WAIT LISTS.....	18
ROBBINS PASSAGE-BOULLANGER BAY - RAMSAR LISTING.....	20
NUCLEAR POWER - TASMANIAN LIBERAL PARTY'S SUPPORT	20
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	21
MAUGEAN SKATE - ANTI-SALMON FARM MARKETING CAMPAIGN	22
AUSTRALIAN ANTARCTIC DIVISION - LOCATION.....	24
CONSTITUENCY QUESTIONS.....	26
METRO BUS SERVICE	26
WASTE MANAGEMENT	26
BUDGET BIDS - JACQUI LAMBIE NETWORK.....	26
LAUNCESTON GENERAL HOSPITAL - WAIT TIMES FOR SPECIALIST SERVICES.....	27
SIDMOUTH GENERAL STORE - IMPACT OF ROADWORKS.....	27
ST PATRICKS RIVER RESERVE CLEAN-UP.....	27
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF WESTBURY FARMLAND	28
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT POLICY ON CHARTER BUS SEATBELTS	28
TABLED PAPERS	28
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - ROYAL HOBART HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT PHASE 2 -REPORT	28
RESIDENTIAL TENANCY AMENDMENT BILL 2024 (NO. 27)	28
FIRST READING.....	28
THE UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA (PROTECTION OF LAND) BILL 2024 (NO. 31).....	29
FIRST READING	29
STATEMENT BY SPEAKER.....	29
PRESENTATION TO THE GOVERNOR OF AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDERS AND ADDRESS-IN-REPLY	29
SITTING DATES	29

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE	29
EMPLOYMENT.....	29
SURVEYORS AMENDMENT BILL 2024 (NO. 12).....	39
TAXATION LEGISLATION (AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT) BILL 2024 (NO. 13)	39
CHILD SAFETY REFORM IMPLEMENTATION MONITOR BILL 2024 (NO. 14).....	39
MOTION	39
CONSIDERATION OF MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.....	39
CHILD SAFETY REFORM IMPLEMENTATION MONITOR BILL 2024 (NO. 14).....	39
IN COMMITTEE	39
HUMAN TISSUE AMENDMENT BILL 2024 (NO. 18).....	40
SECOND READING	40
THIRD READING	53
FORESTRY (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS) BILL 2024 (NO. 20).....	53
SECOND READING	53
IN COMMITTEE	67
ADJOURNMENT.....	81
ANSWERS TO QUESTION - ROBBINS PASSAGE-BOULLANGER BAY - RAMSAR LISTING.....	81
BUSHWALKING - INVESTMENT IN TRACKS.....	82
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - AWARENESS	84
FAMILY VIOLENCE	86
WILLOW COURT COMMUNITY WORKSHOP.....	88
R U OK? DAY	90
VALE MICK LAWRENCE	91
NURSES' WAGES	92
BAULDS ROAD AND TOLLYMORE ROAD - CONCERNS	94
HEALTH SECTOR - ACCESS TO DIAGNOSTIC MAMMOGRAMS AND ANGIOGRAMS.....	94
AUSTRALIAN ENERGY POLICY	95
REGIONAL COMMUNITIES - LEGERWOOD	97

Thursday 20 June 2024

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

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

51st Session of Tasmanian Parliament Photograph

The SPEAKER - Members, before I do the next bit, I ask you to remove your personal folders and items from the desks. That would be why they were so clean when you came in this morning. As you are aware, a Chamber session photo will be taken from the gallery to record the first sitting weeks of the 51st parliament and the restoration of the House to 35 members. This is where you all have to participate. You have to look up at the camera, into the centre of the black square in the gallery, hold for approximately 10 photos and keep holding until we tell you that the photography is completed. You are all politicians, you are all good at doing this, so let us get it done as efficiently and effectively as possible. If you cannot see them, they cannot see you. Best faces, everyone, and the same in the gallery. Looking up. There we go.

Thank you, members. We will now allow the Legislative Council members to enter. You can all blink for a little while to get your sight back and I will give you a few moments to get your belongings back onto the table. On another note, I know how silent you can all be, expectations are high.

QUESTIONS

Energy Shortage - Use of Gas Turbine

Mr WINTER question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.04 a.m.]

Despite having the best wind resource in the country, you have made Tasmania the hardest place to build a wind farm. This might be music to the ears of your Jacqui Lambie Network coalition partners, but it has cost Tasmania several major hydrogen projects after proponents were told there was no power available at any price. It also has also meant that at least a dozen major Tasmanian businesses have been told that their investments cannot proceed until new energy projects are built. Tasmania's shortage of power is damaging our economy and costing the state thousands of safe, secure, well-paid jobs.

Can you confirm the energy shortage is now so dire that Hydro Tasmania has been forced to fire up its larger combined-cycle gas turbine for the first time since 2019?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for this question, noting further attacks on the crossbench and noting the member does not like stability in the parliament, and thrives on division, as evidenced yesterday. The parliament works best collectively, working through difficult issues on behalf of Tasmanians in the interest of stability. We will always work in the

best interests of the Tasmanian people in this place and elsewhere. The member does not like stability and certainty, and thrives on division. We will have none of that. Parliament has worked collaboratively over the last four weeks of parliament, and may continue to do so.

It will certainly continue when it comes to those on this side of the House dealing with complex issues, including about energy security. Tasmania has world-class water and wind resources, natural deep-water ports, and skilled and knowledgeable people in the renewable energy workforce, of which we will build its capability as a key commitment in our 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future. We have positioned ourselves well when it comes to delivering affordable, reliable, clean energy for decades to come.

I know the Labor Party was very disappointed a few days ago when we did not see those big power price increases. Instead, it was some 0.5 per cent, or \$5, over the course of 12 months on a bill. You must have been very disappointed in that. The lowest in Australia, still maintaining our lowest regulated power prices in Australia -

Mr Winter - They are not the lowest.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I know it disappoints you, and you try to spin your way into misery, as usual. I am happy to refer to our very capable minister for Energy on some of the detail.

The Labor Party has very scant detail when it comes to the Tasmanian power company. The irony, when you speak of Hydro, is that you are going to gut Hydro completely. That is why the unions turned against you mid-campaign and that is why you backflipped within less than 24 hours.

The SPEAKER - The Premier's time has expired.

Supplementary Question

Mr WINTER - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - There is a not entirely unexpected supplementary from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr WINTER - I will repeat the question which was not answered by the Premier. Can you confirm that the energy storage is now so dire that Hydro Tasmania has been forced to fire up its larger combined-cycle gas turbine for the first time since 2019? Does this not prove what the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (TCCI) has been saying, that we are in an energy crisis?

The SPEAKER - Supplementary questions are allowed if the original question was not answered. I draw the Premier to the question.

Mr ROCKLIFF - My information is that, yes, it is on at the moment for commercial reasons and we are managing very low rainfall. Do you not want us to have options? We have had record low -

Mr Winter - You tried to scrap it.

Mr ROCKLIFF - rainfall and dry weather - the fifth lowest rainfall on record, I am advised, and we are using options to manage storage levels, which is the prudent thing to do. The energy security response framework implemented by our government is working effectively. You can go and scare people as much as you like. That is what you do, thrive on scare tactics and division - not working for you, I hasten to add -

The SPEAKER - The Premier's time has expired.

Energy Crisis - Energy Imports and Back-up Generation

Mr WINTER question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.10 a.m.]

It was the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry that called this an energy crisis. Premier, over the past eight months Tasmania has imported an average of 183 gigawatt hours of energy, more than it has exported over Basslink. That means that more than a fifth of the state's total power consumption has come from the mainland. On top of that, you are now burning through enough gas to supply a further 10 per cent of Tasmania's power. Is the reason Tasmania is importing so much power and has fired up the combined-cycle gas turbine at Bell Bay because Hydro dam levels have fallen to their lowest levels in more than six years? If relying on imported power, firing up gas plants and worrying low dam levels is not an energy crisis, then what is?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker I thank the member for his question. It highlights the fact that the system is working. I am not sure what you expect me to do about low rainfall. You might be closer to the Lord than I am but I only have so much influence. I am Premier but I cannot make it rain. I am sorry about that.

Members interjecting.

Ms Finlay - They cannot build a windfarm, that is the problem.

The SPEAKER - The member for Bass, Ms Finlay, will be silent. Yelling across the Chamber at other members is not appropriate.

Mr ROCKLIFF - As much as we would like to control the weather and the low rainfall and make it rain, we cannot, but we do have options available because of the investments we have made. The member would obviously like us to turn the lights out - is that right? - but we are not going to do that. We are going to ensure that we continue to invest, releasing the shackles off Hydro Tasmania. I hasten to add, not gut it like you did or were planning to do.

Mr O'Byrne - Bring back Groomy. He will sort it.

The SPEAKER - Mr O'Byrne is not exempt from my notice.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I trust Hydro's expertise to manage storage and to trade over Basslink to achieve the best outcomes for Tasmania, and I would certainly trust Hydro over you every

single day, Mr Winter. If your name is Winter, you might want to make it rain as well, but it has been very dry over the last few months. I cannot make it rain.

Mr Shelton - Some of that power might have been at a negative cost to us.

The SPEAKER - Thank you, Mr Shelton; you are also not outside of my notice.

Mr ROCKLIFF - These are commercial decisions, managing our way through difficult circumstances in terms of low rainfall. I trust Hydro to manage these circumstances far better than I would trust you, Mr Winter.

Supplementary Question

Mr WINTER - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - I will hear the supplementary. Thank you, members on my right; he is allowed to ask a supplementary.

Mr WINTER - Does the Premier acknowledge that the gas turbine has been turned on because he has made Tasmania the hardest place in Australia to build a new wind farm?

The SPEAKER - I am going to rule that one out because it was related to the first question, not your second one.

Macquarie Wharf Upgrades - Funding Allocation

Ms BURNET question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.14 a.m.]

Premier, your obstinate pursuit of a billion-dollar Macquarie Point stadium at the expense of critical infrastructure upgrades at the Port of Hobart is already having real consequences. *The Australian* has reported that Western Australia wants to see the RSV *Nuyina* and the entire Australian Antarctic program relocated to Fremantle. This would be a disaster for the Tasmanian economy and for many hundreds of local jobs across many industries and it is a threat that is now more real than ever, thanks to the approach your government is taking. Your government was awarded \$240 million by the federal government for the Macquarie Point precinct, including Wharf 6. Is it the case that you have not allocated a single cent of this \$240 million to this essential port upgrade and instead plan to blow it all on a stadium at Macquarie Point that we do not need?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for her question. I reject the premise of the question. I am perplexed at the fact that the Greens come in here - and to a certain extent Labor as well, in the last week - not standing up for Tasmania. Backing in the federal Labor government is extraordinary, so I reject the premise of your question. We on this side of the House will always stand up for Tasmania and Tasmanians and we expect the Australian Government to remain committed to Hobart as the Antarctic gateway and invest accordingly.

That is our expectation and we will continue to be very vigorous in our pursuit of the Labor federal government and Ms Plibersek, the minister, to keep their word.

Dr Woodruff - How much of the \$240 million are you spending on the wharf?

The SPEAKER - Leader of the Greens.

Mr ROCKLIFF - We will not sit idly by and let the federal Labor government and the minister threaten Tasmanians and Tasmania.

I am aware of the most recent media reporting in relation to this particular matter and it only strengthens my resolve to keep federal Labor to its word about the Antarctic gateway and Hobart's place in that, which should be secure. It so happens that I will be meeting with Minister Plibersek in coming days and this will be a key -

Mr Winter You are intervening?

The SPEAKER - The Premier is answering a question from the member for Clark. Please allow her to hear it.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Thank you, Speaker. I look forward to meeting the federal Labor minister. There are a number of things we could talk about, which you are remarkably silent on. You are silent on MMG, silent on sticking up for salmon jobs on the west coast -

Ms Finlay - Silence on sticking up for salmon jobs? You have got to be joking.

The SPEAKER - Member for Bass, do not be the first person who is warned.

Mr ROCKLIFF - and silence when it comes to supporting Robbins Island wind farm and the federal Labor government -

Ms BURNET - Point of order.

The SPEAKER - Premier, there is a point of order I will hear from the member for Clarke.

Ms BURNET - Point of order, Standing Order 45. The Premier is not answering the question.

The SPEAKER - I will draw the Premier to the question.

Dr Woodruff - How much have you allocated of the \$240 million?

The SPEAKER - I am sure the Premier remembers the question on the allocation of funding, thank you, Leader of the Greens.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I rejected the premise of the question, incidentally. In reference to other important infrastructure, what is needed from the federal Labor government, member for Clark, is serious, sustained, long-term Antarctic science research and infrastructure funding.

The SPEAKER - Time has expired, Premier.

Supplementary Question

Ms BURNET - A supplementary, Speakear.

The SPEAKER - I will hear the supplementary question.

Ms BURNET - Honourable Speaker, I do not think the question was answered at all in relation to how much of the \$240 million is going to be allocated to the essential port upgrade.

The SPEAKER - The answer the Premier gave has some latittide due to the introduction that you provided in your first question, but the supplementary stands as the actual question on port upgrade costs and assignment of funding. Premier?

Opposition members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - The Premier is going to answer the question. Thank you very much, members on my left.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the supplementary question. TasPorts is investing in Berths 4 and 5, and as you would expect. TasPorts are working with the federal Labor government to deliver Berth 6 on reasonable commercial terms. That is in Tasmania's best interest, and you would expect us as a state government to stand up for Tasmania and Tasmanians. I am perplexed, frankly, at why the local mayor, the Greens, and Labor would prefer to stick up for a federal Labor government at the expense of the Tasmanian people.

Dr Woodruff - Do you want to be the premier under whom the Antarctic gateway goes to Western Australia?

The SPEAKER - Leader of the Greens, you are routinely distressed if people interject while you are speaking. I call the Independent member for Franklin.

Highways - Action Plans

Mr O'BYRNE question to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE, Mr FERGUSON

[10.20 a.m.]

When it comes to roads, the Liberal government has hung its hat on the ambitious Midland Highway 10 Year Action Plan: a plan that I developed, consulted on, and announced with the then federal infrastructure minister, Anthony Albanese, back in 2013 when I was infrastructure minister. You are welcome, minister. In the 10 years since the plan was announced -

Mr Ferguson - What about the Bridgewater bridge?

Mr Abetz - Even Stalin would be embarrassed about that highway.

Mr O'BYRNE - Let us not get Cold War warriors out of the cupboard, shall we?

In the 10 years since the plan was announced, you failed to develop fully scoped, fully costed and fully funded 10-year action plans for the rest of Tasmania's critically important highways. You have only started developing a plan for the Tasman Highway between Sorell and Launceston. When will these 10-year plans be finalised? Will they be fully funded? Will you continue to deliberately under-spend on roads to make sure you have a hollow log full of cash to prop up the budget?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, how much fun will you allow me to have with this question? I am amazed at the question from the member. I like working with the honourable member for Franklin, Mr O'Byrne, and I appreciate what he brings to the House. However, on that question, I am very surprised that the member would bring up the Midland Highway 10 Year Action Plan in a negative way. It is saving lives today, and we will save more lives. In fact, at the 2021 election we pledged 10-year action plans for a whole range of highways around Tasmania, and I thank you, Mr O'Byrne, for raising the Tasman Highway.

In case you are not aware, consultation on that 10-year action plan, from Sorell to Launceston - the full circuit, if I can put it that way, via the east coast, near St Helens, right through the north east to Scottsdale and back to Launceston - has been publicly consulted in recent months. The department has undertaken workshops in our different regional communities, inviting people to come to the pop-up sessions, and online, using Social Pinpoint to encourage people to look at the map of their area of interest, type in their own comments, and upvote and downvote other people's comments. This is to try to get as much engagement as possible from everyday Tasmanians, not just those with industry expertise in highway management and design. I have been pushing that hard.

I also let the House know that we are applying the same approaches on the Huon, on the Channel, and on the east and west Tamar highways, to find long-term strategies - and I do not mean four years, I do not mean 10 years; I mean 30-year strategies - so that future governments, future ministers for infrastructure can have an informed basis for the investment decisions that will continue to save lives.

I will have another look at the *Hansard* later and review your own claims on the Midland Highway, Mr O'Byrne. I will review those matters. One thing we will be able to agree on is how good it is that there are only 10 kilometres to go next construction season north of Campbell Town. Every Tasmanian should be proud of what the men and women of our civil contracting community have done for us in partnership with the Tasmanian government and the Australian government. It has been a massive investment, saving lives with a strategy.

Mr O'Byrne, if you wish, I will share credit with you if that is the truth. We are virtually eliminating, through these partnerships, the chance of head-on collisions, which have been one of the terrible curses of the Midland Highway for a Tasmanian growing up here.

We will have more to say on these other strategies, but I thank the member for his question.

The SPEAKER - The member's time has expired.

Supplementary Question

Ms O'BYRNE - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - I will hear the supplementary.

Mr O'BYRNE - Can the minister confirm that he is yet to land one 10-year strategy on any major road in Tasmania since his government inherited the previous government's 10-year plan on the Midland Highway?

The SPEAKER - I will allow the supplementary because the original question was around the additional plans for other roads.

Mr FERGUSON - I can confirm that we have delivered exactly what the member asks me about in respect of the Bass Highway. I hope that you will hear me, and I hope that you will not repeat the allegation again that somehow these are not serious pieces of work. I remember launching that 10-year strategy at the time with the then mayor of Waratah-Wynyard Council, Robbie Walsh. We will continue our work.

I appreciate your interest in the subject, Mr O'Byrne. I do respect the good things that you did in the portfolio when you occupied the role that I currently hold. Is it not good, colleagues, to see the Bridgewater bridge coming up out of that river, delivering for Tasmanians? I invite you, Mr O'Byrne, to drive over the Derwent River, come north sometime and see the good things that are happening on our roads.

Nuclear Power - Tasmanian Liberal Party's Stance

Mr WINTER question to MINISTER for BUSINESS, INDUSTRY and RESOURCES, Mr ABETZ

[10.25 a.m.]

However much your junior partners in the Liberal-Lambie experiment might not like it, the only solution to Tasmania's energy crisis is building new generation. Right now, there is \$25 billion waiting to be invested in Tasmania and the exciting new energy projects that will create thousands of safe, secure, well-paid jobs in Tasmania across business and industry but they will only happen if we have the state and national policy settings right.

Locally, you have already made Tasmania one of the hardest places to build a wind farm. Nationally, Peter Dutton's new policy to scrap the roll-out of renewables and instead build a series of taxpayer-funded nuclear plants starting in 2035 is an appalling policy. Do you agree that Peter Dutton's policy would jeopardise \$25 billion worth of investment in renewable energy in Tasmania and thousands of safe, secure, well-paid jobs?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question because it allows us to put to this place and to the public the very clear policies that we have on this side to ensure that we have good, clean, reliable energy for Tasmania.

In relation to the previous question that he asked the Premier -

Mr Winter - What about this question?

Mr ABETZ - Just be silent and you will hear. In relation to the previous question to the Premier - and by implication to me - about the so-called energy crisis to which you refer, there is the gas station. I wonder who built that? It was Labor. Why was it built? For the very eventuality of a drier period where we could not fully rely on high-grade sources.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - If members on my left wish to make a point of order, they may.

Mr ABETZ - It makes very good sense, and when we use a Labor initiative to overcome the problem we currently face, the Labor members who initiated that program now condemn us.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Order, members on my left.

Mr ABETZ - They then ask the Tasmanian people to take them seriously, that somehow, they have a plan to overcome the situation. Do you know what? Your forebears had a plan. They delivered it and we are using it for the benefit of the people of Tasmania. You should be recognising your forebears who had the good sense to help develop the Hydro Electric Commission, which is why I am here in Tasmania -

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Leader of the Opposition, if you wish to raise a point of order, do so, but cease interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - My father came over from the other side of the world to help build our hydro dams and the energy system.

Mr WINTER - Honourable Speaker, point of order. I am very concerned that the minister is not going to answer the question. The question is around does he agree with Peter Dutton's policy and does he agree that it would ruin \$25 billion worth of renewable energy development in Tasmania?

The SPEAKER - I will draw the minister to that part of the question so that we do not have to have a supplementary on an unanswered part of a question. Thank you.

Mr ABETZ - The Leader of the Opposition has a 55-second preamble to his question and expects no comment on that, then takes on a five-second question, seeking only an answer to that.

In relation to Mr Dutton's policy, in Tasmania we have been blessed with hydro power and what your forebears did, which you are now seeking to deny with gas and other support, and the Basslink, that we are able to sustain our energy needs. Given the dry nature of our

weather at the moment, we are importing coal-fired energy. The question that Australians should be asking is, would it be better to have nuclear energy rather than coal?

The SPEAKER - Your time has expired for answering the question.

Supplementary Question

Mr WINTER - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - I will hear the supplementary.

Mr WINTER - In relation to the answer from the minister, will the minister stand up to Peter Dutton and denounce the nuclear energy policy which threatens \$25 billion worth of renewable energy projects here in Tasmania?

The SPEAKER - I apologise, I am not going to accept the supplementary. The original question was around whether the minister agreed with it. Whilst that would have been an appropriate supplementary, that is not the supplementary you asked. I will call the next question.

Hobart Cenotaph - Impact from Macquarie Point Stadium

Mr BAYLEY question to MINISTER for VETERANS' AFFAIRS, Mr BARNETT

[10.30 a.m.]

Last week, at the explicit request of the RSL and its sub-branches, we announced we will develop legislation to protect the Hobart Cenotaph from the impacts of your stadium. At 99 years, the Cenotaph is Australia's oldest war memorial, with the site chosen specifically because of its prominent location and view fields across the city and down the Derwent. It is now on Tasmania's heritage list, in part because of these sightlines. The size, bulk and height of your stadium will destroy these sightlines.

Last Friday, the RSL CEO said:

I think the Tasmanian government may have underestimated the ferocity with which we would fight for what we believe is right. Sometimes it is difficult to be brave. Sometimes it is hard to stand against the wind.

Your shallow dismissal of the announcement was to retort that it was about the Greens' opposition to 'growth, development and progress'. This dismisses and politicises the concerns of the RSL. Will you commit to sitting down and respectfully hearing their commitment to the Cenotaph and fears for its special values?

The SPEAKER - The time for the question has expired.

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for his question and providing the opportunity to respond to the question. It is in two parts, because you have referred to the views of the Greens and the views of the RSL.

With respect to the views of the Greens, you are opposed to Macquarie Point. You have been since day one. You have been consistent. You oppose growth, development, jobs and progress -

Mr Bayley - You politicised their request to you, minister.

The SPEAKER - Thank you, you have asked the question.

Mr BARNETT - You have asked the question, I am responding. That is the first thing I would say: you are wanting to kill that project and you will do anything you can to make that happen.

However, on this side of the House, we respect RSL Tasmania. I have an ongoing working relationship with RSL Tasmania and the 17,500 veterans. There is nothing I enjoy more than standing up and advocating for their interests, and that is ongoing.

The Cenotaph is something that should be respected and commemorated. We are committed to ensuring that occurs on this side of the House and, I hope, across the Chamber. We are committed to a transparent process. There needs to be consultation. At every stage we want to ensure that not just RSL Tasmania but the Vietnam veterans association, Soldiers Memorial Walk and the 17,500 veterans across the state will be consulted on our plans.

It has to go through due process. Those concept plans will be released, I am advised, in coming weeks, in the not-too-distant future. That is encouraging. That is an appropriate process and I expect full consultation, full engagement with the RSL and other veterans in that regard. I am looking forward to ongoing consultation with the RSL and other veterans to ensure their interests are protected. This is important. The Premier and I met with the RSL at the Cenotaph last year, and that relationship is, of course, ongoing. I appreciate the opportunity to hear your concerns and also the concerns expressed by John Hardy and RSL Tasmania. They are taken very seriously and I will continue to take those concerns seriously and ensure that there is ongoing consultation and engagement, particularly when the concept plans are released.

I am looking forward to RSL Tasmania's state congress this weekend at Orford, to being with my colleagues and friends in the veteran community on Saturday night and Sunday.

The SPEAKER - Minister, the time for answering has expired.

Supplementary Question

Mr BAYLEY - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - I will hear a supplementary.

Mr BAYLEY - Honourable Speaker, the minister said the RSL will be consulted going forward. The logical question that flows from that is what are you prepared to change about your stadium in terms of the size, bulk, 23,000 seats and roof? Are you prepared to change the stadium to accommodate the views of the RSL and protect the Cenotaph? This flows directly from your answer.

The SPEAKER - You do not need to make an argument around the question. The supplementary is in order, as it arises from part of the answer given by the minister. I will call the minister for a brief answer.

Mr BARNETT - Thank you for the supplementary question. I expect ongoing consultation and engagement with our veteran community, specifically with RSL Tasmania. The Premier and I have made it clear that consultation has occurred and will continue to occur. I am determined to ensure that when those concept plans are released, there is consultation and engagement.

We have one of the best architects in the world leading this process with our plans for Macquarie Point and the precinct. It is very exciting. I would like to see real opportunities to take on board the veteran community's concerns, and to ensure that occurs. We are absolutely committed to that and I am looking forward to further engagement and consultation.

Youth Justice - Ashley Youth Detention Centre Taskforce

Ms JOHNSTON question to MINISTER for CHILDREN and YOUTH, Mr JAENSCH

[10.36 a.m.]

In light of the unopposed passage through the other place of a motion seeking the establishment of a multidisciplinary taskforce to work to remove children on remand from the Ashley Youth Detention Centre, will the minister now act to establish that multidisciplinary taskforce, as is urgently called for by a coalition of community sector and civil society organisations, including the Tasmanian Council of Social Service (TasCOSS) in a media release this morning, and others, by the Children's Commissioner and now the Legislative Council?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for her question, and her concern and interest. I note that across this parliament, in both Houses, and the sector that works with young people and our youth justice sector, that there is acute interest and awareness in the need to reduce the number of young people in detention immediately and in the longer term. That is what our Youth Justice Reform Blueprint is all about. As we put that in place, we need to actively work to reduce the number of young people in detention who do not need to be there.

With the motion in the other place yesterday, there was reference to the number of young people in Ashley recently, which peaked at around 26, which is a very high number for that facility historically and a concern for many. I am pleased to report to the House today that less than a month later, that number has halved. Today there are 13 young people in Ashley Youth Detention Centre, five of whom are sentenced and eight of whom are on remand.

What has enabled the other 13 people to be able to be moved out of detention is that some have concluded their sentence; some have had their court appointments and their sentencing has been confirmed to be supervision in the community, rather than detention; and some have been supported and successful in applying for bail, thanks to some of the community support services.

We met with TasCOSS only a few days ago. We agreed that we need to continue to work through the individual needs of the young people who remain on remand, and who are entering remand every day, to ensure that we are exhausting all opportunities to support them to apply for bail, to put supports around them that enable them to see out their period on bail awaiting the termination of their court process in the community with the supports they need. The work we have done so far has been successful in this area. We are intensifying it, but we realise that a highly individual case-by-case assessment is needed. No two young people have the same story or the same needs.

Sitting at the table with a range of service providers the other day, we agreed that none of our community service provider organisations are in a position to be a detention facility. We are talking about the smaller number of young people on remand who, with their legal teams and families, choose to apply for bail. We need to assess their individual needs and where we can match that with capability in the sector, we will do that. We have committed to working closely with the sector to do that, acknowledging that we are not going to be able to get all possible service providers around the table for every single case.

The SPEAKER - The minister's time for answering has expired.

Supplementary Question

Ms JOHNSTON - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - I will hear the supplementary.

Ms JOHNSTON - The minister has not actually answered the question. A simple yes or no will suffice: Will you establish the multidisciplinary task force called for by the other place and community organisations?

The SPEAKER - That is an appropriate supplementary, as it was the actual question, so could the minister turn his attention to it and answer it, please.

Mr JAENSCH - As we discussed with TasCOSS and organisations that they represent the other day, we are effectively delivering just that right now, by having people involved in the individual case management of young people to determine their needs and then interact with the sector to identify which service providers can provide elements of the supports that they need.

Ms Johnston - A long-winded 'no'.

Eden Westbrook - Coronial Inquest

Mr JENNER question to ATTORNEY-GENERAL, Mr BARNETT

[10.41 a.m.]

Attorney-General, are you aware of the *Under Investigation* story that aired on Tuesday 18 June relating to the tragic death of 15-year-old Eden Westbrook in 2015 in St Helens? Would you consider doing what the previous Attorney-General did in the Jari Wise case in directing that an inquest be held pursuant to section 24(1)(g) of the Tasmanian *Coroners Act*, given the requests and applications to date by the Westbrook family have been consistently refused?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for his question, and immediately respond and say what a tragic outcome. My heart goes out to the Westbrook family very sincerely.

It is a devastating matter and the subject of a coronial investigation. The coronial findings were made public. The coronial report included the circumstances leading up to Ms Westbrook's death and referred to the competency of the police investigation. The coronial investigation was conducted by St Helens Police and provided to the coroner - that is the advice I have. Obviously, anyone who would have information that has not been provided, they should contact St Helens Police on 131 444.

With respect to the other part of the question, I would like to take that on notice and get back to the member, as I take these matters very seriously.

The SPEAKER - I will note that that question has been taken on notice.

Renewable Energy Zone - Robbins Island and Whaleback Ridge

Ms FINLAY question to MINISTER for ENERGY and RENEWABLES, Mr DUIGAN

[10.43 a.m.]

On your watch, Tasmania is not generating enough power to keep the lights on, let alone enable our economy to grow, and that is down to your complete failure to get any new energy projects off the ground. At the recent election, you promised to introduce legislation for a renewable energy zone in the first 100 days. Not only have you broken that promise, but the draft zone you have released does not even cover Tasmania's two most important proposals: Robbins Island and Whaleback Ridge. When questioned about this glaring omission, you said they were left out 'to ensure new renewable generation is built in the right place'. Do you believe, like your Lambie coalition partners, that Robbins Island and Whaleback Ridge are in the wrong place, or will you withdraw and revise your already flawed and delayed renewable energy zone?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for her question and her interest in this very important matter. Bringing more on-island renewable generation to Tasmania is a key plank of

this government. We have committed strongly to delivering just that very outcome. We have a legislated, world-leading renewable energy target of 200 per cent of our 2020 generation level by 2040. This is a globally significant target and we are committed to that.

I have spoken previously about our renewable energies pathway legislation that will come to this place in the coming weeks and that will provide a more streamlined pathway for proponents to find and deliver their projects and navigate their way through the various approvals pathways that are in front of us all here. This is an important question for us all. We each in this place have a responsibility to have Tasmania grasp the opportunity that is before us in the shape of renewable energy. I would look squarely at the Greens in this space because this is our once-in-a-lifetime opportunity and we must grasp it. I thank you for your interest in this and look forward to working with you to deliver this -

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Minister, I will just stop the clock for a second. I apologise for interrupting you as you are attempting to answer the question, but member for Lyons, Mr Shelton and Minister Ellis, if you have very loud conversations, not only can we not hear the minister, but Hansard cannot either. Please respect the minister in giving his answer.

Mr DUIGAN - Thanks, honourable Speaker. To the point about renewable energy zones, they are -

Mr Winter - Hard to find. They are pretty small.

The SPEAKER - Leader of the Opposition, that applies to you as well.

Mr DUIGAN - an important tool. They are something that is being used in other parts of the world and other parts of the country. I note, Ms Finlay, that you had a reaction to it on the radio, that you disagreed with it on a gut feel, but I would like to give you some context about what it actually is.

Ms Finlay - Not including Whaleback Ridge and Robbins Island seems like a pretty dud deal to me.

The SPEAKER - Member for Bass, you have asked your question and you have other opportunities to use the forms of the House.

Mr DUIGAN - A renewable energy zone is an area that is a good place to build renewables. It is an area that has less contested land use. A plantation forestry area, for example, is a good place to put up renewable energy. It is a place that has good resources and easy and cheap effective connection to the network. That is important. The legislation will give us the opportunity to derogate from the national electricity rules and find a way to allow the proponents to bear the cost of building what is needed in terms of infrastructure to connect to the network. It will not be hanging from the power bills of mums and dads in Tasmania and that is super important. Our Renewable Energy Zone (REZ) legislation will be out for draft consultation -

The SPEAKER - Unfortunately the minister's time to answer has expired.

Supplementary Question

Ms FINLAY - Honourable Speaker, a supplementary question.

The SPEAKER - I will hear a supplementary.

Ms FINLAY - Notice of question, honourable Speaker.

The SPEAKER - To whom? A new question? In that case, I will call the member for the Greens.

Ms FINLAY - I just need the time before he goes upstairs.

The SPEAKER - I do apologise. Would the member be happy to give the call to Ms Finlay? I will take the question.

Ms FINLAY - Thank you. I appreciate that, member for Clark.

Aquila Clean Energy - Hydro Tasmania Offtake Agreement

Ms FINLAY question to MINISTER for ENERGY and RENEWABLES, Mr DUIGAN

[10.48 a.m.]

Aquila Clean Energy has stated it can build its Port Latta wind farm, also outside the REZ, to get that project moving if Hydro Tasmania enters into an offtake agreement with them. Given the energy crisis we are in, will you direct Hydro to enter into such an agreement and finally get this project started, at least one project started, or are you going to keep importing energy, burning gas, turning away businesses seeking additional power and let thousands of new, well-paid jobs disappear?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the question. I am very well aware of the Aquila Port Latta wind farm and you would be aware that throughout the election campaign, the Rockliff Liberal government has taken the Hydro Tasmania charter and put a line through that, and that is another one of our 100-day commitments. We will be rewriting the Hydro Tasmania charter under our 2030 Strong Plan to look at how we go about delivering more renewable energy for Tasmania and how we make these things happen.

You will notice that we will be returning Hydro to some of its foundation principles, and that will revolve around delivering affordable power prices to Tasmanians. I reflect on the Office of the Tasmanian Economic Regulator's recent announcement that power prices for residential customers in Tasmania will rise by half of one per cent for next year. Half of one per cent equates to around \$5, or potentially \$10 for large power users.

It is important to reflect on what a good job this government has done over the past 10 years. I know you like to cherry-pick this -

Members interjecting.

Dr BROAD - Point of order, Standing Order 45, relevance. The minister is clearly not answering the question. He has not mentioned offtake agreements. Can you get to the substance of the question please?

The SPEAKER - I will draw the minister to the question and ask him not to invite interjections.

Mr DUIGAN - Over the past 10 years, in real terms power prices in Tasmania have risen 16 per cent. In nominal terms, adjusted for inflation, they have gone down by 14 per cent.

Mr Winter - You have that the wrong way around, I think.

Mr DUIGAN - This government has done an excellent job.

Ms FINLAY - Point of order, Standing Order 45. The question is not about power prices. It is about you directing Hydro to enter into an offtake agreement with Aquila.

The SPEAKER - Member, you cannot argue the point, but I will draw the minister to the question, otherwise he will get a supplementary that he will be asked to answer.

Mr DUIGAN - As I mentioned, we are rewriting the Hydro Tasmania charter, and that will set out our government's expectations for Hydro Tasmania and its role in bringing forward more generation in Tasmania. Will Hydro be directed to do something that is potentially not commercial - that is not what we are seeking to do. I have great hope and aspiration for the Port Latta windfarm, but these projects need to be commercial. We expect Hydro to act in the best interests of all Tasmanians.

State of the Environment Report

Mr BAYLEY question to MINISTER for HOUSING and PLANNING, Mr ELLIS

[10.51 a.m.]

The State of the Environment report is already a decade overdue. Despite being legally required every five years, your government failed to commission the report on the state's environmental health until forced to by political and legal pressure. The latest delay, announced yesterday, is a symptom of chronic under-resourcing by this government and a fundamental disregard of your environmental responsibilities.

The act says that you can hold off public release of this report for 15 sitting days before tabling it. This could mean Tasmanians would not see the report until the end of the year. Given your past form, including the months-long delay to release the Murrihy report, this is what we fear you will do.

This latest delay comes on top of a decade-long wait. Will you commit to tabling the State of the Environment Report on the first sitting day after you receive it, and will you commit to adequately funding the management actions that it recommends in this year's budget?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, The Tasmanian government's 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future outlines our commitment to protecting our state's much-loved natural environment. The State of the Environment Report is an important means of documenting baseline environmental data, trends and risks across Tasmania.

The Tasmanian government had originally tasked the Tasmanian Planning Commission with producing a new State of the Environment Report by June 2024. The commission, which is independent, has requested an extension of time to undertake quality assurance processes and to finalise the report.

I have issued the Tasmanian Planning Commission with a new direction under section 7 of the *Tasmanian Planning Commission Act* to produce a new State of the Environment Report by the end of August 2024 - a modest delay. It remains important that the State of the Environment Report be produced by an independent body at arm's length from government and that pre-eminent independent body is the commission. Ultimately, we will consider their findings and work through any recommendations.

Supplementary Question

Mr BAYLEY - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - I will hear the supplementary question.

Mr BAYLEY - The minister just told us everything we already knew because it was in his media release. The question was very clearly: do you commit to releasing it on the first sitting day after you receive it so we can see it before the budget?

The SPEAKER - You do not need to make the argument for the supplementary. The supplementary holds because it was the original question. I will draw the minister to the actual question.

Mr ELLIS - I am glad that the Greens read my media release, but ultimately, we will consider the findings and then we will release them in due course.

Health System - Specialist Wait Lists

Mrs PENTLAND question to MINISTER for HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH and WELLBEING, Mr BARNETT

[10.54 a.m.]

We are becoming a state where only the wealthy can keep healthy. We have over 60,000 people on a wait list to see a specialist in Tasmania. That is over 10 per cent of the state's population.

Wealthy people are taking medicine into their own hands and taking themselves to the mainland for treatment. The Tasmanian health system is failing Tasmanians with no clinical

pathways. If we cannot treat people in Tasmania, should we not be getting them to the mainland for treatment? Tasmanians are on specialist lists way too long. How are you going to fix this?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the honourable member for her question and her special interest in this space. That is acknowledged and appreciated. It is important for all of us to get better healthcare outcomes for all Tasmanians, and that is why we are delivering record funding over the forward Estimates: \$12 billion, or \$8.3 million a day.

Obviously, part of your question goes to those getting the surgeries they need. That is why I am pleased to have been backed in by the now Premier and former minister, who announced \$196 million extra funding to support elective surgeries over a four-year period. We have now seen, since COVID, a 30 per cent reduction in that wait list. That is very encouraging, but there is more to do.

We have delivered more elective surgeries than ever before: 21,300 in that last financial year. I am advised that we are going close to that number for this financial year. I acknowledge, as I often do, our awesome and dedicated healthcare workers who deliver on that. I acknowledge them again today.

With regard to the pressures, I have made it very clear, as all my state Labor health ministers did last Friday, that there are a lot of pressures that have been building up, and that is as a result of being let down by the federal Labor Government, particularly in this space of funding and support for primary health care.

You talked about prevention in your question and the importance of being healthier. Primary health care is the key - access to a GP, Medicare. Why is it that we have the lowest Medicare bulk bill rates in Australia?

This is an issue for all of us. Everyone in this Parliament should be of one accord - Team Tasmania - to send a message to Canberra that they need to do more when it comes to primary healthcare. We have been stepping up with regard to supporting GP practices that are delivering that primary healthcare - at St Mary's, Bridgewater, Glenorchy, Lauderdale and East Devonport. We have been stepping in and stepping up, but that is because the federal Labor government has failed.

I would like to see the federal government stepping up. I will have ongoing engagement with the federal health minister. You are spot on when you talk about the importance of prevention and building better healthcare services. That is what we are about: delivering record funding and better healthcare services, and that is exactly what we want to deliver to all Tasmanians.

I am very happy to have an ongoing engagement with the honourable member about these important matters because they are very important to me and this government.

The SPEAKER - The minister's time has expired.

Robbins Passage-Boullanger Bay - Ramsar Listing

Mr GARLAND question to MINISTER for HOUSING and PLANNING, Mr ELLIS

[10.58 a.m.]

You recently outlined that we anticipate there are likely to be ongoing conversations about the issue with the Ramsar nomination for Robbin's Passage-Boullanger Bay, and we remain open to these discussions, also acknowledging the work of Cradle Coast NRM to date.

When it came to the crunch, Liberal members chose not to support Cradle Coast NRM to begin the Ramsar nomination. You acknowledge their work yet stopped them from working. A supporter of jobs would take the chance to secure potential funding for the north-west region. You remain open to discussions yet ignore their request.

Members have recently talked about the need for there to be more consultation, but what needs to happen before consultation is consent by the landowner, the state government. That is the first step. The consultation is a major part of the nomination. What Cradle Coast NRM is asking for is consent to start consulting. Enough dialogue, more action, yes or no. As landowner, will you give Cradle Coast NRM consent to proceed to start the Ramsar nomination?

The SPEAKER - The member's time has expired for the question. I note that we are not to reflect on votes of the House and call the minister for Planning to answer with regard to that.

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for his question. I understand that this is a matter that the Minister for Parks and Environment is responsible for. He has previously been in this Chamber answering questions previously. I appreciate the member's interest in this area. It is not an area that I am briefed on to provide support to the member in the other place. I am sure we can refer the question to him for further follow-up for you.

The SPEAKER - Will that be an on-notice question to get advice on or will you take it on notice so that the answer comes back?

Mr ELLIS - I am happy to refer it on behalf of Minister Duigan.

The SPEAKER - I will take that as an on-notice question.

Nuclear Power - Tasmanian Liberal Party's Support

Mr WINTER question to MINISTER for BUSINESS, INDUSTRY and RESOURCES, Mr ABETZ

[11.00 a.m.]

Minister, do you support Peter Dutton's nuclear policy and are you concerned that it risks \$25 billion worth of investment in renewable energy and industry, including projects like HIF and ABEL Energy?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, like yourself in a previous life, I might have been more interested in matters federal, but nowadays in this state parliament, I can indicate to you that Tasmania is a renewable energy powerhouse, courtesy of both Liberal and Labor governments over the decades.

Mr Winter - No, wrong.

Mr ABETZ - Wrong? We are not the renewable energy -

Mr Winter - Nothing to do with your party.

Mr ABETZ - Nothing to do with the Liberal Party? My goodness. What a very short memory those opposite have. Our forefathers gave us the Hydro, and that was backed in by both sides of politics over many decades. We are the renewable energy generation state. Dare I say it, our 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future charts a path to growing on-island renewable energy generation. We are continuing with that.

As to the matters the Leader of the Opposition raises in relation to the mainland and their energy needs and brownouts and the problems they are having, Mr Dutton has put forward a proposal and that is for those on the mainland to consider. We in Tasmania are exceptionally well served with renewable energy and I have every anticipation that what we are pursuing in this state will not in any way be prejudiced.

Supplementary Question

Mr WINTER - Point of order, Speaker. Before the minister sits down, I want to draw him back to the question. Does he support Peter Dutton's nuclear policy?

The SPEAKER - If you have resumed your seat, that means you have completed your answer. Therefore, I will take it as a supplementary question and I will hear it again.

Mr WINTER - Does Mr Abetz support Peter Dutton's nuclear policy?

The SPEAKER - That was the question and I will draw the minister to it.

Dr Woodruff - Yes, or no?

The SPEAKER - Yes or no would be helpful, but somewhat unrealistic, I think.

Mr ABETZ - The perpetual interjector, the Leader of the Greens.

We in Tasmania will pursue our renewable energy policies and in relation to the matters for the federal election, that will be determined elsewhere on the mainland. These are matters for discussion and I personally welcome discussion on alternative energy sources. That is something for the people of Australia to decide, because we have an energy issue right around Australia as we are seeking to get out of coal. Might I remind those sitting there that if we had followed Bob Brown's suggestion from 1983, today we would have a coal-fired power station in the Fingal Valley, so I will not be taking advice from those opposite.

The SPEAKER - The minister's time has expired. I appreciate the Greens not rising to that bait - thank you.

Maugean Skate - Anti-Salmon Farm Marketing Campaign

Dr WOODRUFF question to MINISTER for BUSINESS, INDUSTRY and RESOURCES, Mr ABETZ

[11.04 a.m.]

Minister, the ancient Maugean skate is close to extinction, driven there by industrial-scale salmon farming in Macquarie Harbour. Tasmanians who love the beauty and health of our marine environment have for years tried to raise the alarm. Your government's continued refusal to regulate salmon farming to protect nature leaves them no option. Community group Neighbours of Fish Farming have launched a mainland consumer information campaign starting in Melbourne. Commuters and shoppers are greeted with massive billboard messages outside Flinders Street Station and on major freeways in and out of the city. The message is clear - if you love Tassie, do not eat farmed salmon.

Mr Winter - Shame.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Order. While 'shame' is appropriate, I do need to hear the question.

Dr WOODRUFF - Every bite you take is destroying our marine life and waterways. Will you admit your blinkered, pro-industry, anti-environment policy is the cause of this market campaign against Tasmanian salmon, and do you really think a species' extinction will help our state's clean green brand?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, this campaign that is disgracefully being run on the mainland is designed for one purpose only, and that is to raise funds for the Bob Brown Foundation and other organisations like it, peddling misinformation in the hope that well-minded individuals on the mainland will give money to organisations that then help fund the Greens at election time. Let us make no mistake about that.

Dr WOODRUFF - Point of Order, Speaker, under 45. The question was about Neighbours of Fish Farming. I am not sure where the minister is going with this, but can I draw his attention to the question, please?

The SPEAKER - The minister has been answering for around 30 seconds, but I will draw him to the question and I am sure he will attend to it.

Mr ABETZ - There was a whole host of issues in the question and I am seeking to deal with them in a methodical manner.

The advertisements paid were for, one assumes, by people with a bit of excess money, who do not rely on jobs in the productive sectors, and are engaging in propaganda, not

information. Let us be very clear on that. As for the Greens, is their want. When they cannot win the argument in Tasmania with their fellow Tasmanians, they go over to the mainland to try to foist their view of the world on we Tasmanians through Canberra, and that is what we are seeing at the moment with Minister Plibersek and Macquarie Harbour.

Let us make no mistake in relation to the Maugean skate that is in Macquarie Harbour. We have a fantastic pre-breeding program that is going exceptionally well, and might I add, without any industrial fish farming, so I do not know why 'industrial' has to be put into that terminology, but that is the terminology used by the Greens.

Without any fish farming, the skate unfortunately no longer exists in Bathurst Harbour. I wonder why?

Dr Woodruff - Irrelevant. It was never there.

Mr ABETZ - It is those sorts of things that need to be put into the debate and which the Greens steadfastly refuse to acknowledge. Fishermen and people around the area who know about Bathurst Harbour know that the Maugean skate did exist there -

Mr Ellis - That's right. It used to be called the Port Davey skate.

The SPEAKER - Thank you, Minister Ellis.

Mr ABETZ - It no longer exists there, but that has nothing to do with fish farming because there was no fish farming in the area. How do the Greens explain the disappearance of the Maugean skate out of Bathurst Harbour? That is an inconvenient truth that goes against the dishonest fundraising campaigns they run on the mainland.

The SPEAKER - The minister's time has expired.

Supplementary Question

Dr WOODRUFF - A supplementary question, Speaker.

The SPEAKER - I will hear the supplementary question from the Leader of the Greens.

Dr WOODRUFF - The minister did not go close to answering the question.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Members, I need to hear the supplementary. Thank you.

Dr WOODRUFF - Do you think a species extinction will be good for our clean green state brand?

The SPEAKER - I will draw the member to the question, but before we start the clock, I will remind members that standing orders 44 and 45 say that we should not have debate and argument. Both questions and answers have been having those. It is a form of the House to allow it to a certain extent, but I will draw the member to that part of the question now.

Mr ABETZ - Any extinction of any animal is to be regretted and that extends to Maugean skates, or animals - possibly there is another term for them - but unfortunately, they went extinct in Bathurst Harbour.

Dr Woodruff - - Whoops, another one has gone. Oh dear. What a pity.

Mr ABETZ - They also went extinct in Bathurst Harbour and we do not know why.

Mr Bayley - Have you asked? Scientists are very clear on that, minister.

Mr ABETZ - Why are you seeking to pin one activity, namely salmon farming, on the disappearance of the Maugean skate in Macquarie Harbour, when clearly salmon farming could not have been the reason for its disappearance in Bathurst Harbour? Think logically.

Dr Woodruff - The ultimate anti-science minister.

The SPEAKER - Order, Leader of the Greens and the Deputy Premier.

Mr ABETZ - Apply a bit of common sense. Get rid of your ideology and desire to raise money on unfounded grounds and you might take a more acceptable stance on this, especially for the men and women of the west coast who rely on fish farming for their livelihoods.

The SPEAKER - The minister's time has expired. Leader of the Opposition, before you ask your question - we have managed to get to the last question, I believe, of the first four weeks without me evicting anyone. Can we hold on to that, please?

Australian Antarctic Division - Location

Mr WINTER question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.10 a.m.]

Today, *The Australian* reports that the Western Australian government is eager to be considered as the new home for the Australian Antarctic Division (AAD). Unlike your government, they appear to recognise the economic benefits of hosting AAD: thousands of safe, secure, highly paid jobs, and hundreds of millions of dollars of economic activity every year. TasPorts and the responsible minister, Minister Ferguson, clearly do not. They have failed to deliver the infrastructure the new ship needs, attempted to price-gouge AAD, have caused negotiations with the Commonwealth to break down and put our entire Antarctic sector at risk.

Last week, the federal minister requested your personal intervention, and this morning you have outlined that you are going to heed that call and personally intervene. Does your trip to meet the federal minister not showcase your lack of confidence in the Deputy Premier and in TasPorts' appalling handling of this matter?

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - My desire to not throw anyone out has just gone with that question.

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for his question, even though it was a recycled question from the Greens - the first question of the Greens today, recycled by the Labor Party as the last question today. Why do you stick up for Canberra every single time? You had to come back to a Greens' question because you have wasted the parliament's time by ridiculous wedge questions directed to the honourable member behind me here.

As per the honourable Speaker's comments, the first four weeks of parliament have demonstrated an element, at least on this side and the crossbench, of maturity - not division, but maturity. You can laugh all you like, member for Bass. You are probably still recycling those 'No stadium' stickers as we speak.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Order. I am quite sure that Hansard is struggling to hear the answer given by the Premier.

Mr ROCKLIFF - When it comes to the enormous economic benefits of the Antarctic precinct and the Antarctic gateway, which Hobart is and will always be at the centre of, if federal Labor holds to their word - 1000 jobs and \$183 million of economic activity - we will give vigorously, as we have done. I remind you of TasPorts' investment in Berth 4 and 5, and the mature discussion that needs to be had, and which we are willing to have, when it comes to the arrangements in commercial terms between TasPorts, the state government, the AAD and the federal government.

My expectation when I meet the federal minister is that the federal minister puts aside the politics and actually comes to the table for a mature discussion.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - I will be putting all of you aside in a moment. Thank you, Premier.

Mr ROCKLIFF - That is the way we will be approaching this very serious matter, and I expect the federal Labor government to be true to their word in ensuring that Hobart remains the Antarctic gateway.

I am also looking forward to, I hope in the not-too-distant future, providing some certainty for the many hundreds of jobs on the west coast when it comes to the salmon farming industry.

The SPEAKER - The Premier's time has expired. Our time for Question Time has finished. I call on constituency questions.

CONSTITUENCY QUESTIONS

Metro Bus Service

Ms BURNET question to MINISTER for TRANSPORT, Mr FERGUSON

[11.15 a.m.]

I ask this question on behalf of Zahra and Scott, two constituents who have recently returned to Tasmania from a place where there was a working Metro system. They are living in Sandy Bay, and they have found their Metro bus service to travel to work into the city has failed them on a number of occasions. The bus service has either not turned up at all, is not reliable or is not frequent enough to rely upon. They said:

That was certainly the case several months ago. It used to not turn up at all and was often late. To be honest, I have not been using the bus much lately for those reasons, especially the delays, and now drive half the way and walk the rest.

What steps will you take to improve this regular peak-hour service and to restore other metropolitan bus services so that people like Scott and Zahra can rely on a dependable bus service once more and not add to unnecessary congestion on our roads?

Waste Management

Mrs PETRUSMA question to MINISTER for PARKS and ENVIRONMENT, Mr DUIGAN

I am aware of concerns in the community around tyre stockpiles and how we are managing waste. Waste management, sustainability and lower impact environmental strategies are of particular concern to the community in my electorate of Franklin.

To this end, the recovery of old and used tyres is one action that can be looked at as part of a circular economy approach to reducing the environmental impact of these non-renewable products and maximising their use for their entire life cycle. Can you please provide information about what the government is doing to address the issue of end-of-use tyres and what action is being taken to reduce and potentially recycle and reuse the tyre piles in Tasmania?

Budget Bids - Jacqui Lambie Network

Mr WILLIE question to TREASURER, Mr FERGUSON

Your coalition partners, the Jacqui Lambie Network, have powers afforded to them that no one else in this place has. One of the most significant is their ability to put forward Budget bids. Several of my constituents are very interested to understand what they have put forward. Can you outline how many bids they have made, what the total value of those bids are and will you commit to releasing them publicly?

Launceston General Hospital - Wait Times for Specialist Services

Mr FAIRS question to MINISTER for HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH and WELLBEING, Mr BARNETT

Constituents in my division of Bass have made inquiries about reports of *The Examiner* this week claiming health department figures show some patients are waiting up to six years to see a specialist health professional at the Launceston General Hospital.

The report claims urgent wound management patients are waiting 1121 days, with semi-urgent respiratory patients waiting 940 days for specialist services. Those respiratory patients deemed non-urgent can wait up to 2087 days, which is nearly six years.

Can the minister provide verification of these figures and an update on the availability of specialist services at the LGH?

Sidmouth General Store - Impact of Roadworks

Ms FINLAY question to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE, Mr FERGUSON

It has been repeatedly brought to our attention both by community members and the Sidmouth General Store owners that ongoing road works are having a considerable impact on their business. Their small, family-owned local business relies on passing traffic to survive.

The impact of putting the road works traffic lights right outside the store on more than one occasion makes it difficult for any potential customers to stop. These works have been continuing for an extended period and will continue for some time. The impact to this business is ongoing. What adjustments can be made to allow passing traffic to easily access this business both now and in the future?

St Patricks River Reserve Clean-up

Ms ROSOL question to MINISTER for PARKS and ENVIRONMENT, Mr DUIGAN

Residents of Nunamara and surrounds have contacted me about the state of St Patricks River Reserve. Floods in 2016 caused significant damage to the reserve. However, no works have been undertaken to repair the reserve and residents report the area has been neglected for the last 35 years. Despite their efforts to identify the authority responsible, they have been pushed between the Department of State Growth and the Parks and Wildlife Service to resolve the issue. They have offered to clean up this reserve themselves, and they have made several applications for approval to do this, including a current application they are awaiting response on.

What do the residents need to do to get action on the care of their reserve? Will you intervene and help them to receive the approvals they need to complete the required works in the reserve themselves?

Compulsory Acquisition of Westbury Farmland

Ms BUTLER question to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE, Mr FERGUSON

Carol and John Firth of Westbury are concerned about the Department of State Growth's plans to compulsorily acquire their land for a heavy vehicle rest area. They say there was no consultation with them and the first they heard was a letter in the mail with the title, 'Project Update'. Noting the poppy yield of the land has the highest alkaloid levels in the area, these concerns were raised with the government in January this year. Mr and Mrs Firth have advised that the acquisition of their prime agricultural paddocks will proceed. Are you concerned about the way they have been treated and will you step in to find a suitable resolution?

Education Department Policy on Charter Bus Seatbelts

Mrs BESWICK question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, Ms PALMER

My question is a follow-up from yesterday in regard to the policy of the Education department around chartering buses and the requirement for whether or not they have seatbelts. We would like an update on where that is at, and whether it has been reviewed in the last two years.

TABLED PAPERS

Public Works Committee - Royal Hobart Hospital Emergency Department Phase 2 - Report

[11.23 a.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Honourable Speaker, I have the honour to bring up the report of the Public Works Committee on the following reference, Royal Hobart Hospital Emergency Department Phase 2, together with the evidence received and the transcript of evidence. I move -

That the said report be received.

Motion agreed to.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCY AMENDMENT BILL 2024 (No. 27)

First Reading.

Bill presented by Ms Ogilvie and read the first time.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA (PROTECTION OF LAND) BILL 2024
(No. 31)**

First Reading

Bill presented by Ms Ogilvie and read the first time.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

Presentation to the Governor of Amendment to Standing Orders and Address-in-Reply

The SPEAKER - I have to advise the House that, in accordance with the provisions of the *Constitution Act of 1934*, I attended Government House on 19 June last to present for approval the amendment to the Standing Orders agreed to by the House on 12 June last and advised that Her Excellency the Governor gave her approval of the same.

I also have the honour to report to the House that, accompanied by the mover and the seconder, I attended at Government House on Wednesday 19 June and presented to Her Excellency the Governor the Address-in-Reply agreed to on 21 May, and that Her Excellency was pleased to reply as follows:

Honourable Speaker and honourable members of the House of Assembly,

In the name and on behalf of His Majesty the King, I thank you for your address.

B Baker, Governor.

SITTING DATES

[11.25 a.m.]

Mr ABETZ (Franklin - Leader of the House)(by leave) - Honourable Speaker, I move -

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday 30 July next at 10.00 a.m.

Motion agreed to.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Employment

[11.25 a.m.]

Mr WOOD (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, I move -

That the House take note of the following matter: Employment

Honourable Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on today's MPI about how we are delivering stability and securing Tasmania's economic future. This government is getting on with the job of delivering our 2030 Strong plan, which will create more jobs and continue to grow our economy. A central part of that plan is growing jobs across the state, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Employment is at record levels. The May 2024 unemployment rate of 4 per cent is the lowest unemployment for our state since the Australian Bureau of Statistics started collecting this data in 1978. In May 2024 there were 284,027 Tasmanians in work, including a near record 138,786 women. There have been 48,965 jobs created since March 2014, when we were elected to government. The unemployment rate is a whopping 3.9 per cent lower than the catastrophic 7.9 per cent it was at the peak of the former Labor government's 2013 recession.

Tasmania also has the strongest wage growth in the nation, recording 1.6 per cent for the March 2024 quarter, and 4.9 per cent annual growth to March 2024. This represents the largest annual growth in wages in Tasmania in over a decade. Our strong wage growth means that not only is our unemployment rate lower than ever before, but Tasmanians are earning more than ever before. This positive development means more food on the table for Tasmanian families.

An important part of our 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future is creating jobs. We need to ensure that Tasmania remains the best state to live, work and raise a family. Under our 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future, we are taking strong action on jobs. We have already extended the Payroll Tax Rebate Scheme to 30 June 2025 to help businesses take on more young Tasmanians into apprenticeships. We have enhanced our successful Buy Local Policy to support more Tasmanian businesses by lifting the local weighting test to 30 per cent. We are stimulating economic growth by growing the capacity to invest in Tasmanian projects through the Tasmanian Development Board. We are also partnering with iconic Tasmanian shipbuilder, Incat, to double their shipbuilding capacity and deliver up to 500 jobs, as well as new training facilities through a \$5.25 million investment.

We are boosting funding to train the next generation of Tasmanian workers, including turbocharging the VET in all schools and colleges; boosting our YouthBuild program with an investment of \$800,000 to prepare students for apprenticeships; and providing \$2.5 million to deliver vocational learning to years 9 and 10 students in all secondary schools in partnership with local industry bodies.

We are also establishing a \$30 million VET Futures Fund to deliver new and upgraded facilities and industry standard equipment at colleges, secondary schools and trade training centres; investing \$750,000 to grow our specialist VET workforce in schools; and providing \$1.2 million a year over two years to the Beacon Foundation to continue their Work-based Learning Services program in 50 secondary schools.

Deputy Speaker, Labor can attempt to cherry-pick and play policies all they want, but the reality is that Tasmania's economic performance is incredibly strong and Tasmanians are better off under a Rockliff Liberal government and our 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future.

Having a strong economy allows us to invest more into the things Tasmanians care about, like health, education, housing and community infrastructure. We will continue to harness Tasmania's competitive strengths to build on these gains and grow an even more resilient and diverse economy.

Time expired.

[11.31 a.m.]

Mr WILLIE (Clark) - Deputy Speaker, I thank the member for Bass for bringing this matter of public importance forward. I feel sorry for backbenchers that they have to be put up to these sorts of jobs. If the government had conviction about some of the things the member was saying, they might have the Treasurer here talking about that. We know that this government is in decline and we know that the economy is flatlining, and there are many things that they used to talk about that they do not want to talk about anymore. It is not just me saying it. You have respected independent economists like Saul Eslake saying we are now going back into a cycle that was similar to the 1990s.

We have a government with its head in the sand. They are telling everyone everything is okay. It is laughable that the member brings forward a matter of public importance that has the word 'stability' in it. We have a Premier who, through his poor leadership, lost two members of his team in the last parliament, forced his government into minority and was beholden to those two members of parliament. It was bad for business confidence. From that time, we have lost 5000 jobs.

It is the Premier's words in the last election that people should listen to. He said that minority governments crash the economy, crash the health system and is bad for confidence.

Ms Ogilvie - Sounds like you want that.

Mr WILLIE - Not at all. I want Tasmanians to be able to live here, to be aspirational, to have good opportunities, but the statistics are not lying. There are too many Tasmanians who are leaving the state at the moment. We have had seven consecutive quarters of net interstate migration loss. That means there are working-age Tasmanians who are leaving the state for better opportunities elsewhere. The last set of data that was released last week is the worst since 1998. That should concern all of us. It is hurting our economy.

We need to make sure that Tasmanians can live here, that their kids can get a good education, that they can access the health system when they want it, that they can access a good, safe, well-paid job and can live a good life here and then retire. Unfortunately - and it is quite tragic - there are too many Tasmanians who do not believe in that and they are leaving. They do not want to leave but they have to because of economic and social reasons. This government cannot deliver the social services Tasmanians would like.

We have things like the State of the States CommSec report. The government used to talk about that all the time. Every time it was released, they would march in here and say, 'Look at all of this, we're top of the ladder'. They do not talk about it anymore and it reflects what has happened. Across eight economic indicators, we are dead last. That is why they are not talking about it. We have negative employment growth, which means job losses, and we have a population that is stagnating. It is the worst it has been in eight years.

Then we have the Deloitte Access Economics report. They used to like to talk about that too. That is a projection into the future, projecting just 0.3 per cent of economic growth. Our economy is now flatlining and there is no denying that. That report is also forecasting job losses over the next two years.

It is quite laughable that we have a member put forward this matter of public importance today talking about stability and economic growth when their head is in the sand. We need to make sure that this government is staying on track, that it is delivering for Tasmanians and that it is growing the economy.

In Question Time today we heard about a lack of political will in getting renewable energy developments up to help grow the economy. It is not just Labour saying this. It is the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry that is saying that we are in an energy crisis. It is major businesses around Tasmania saying they cannot get power at any price and they want to grow jobs, they want to grow the economy, but they cannot because this government has lacked the political will to get those developments off the ground, to grow jobs, to grow the economy and to make sure that Tasmanians can have access to good opportunities here.

There is a reality check coming for this government. The best days are past this government. That is clear to see for the whole Tasmanian community. They are now in coalition with the Jacqui Lambie Network and independents. It is laughable that they are talking about stability. A lot of Tasmanians I talk to in the community are wondering just how long this parliament will go. Many cannot see it going the full term and that is bad for business confidence. It is time for this government to wake up.

[11.35 a.m.]

Mr BAYLEY (Clark) - Deputy Speaker, I thank the member, Mr Wood, for bringing this MPI forward on stability and economic future. I will make the point up front that stability is completely relative to who you are, where you live and how your circumstances are. In the leaked report from Saul Eslake that we were talking about in this place last week, he makes the point that the disparity between the regions and the cities are getting ever greater in this state. If you are on the housing wait list, if you are one of the 4700-plus applications - which may be massively more than that if you are a family - you have no stability. If you are waiting 80-plus weeks for a housing support, you certainly have no stability. If you are waiting for dental care or healthcare or elective surgery, you have no stability. If you are the neighbour of a precious part of Tasmania that is threatened or is having stitch-up reviews like the kunanyi review introduced out of the blue, you have no security for your place.

If you are an Aboriginal Tasmanian who cares for your Aboriginal heritage, your ancestral heritage, and you know that the *Aboriginal Heritage Act* does not work, because the minister tabled a report in here three years ago that said it does not provide effective protection for Aboriginal heritage, you have no stability. I want to make that point upfront because we in this place should always be all about people.

When it comes to the stability of this parliament, I want to reference yesterday. It was quite a red-letter day for this parliament, and indeed for the legislative reform and future of this state. We had two non-government bills passed by this parliament: a really important bill from the Labor Party in relation to industrial manslaughter and a bill from the Greens to repeal begging. They did not have the support of the government but were passed thanks to long-running campaigns to get these issues dealt with. They do not have a majority in this place because the 35 of us vote according to how we want to and the numbers do not dictate it, and they finally got through. It was indeed a red-letter day for this parliament and people absolutely celebrated that. For the begging bill, it was the third or fourth time it had been introduced here. This had been aerated and spoken about a lot in this place and it finally got through. It is very welcome.

We regularly hear the word collaboration from Minister Barnett regularly, we regularly hear the word commonsense and my advice would be for this government to drop the culture wars when it comes to policy and legislative agenda. I am talking about things like opening up 40,000 hectares of protected forests for a logging industry that does not even want it; things like a youth strike force to come down hard on youth crime when the Children's Commissioner makes it abundantly clear that it will not work and it is not what the state has needed - ignoring the commission of inquiry's recommendations around closing Ashley, for example, and pushing out the date to close Ashley. These are all issues that not only impact on us as people, but they impact on our brand and our liveability. There is nothing stable about stimulating culture wars, and there is nothing stable about ignoring social and environmental concerns.

We had an interaction in Question Time about salmon, the Maugean skate and market campaigns - people resorting to the market and speaking to consumers. That is what people will do when they do not get uptake from a government, when they see regulatory favour, and when they do not see the government responding to those failures and making amendments.

It has happened before in relation to the forestry industry; it is happening at the moment in relation to the salmon industry. I am sure it will keep happening as long as this government continues to ignore people's concerns and regulatory failure continues to dominate those industries.

Saul Eslake has made it very clear that:

We appear to have entered another one of those cycles like the 1990s of slower population growth, slower economic and employment growth, and more working-aged people leaving.

We do need to be looking to the future. We have an education system that is clearly not delivering for Tasmanian children and, therefore, Tasmania's future. We mentioned those regional disparities and I mentioned that people cannot get the kind of services we need. If we are going to deliver stability for the Tasmanian people, political stability is one thing, but actual outcomes are what Tasmanians are looking for and that is what we all should be collaboratively focused on.

[11.40 a.m.]

Mr ABETZ (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Thank you for the welcome, member for Clark. Delivering stability is vital for all Tasmanians, and delivering their economic future is vital for each and every individual Tasmanian because it will guarantee them their employment. What we have seen in recent times is that new members to this place, such as the those of the Jacqui Lambie Network, and others such as Mr Byrne and Ms Johnston, are willing to sign up to provide stability in this place. This was in circumstances where Mr O'Byrne and Ms Johnston, in particular, but the Jacqui Lambie network as well, were left with no alternative because Labor acknowledged they were not ready to form government. They were incapable of forming government, so they did not even bother putting their hand up to the Tasmanian people saying that we could be a government.

Mr Winter - We won 10 seats. You cannot possibly form government with less than 15.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER - The Leader of the Opposition can have his turn in a minute.

Mr ABETZ - The Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, said that he would form government and he has, and the Jacqui Lambie Network members, with Mr O'Byrne and Ms Johnston, have been responsible in their approach in providing stability. It is a bit rich for a party that acknowledged it was incapable of forming and not ready to form government to come in here to seek to lecture and hector us about stability, because each and every day in Question Time what they have done is sought instability -

Members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. Interjections will cease.

Mr ABETZ - They revel in instability. Mr Willie talked about business confidence. The National Australia Bank tells us about the business confidence that Tasmanian businesses have, and it is more than double the Western Australian business confidence, which ranked second.

Members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER - I ask members of the opposition to allow the minister to answer the question.

Mr ABETZ - Tasmania has seen the strongest growth in business confidence of all states over the last three months, improving by 12 basis points and, in trend terms, is now equal third-strongest in the country and above the national average. Faced with those figures, what do we get from those opposite? Relentless negativity.

I say to Mr Willie, if you want stability, you would not have a political party that is off and then on in relation to Macquarie Point and the stadium. That does not provide stability. That provides uncertainty. I feel desperately sorry for the member for Bass who campaigned so strongly against the stadium and now has to be in favour of the stadium, but that is instability. We on this side have remained steadfast.

Then we had Mr Willie telling us about this parliament not lasting the distance. On what does he base that other than his wishful thinking, hoping that he can gain government on the back of the instability his party is seeking to create in this place?

In relation to the Greens and their comment about the Eslake Report talking about regional disparity, can I say to the Greens, that is why we on this side back in mining, agriculture, forestry, aquaculture and tourism, because we see the regional disparity and that is why we are seeking to provide jobs within the regions.

The Greens member who commented on that is a member for Clark, and yes, there are a good dose of public servants within the electorate of Clark, but if you get out of Clark and see the regional areas of our state, you see the vital importance of providing jobs and opportunities. That is exactly what we are doing with our 2030 Strong Plan to deliver for mining, farming aquaculture and forestry.

Stability is the Liberal Party's modus operandi.

[11.46 a.m.]

Mr WINTER (Franklin - Leader of the Opposition) - Deputy Speaker, I half thought it was our MPI when I saw the topic, but it turns out the government wanted to talk about stability. It is an ambitious topic for them to want to bring up this morning.

We heard the member for Bass arrive at the lectern and try, dutifully as he does, to make an argument as to why this was a stable government. Then we heard from minister Abetz trying to lecture us about stability in government.

This is a government which for 10 years has talked about being a strong, stable majority government. This is a government which on day one, two parliaments ago, lost their speaker and therefore lost their real majority. This is a government that has not been able to go the full term since 2018. This is a government that has taken Tasmanians to three elections in a little over six years.

This is a government that does not understand stability, does not understand or know about majority anymore, and this is a government that has been formed on a basis that minister Abetz said on election night should not be possible. He said he thought it would be very difficult to form a government with less than 15 seats. He warned against it, in fact, and yet that is what the Liberals did, and that is what this government is formed on.

The first step they took was to do a deal with the Jacqui Lambie Network: a Jacqui Lambie confidence and supply agreement between Premier Jeremy Rockliff and parliamentary members of the Jacqui Lambie Network. This agreement ties the Jacqui Lambie Network very strongly to this government. I heard the comments of the member for Lyons, Mr Jenner, on *ABC* radio with Leon Compton, questioning whether or not they should have signed up to this deal in the first place. The deal that the member for Lyons did not seem very keen on, and which the member for Bass, Mrs Pentland, appeared yesterday to be embarrassed about, is the deal the entire government is based on.

When the Jacqui Lambie Network was linked to this government - because they are linked - the Jacqui Lambie Network sought the assistance of the Speaker to see if they could be separated. They cannot be separated from this government because it is here in black and white. It is in the agreement. This is a coalition between the Liberals and the Lambies that has been set up to try to make this parliament work.

We will be responsible. The first thing we did in this parliament was move a motion in support of our traditional industries of forestry, mining, aquaculture and renewable energy. We did that. We supported that. It was the first vote in which this government split from its coalition partner, the Jacqui Lambie Network. It could not support forestry, could not support mining, could not support aquaculture and could not support renewable energy at Robbins Island. That is what this government is formed on - inherent instability, a coalition partner that does not want to be a part of a coalition and yet has signed a coalition deal anyway. The inherent problem with this government is that it does not stand for anything. Its only modus operandi is survival. This premier cannot make big strategic decisions. He can barely do anything at all except attempt to survive.

The agreement with the Jacqui Lambie Network is interesting, even in the headline, because it is not an agreement between the Liberal Party and the Jacqui Lambie Network - it is an agreement between Jeremy Rockliff and the Jacqui Lambie Network. It is not just about his

survival in this parliament, but survival against Mr Abetz and the Deputy Premier. He not only has to survive the crossbench and the Jacqui Lambie Network; he has to survive against Mr Abetz and the Deputy Premier who want his job, who nominated to be the leader of the Liberal Party, but lost. He is now waiting every single waiting moment.

Members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. The interjections will cease. The member will be able to make his contribution in silence, please.

Mr WINTER - This government is based on instability. It is based on the instability of the previous parliament, of an election a year early because it could not make the last parliament work. Now it is charged with making an even more difficult parliament work.

This is a government that has failed to deliver for Tasmanian business. It has overseen 5000 jobs lost over the last 12 months. This is a government that has overseen an education system that is struggling. All of the education results we are seeing are really struggling.

We are also building up to a Budget that is going to be the worst budget in many years. We are already seeing the cuts starting to be applied in our health system and it is just going to get worse. I am deeply concerned about the instability of this government and its effect on our economy, and the services -

Time expired.

[11.51 a.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Deputy Speaker, it is my honour to rise this morning to contribute on the government's matter of public importance, it being that it is important to the people of Tasmania that Tasmania has stability. To have stability you have to have certainty. To have certainty you have to have confidence. There is no doubt that across the community, in homes, households and families, but also in industry, from some of our smallest mum-and-dad businesses right up to our largest businesses, there is no confidence or certainty in Tasmania right now. That is because the government, for the period of its term, has been attempting to lead, but leading takes action and this government is no good at delivering on action. The government makes announcements and promises. They talk but they cannot actually deliver. This means Tasmanians cannot contribute in a way, or engage in a way they could and would like to.

This morning, the Premier spat across the Chamber that Tasmanian Labor is silent on salmon and silent on Robbins Island. There could be nothing more laughable. It shows how much pressure this premier is under that the only retort he can find is something absolutely untrue. It is clear that Tasmanian Labor is the strongest supporter of the salmon industry and the strongest supporter of renewable energy.

Mr Abetz, you may laugh. However, when a vacuum on action is formed, it provides for negative energy to fill that space. You were not here at the time, but your side placed a moratorium on the salmon industry in Tasmania, which caused a volume for the negative people to rise up and act, such as they spoke about this morning with these campaigns on the mainland. You quite rightly said that they are, in fact, fundraising activities, but what they are is the filling of the volume caused by the moratorium from the Tasmanian Liberal government

in Tasmania. It has put families, individuals and young kids directly at risk, not only on the west coast of Tasmania, but across the north-west coast of Tasmania and all regional communities here, because that industry is so important.

Premier, we do not stand silent on salmon jobs in Tasmania. We stand with workers, we stand with industry, we stand with the communities that are not even directly employed by salmon: the schools, hospitals, services, bakeries, supermarkets, footy teams and the community organisations that rely on them. If you want to suggest that you have stability in Tasmania from the leadership of your government, then you only need to look at the moratorium placed on the salmon industry to know that is not true.

You say that we are silent on Robbins Island: this government has made it the most difficult place in the world to deliver a wind farm. We see this government talk about renewable energy zones, improved pathways, the benefits of generation, the benefits of big projects. However, you cannot deliver projects to Tasmania, which is why we are in an energy crisis. We have the gas-fired power station being used at the moment. We are importing energy. The minister, Mr Abetz, says, 'Well, you know, is it not great that we have a mix of energy opportunities in Tasmania'. What would be great is if this government had the capacity to deliver renewable energy projects so we do not need to rely on that. Yes, it is great to have a mix, and we are a supporter of the mix. However, what we would love to see, what Tasmanian people would love to see, what people from around the world who are holding in the winds with \$25 billion worth of investment Tasmania would love to see, is a government that can actually do their job and deliver.

Is it that you are too afraid to make decisions? Is it that you are too scared to produce the information required to deliver? Is it that you do not have the capacity, or that you are not willing? Those questions remain on the lips of Tasmanians. They remain on the lips of people across the country and the world because, as you are unable to deliver, we have projects sitting here. These projects are not competing with each other. The funds for investment in Tasmania and for jobs in Tasmania, for certainty, confidence and security, is not between the companies; it is within the companies for their assets to be delivering in other parts of the world. Tasmania is losing out because this government does not know what stability is. They do not know how to create confidence. They do not know how to create certainty

We talk about wind farms. We talk about salmon. Let me talk about the farmers of Tasmania who, having experienced the dry conditions, are seeking support from this government for getting feed from mainland Australia. They simply want support with the process of getting it from mainland Australia to Tasmania, and you cannot even do that. After weeks and months of serious suggestions for support, you cannot even deliver for the farmers of Tasmania.

Time expired.

[11.56 a.m.]

Mr FAIRS (Bass) - Deputy Speaker, Tasmanians want a stable and constructive parliament. I have heard a lot of sides on this issue this morning. That is the kind of parliament I put my hand up for: a stable, constructive parliament. Many Tasmanians I spoke to do not want petty, childish negativity from their politicians. During the election, what I heard loud and clear was that Tasmanians want a parliament that delivers on the issues that matter for them. They want MPs - all MPs - to get on with the job. They want a strong economy that

provides jobs and opportunities. That is what the people of Bass are interested in and therefore, that is what I am interested in. The makeup of this Chamber reflects the will of the people. That is a fact. I may be new to this place but, from what I can see, this parliament is working. We are getting things done.

In terms of our economic future, the unemployment rate is at 4 per cent, the lowest level since the Australian Bureau of Statistics started collecting data in 1978. The unemployment rate is 3.9 per cent lower than it was at any peak of the former Labor-Greens government. Tasmania has near-record-high employment, including record-high employment for women across our state. This is an indication of the resilience of Tasmania's economy and our jobs market, and shows that our 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future is working.

Just this week, I was thrilled to contribute to legislation protecting our frontline workers. This legislation marks a significant step forward in safeguarding the wellbeing of individuals who are essential to our economy and our community. We have all heard the shocking stories of unprovoked attacks on hard-working Tasmanians. We were able to progress the bill to protect them.

Our government is focused on delivering on its clear plan to continue building our economy and delivering jobs. We will continue to do all we can to keep this momentum going. That is what our plan is about. Our 100-day plan is on track, and we are getting on with the job. We have begun our recruitment pleads for more paramedics and health professionals. We have halved bus fares across Tasmania. We have passed legislation in both Houses to abolish stamp duty for Tasmanians buying their first home, which has been welcomed with open arms. That is just to name a few already delivered.

Our long-term plan has built a nation-leading economy that is in the corner of Tasmanian businesses while creating over 49,000 new jobs. We will continue to do what matters for all Tasmanians.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER - There are two minutes remaining.

[11.59 a.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Thank you, Deputy Speaker. In the two minutes, it is clear that we have a government that talks about stability when the reality is this is a government held together with sticky tape and bubblegum. We see that with the behaviour of the Jacqui Lambie Network in constantly contradicting the government.

Today in Question Time, we heard the member for Bass, who has just taken his seat, ask a very pointed question about the performance of the health system. The member has some significant concerns about his own government's management of the health system and the outrageous waiting times of up to six years seen at the Launceston General Hospital. What we see also from this government is that they are so desperate to try and keep this government together that now, once again, they are raising the issue of a stability clause and legislating a stability clause.

To be clear, this stability clause has exactly two grounds. The first is to lock in the Lambie Network to make sure that nobody from the Lambie Network leaves the flock from what is a fledgling party of three individuals from diverse backgrounds with no history of a political

party or a political structure. This stability clause is about keeping together the Lambie Network just in case, because if the Lambie Network splits, then the government is in significant trouble.

The second part of the stability clause is to keep their own government together. In the past two parliaments we have seen Liberal members give up on their own party, whether it be the one who took the Speaker's Chair or the two who walked away and sat on the crossbench. That is why this government is desperate to try to legislate. They cannot keep their own party together by good manners and goodwill now, so they have to use the blunt-force instrument that is legislation to keep their own coalition together. If that is not a coalition held together with sticky tape and bubblegum, I do not know what it is.

Time expired.

Matter noted.

SURVEYORS AMENDMENT BILL 2024 (No. 12)

TAXATION LEGISLATION (AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT) BILL 2024 (No. 13)

Bills agreed to by the Legislative Council without amendment.

CHILD SAFETY REFORM IMPLEMENTATION MONITOR BILL 2024 (No. 14)

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with amendment.

MOTION

Consideration of Message from the Legislative Council

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Attorney-General) - I move -

That the last-mentioned message be considered forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

CHILD SAFETY REFORM IMPLEMENTATION MONITOR BILL 2024 (No. 14)

In Committee

Council amendment to Schedule II

[12.02 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT - This is an amendment that has been moved in the Legislative Council that we agree to as a government. It is a minor technical amendment, but I appreciate the scrutiny and feedback from the Legislative Council. It relates to removing 'seven sitting days'

and inserting 'five sitting days' and relates to the Child Safety Reform Implementation Monitor Bill 2024, specifically clause 3(4). The effect of this amendment is that instead of having three sitting weeks to respond for the minister to cause a statement setting out the grounds for the suspension or removal of the said implementation monitor, it would be two weeks, or five sitting days. That is the effect of the amendment. It is a minor one and something the government supports. We appreciate that and look forward to any questions but also support from the House.

Ms HADDAD - Thank you, Deputy Chair. I can indicate that the Labor Party will support this amendment. I understand it was moved by the member for Nelson in the upper House and as we have heard the Attorney-General explain, it changes the number seven to five, meaning that it would have to be laid before the House during the first five sitting days of the House following a suspension rather than seven days, which is what is in the original bill. As the Attorney-General explained, that has the effect of reducing the time to two weeks from three. We supported it in the upper House and we will support it here as well.

Council amendments agreed to.

Resolution agreed to.

HUMAN TISSUE AMENDMENT BILL 2024 (No. 18)

Second Reading

[12.06 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Attorney-General) - Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the bill now be read a second time.

The purpose of the Human Tissue Amendment Bill 2024 is to make contemporary amendments to the *Human Tissue Act 1985*. While these amendments are minor and technical, they will include the ability to give important recognition to those people who have given the ultimate gift of life in organ donation. I acknowledge the advocacy of families, carers and loved ones regarding the technical barriers that were recently identified across Australia's organ donation and transplantation laws that have limited families' ability to publicly share their loved one's stories.

Established in 2009, the Australian Government's Organ and Tissue Authority coordinates the DonateLife network in partnership with state and territory governments. DonateLife teams up with eye and tissue banks, hospitals, health specialists and the community. Impressively, the first 10 years of the national DonateLife network program saw a 122 per cent increase in deceased donation rates, resulting in an 81 per cent increase in people receiving an organ transplant.

Locally, DonateLife Tasmania coordinates all organ and tissue donation activities across the state. DonateLife medical and nursing specialists provide professional donation services within hospitals and encourage best practice to increase donation rates. Such is the success of this Tasmanian team that while the 2023 national rate of consent to transplants was 55 per cent, Tasmania led the nation with an 83 per cent consent rate for families of potential organ donors.

Other DonateLife Tasmania activities include raising awareness about organ and tissue donation and offering care and support to donor families, including by facilitating community-based activities and events.

Donor remembrance services and associated media recognise the gift of organ donation with donor families which seek to promote organ and tissue donation. It was the Western Australian government that first raised concerns that the media activities of the DonateLife network had evolved between the four decade-old framework which required strict confidentiality of donor identities. In Tasmania, it was regrettably confirmed that the *Human Tissue Act* prevented DonateLife Tasmania from publishing the personal stories of deceased organ and tissue donors, even where such publication would be in accordance with the wishes of the donor's family who may wish to honour their loved one's donation in this way.

In the words of Bruce McDowell, Chairperson of Donate Families Australia, when he wrote to the premier seeking amendments to the *Human Tissue Act*:

We feel that it is a basic human right for families to be able to speak freely about their loved one as part of their healing.

Fortunately, unlike some other jurisdictions, Tasmanian donor families have not been prevented from sharing their stories personally, but these amendments acknowledge that these stories should have the full support of the Donate Life Network's resources.

Today's amendments will acknowledge the lifesaving gift of organ donors and allow families to tell their stories and commemorate their loved ones. They will also raise community awareness of and increase participation in the Australian Organ Donor Register, and further the re-harmonisation of organ and tissue donation legislation nationally.

Before moving on to describing the other amendments, I acknowledge that approximately 1800 people are on the wait list for a transplant in Australia. One organ donor can save the lives of up to seven people and help many more through eye and tissue donation. Online registration takes only a minute and can be done through the Donate Life website, myGov or the Medicare app.

In preparing these amendments, a number of other technical issues and anachronisms were identified, to which I will now speak. The act currently allows for two medical practitioners to sign off on an emergency blood transfusion for a child when no parent or guardian is able to consent to that transfusion. However, air ambulance and rescue operations have come a long way since 1985, and it is now technically possible to administer blood transfusions during remote rescue situations.

These amendments will replace the requirement for two medical practitioners to endorse the decision to give a child a lifesaving blood transfusion with a requirement for one medical practitioner and one paramedic. This reflects the crewing configuration of the aeromedical and medical retrieval services known as the air ambulance, which predominantly involve a paramedic and doctor working on a rescue helicopter in remote locations.

A further amendment to the same section clarifies that a person who is under the age of 18 and who is capable of making their own fully informed and voluntary decisions about their health, would not have their wishes overridden by anyone. It is now common for

contemporary medical practices to empower children to make informed decisions about their healthcare in order to foster trust and promote wellbeing.

In response to this evolving understanding of children's autonomy and rights, legal recognition of children providing their own consent to medical treatment is developing across Australia. Part of this process is the removal of outdated legislative barriers to persons under the age of 18 making decisions for and about themselves.

Several of the other amendments are for this purpose, including the removal of any references that assign different rights of consent to persons under the age of 18 who are married and to persons who are not married. The amendments replace these references with appropriate, capacity-based principles. A new division 7 in part 2 of the act similarly creates a framework for the use of a child's tissue for approved medical research.

The *Human Tissue Act* currently allows for the donation of blood for therapeutic, medical and scientific purposes with the consent of the adult donor or the parent of a child donor and the agreement of the child. These provisions are out of date because they do not allow a mature minor to consent to their own involvement.

The amendments are based on provisions in the equivalent Queensland legislation and will require that consent to research involving the removal of tissue from children should be sought in accordance with the National Statement of Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

The National Statement is an evidence-based protocol issued by the National Health and Medical Research Council, which is itself established under the Commonwealth Government's *National Health and Medical Research Council Act 1992*. The National Statement and thus the amendment provisions require a medical researcher to engage with the child in a manner appropriate to that child's age and maturity, articulating when freely given, the child may provide informed consent. Unlike the current *Human Tissue Act*, it makes no linkages between a child's personal autonomy and their marital status.

I commend the bill to the House.

[12.14 p.m.]

Ms HADDAD (Clark) - Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to be able to make a contribution today on the Human Tissue Amendment Bill 2024. At the outset I would like to thank the minister for the briefing that was provided to me by his office and department, and particularly for facilitating the opportunity for me to meet with Susan from DonateLife, who was able to provide me some really practical explanations around the vital need for this legislative change to take place.

As we heard the minister explain, the bill amends the *Human Tissue Act* to allow for DonateLife Tasmania, with the consent of organ donor families, to publish information that identifies organ donors for commemoration and promotional activities, and to correct other administrative and technical errors and deficiencies in the act.

As I have said in many other debates in this place, it is really important that our legislation is contemporary and modernised, and that we make appropriate changes as things in our society change. It is really important to note that these changes will mean that the next of kin of

a deceased person who has been a donor will need to consent to the disclosure or the publication of their loved one's identifying information in order for it to be published.

The bill goes on to make some other administrative changes around the ability for children under the age of 18 to give consent, recognising that you can register to be an organ donor from 16. There are also some practical changes, as we heard the minister explain, for situations like the emergency rescue of a child who needs a blood transfusion. Previously, if a parent or guardian was not available to consent to a blood transfusion, two doctors would need to be present to give permission for that child to receive a blood transfusion, which does not reflect how emergency rescues are conducted now.

It also removes human breast milk from the application of the act's donation and transplant provisions, which will support a sustainable supply of donated breast milk for babies who are born prematurely. That is another area where medical interventions have raced ahead so incredibly fast, and where babies born at premature dates who previously would not have been able to stay alive are now able to with fewer weeks of gestation.

I was born six weeks early, for example, which, back then - a long time ago, a longer time ago than I wish it were - was very early. Six weeks premature these days is probably not considered quite as early as it was back then. Donated breast milk is a really important product for babies born prematurely.

There are also some changes around compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. Those changes go to the rules around children's consent and the use of human tissue for research purposes needing to be ethics-approved.

The work that DonateLife does is very important in our state and around the country. They commemorate the lives and the gifts of donors and donor families - the loved ones of people who have passed away and donated organs. In 2021, it came to their attention that some of the activities that they were doing to support families might have technically been in breach of this act.

Similar situations are in place in other states and territories, and there is some national work, as well as work happening in other states and territories, to correct legislation, but so far only the Australian Capital Territory has moved to modernise their laws. We will be the second jurisdiction that is making the changes that are needed to make sure that the lives of donors can be celebrated and published with the consent of their surviving next of kin.

Organ and tissue donation can save and transform the lives of people who are, in many cases, seriously ill or dying. Donated organs or tissue can save and significantly improve the lives of many people.

Around 17,150 people are on waitlists around the country at the moment for organ transplants, and every person on the list has been assessed and has met eligibility requirements. People are usually on the waitlist for at least six months to four years, but some wait much longer. In addition to that number, there are a further 13,000 people who are on kidney dialysis due to kidney failure, who may need a kidney transplant in the future.

One person donating their organs means that up to seven people can have their lives saved and can come off those waitlists. Australia is internationally recognised for its successful organ

transplant programs, and the majority of people who receive transplants go on to lead full and active lives.

Transplants, as people would know, are required for a range of different conditions. People with kidney disease or kidney failure are put on dialysis. Many will need a kidney transplant later in life. People with heart failure, heart infections or other defects often will need heart transplants to survive, but additionally, heart valves can also be donated, and these are mainly used to repair genetic defects in young children and babies or to replace diseased heart valves in adults. Lung transplants are often needed by people whose lungs cannot provide enough oxygen to their bodies, such as people with cystic fibrosis or emphysema. People with liver disease, hepatitis B or C or congenital liver defects might need a liver transplant to stay alive.

The liver is a unique organ because it can regrow. An adult liver can go to another adult, or it can be made smaller and transplanted into a child where it will grow as that child grows. The liver can also be divided and transplanted into two people. Although very rare, a living person can donate part of their liver to another person, usually a parent or child.

Additionally, people who are going blind or losing their eyesight can receive donations of corneas to restore sight. This is for people who are partially blind due to corneal damage, injury or cancer. The sclera is the white part of that that surrounds the eye, and grafts of that tissue can help people who face blindness through injury or cancer.

Additionally, bone tissue can be donated, including when people are still alive. That includes tendons such as the Achilles tendons, ligaments and meniscus. Donated bone tissue can be grafted to help people who have lost bone through cancer or other diseases or accidents. Bone tissue can heal people suffering from fractures. It can strengthen hip and knee joint replacements, repair curvatures of the spine and scoliosis in children and teenagers, and can even repair teeth.

You can donate bone while you are alive, and if you are having a total hip replacement, you can agree to donate your femoral head, which can be used for bone grafts. Tendons and ligament donations are used to replace those torn or irreparably damaged, often through sporting injuries. Many professional sports people have been able to return to their sport after having a tendon or ligament transplant.

I want to share some of the stories that are on the DonateLife website. As the legislation is currently written, recipients of organ donations or tissue donations can share their stories, but not in a way that might identify their donor. The changes being made in this bill will allow DonateLife to celebrate the lives and the sacrifice of those donors. I will share a couple of the short stories that are on the DonateLife website, and I really encourage members to have a read of those stories for themselves.

Kristy is a Victorian resident who received a kidney, and she said this:

Having spent most of her teenage years battling a debilitating kidney condition, Kristy is forever grateful not only to have reached her 30th birthday, but to also have been able to have a baby. Diagnosed with IgA nephropathy at age 14, Kristy's kidneys eventually became so inflamed that they were unable to properly filter waste from her blood. At the age of 22,

her kidneys failed, and she was placed on dialysis and officially waitlisted for kidney transplant.

She said, 'I remember crying and calling my family from the tram to tell them the news. Other people on the tram heard my conversation, and when I hung up they were all congratulating me.' She is now doing well and living life to the full, and said that organ donation is truly life-changing. She said, 'I have been able to travel overseas. I get to spend time with my partner, my mum and my two sisters and I have a baby. I think about my donor and their family every day, and I want to say thank you.'

When a Victorian child, Chloe, was born, her parents, Valencia and Aaron, thought the hardest part was over. Little did they know that it was just beginning. Chloe's skin turned increasingly yellow after birth and she was diagnosed with a rare liver disease. She had surgery at six-and-a-half weeks, which was partially successful, but within a few months a common, cold caused her condition to rapidly deteriorate.

Chloe was urgently listed for a liver transplant and, thankfully, a lifesaving call came seven days later. Her mum, Valencia, said that she was once again changing in front of her eyes, but this time for the better. Her skin colour was getting fairer; her eyes were no longer yellow. Chloe is now two-and-a-half years old and she is doing incredibly well. She is very sociable and loves dancing and singing. Her parents said, 'We cannot thank our donor family enough for saving our daughter and giving her a second chance in life.'

There is a story that is shared with permission from the family of a donor, and that is the story of Carl from the Northern Territory. Carl was an avid hockey player and played for numerous high-level representative teams. He was fit, often running eight kilometres from home to hockey, then training, umpiring a game, playing a game, training again and then running eight kilometres home again. In the Northern Territory heat that would have been very challenging. He must have been a very fit young man.

Carl was helping some younger hockey players remove a snake from their change rooms one evening when, unbeknownst to him, the snake bit him on his finger. Carl started his training run and was later found collapsed. During the hospital admission, snake venom was found in Carl's bloodstream and urine. When he collapsed, he sustained a large head injury that was inoperable, and was pronounced brain dead. He was only 26 years old.

His wishes for organ and tissue donation were very clear, and family had all registered their wishes to be donors, so this decision was simple for his family, although of course not an easy one. Carl's family wanted people to know that the most important thing that can happen is for people to communicate with their family, friends and loved ones. Ask your family about their wishes and tell them yours, so that if there is a situation where they are asked, they will confidently know how to answer.

That is where I want to conclude my contribution today. I put on the record the importance of registering for organ donation. Everyone over the age of 16 can register to donate organs and tissues on the Australian Organ Donor Register. While there are thousands of people who are registered, only 2 per cent of Australians die in a way that makes it possible for them to donate their organs. That is why it is so important that people do register and talk to their family, because if you are registered when you die, organ and tissue donation will only go

ahead with the support of your family, and medical teams will not proceed with donation if your family objects.

Each year, opportunities for transplants are missed because families are not sure what to do or how their loved ones felt about donation. Often there is no malice in that challenge, but it is simply a case of the fact that that family did not have the chance to have the conversation around the wishes of their loved ones. It is important to talk to your family when you do register about your wishes when it comes to organ and tissue donation in the event of your death. It is a really sensitive and deeply personal topic to have to raise with your family, but it is such an important one, because while there are lots of people registered, people often die in circumstances that mean their organs and tissues cannot be used for donation, which is all the more reason that we need to make sure that people who do die in those circumstances can have their wishes carried out and provide organ and tissue donation.

For people who are not registered and wish to register, or for those who are but have not spoken to their family, I do recommend looking at the DonateLife website, because they have a whole page with tips about how to have those important conversations. With those comments I conclude my contribution and indicate that we will support the bill. We look forward to continuing to support the work of DonateLife.

[12.28 p.m.]

Ms ROSOL (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to make my first contribution to a bill in this place. I am pleased to say on behalf of the Greens that we will be supporting the Human Tissue Amendment Bill 2024. I want to thank the government for the briefing on this bill. It was a very short briefing, but it was quite comprehensive. For a relatively brief bill, it does quite a lot. The amendment to allow for the publication of identifying particulars of organ donors with the consent of families is obviously something we can support, and we welcome changes that allow the sharing of these people's stories. We also commend the department for making the decision to not enforce the provisions as they currently stand.

Similarly, allowing a paramedic to fulfil the role of a secondary medical practitioner in remote rescue settings is welcome, as is modernising the consent provisions in the bill, which I understand is reflective of the recent reforms made to the *Guardianship and Administration Act 1995*.

The various other amendments, including the removal of breast milk from the application of the act, and ensuring that human tissue collected under provisions of another act do not attract offences under this act, are also supported by the Greens.

Organ donations save lives. There are around 1800 Australians on the organ transplant wait list, and 14,000 people on kidney dialysis, many of whom could benefit from a transplant. In 2023, of 191,000 Australians who passed away, only 84,000 died in hospital. Of those, only 1530 were potential organ donors, and of these, requests were made of 1435, consent was granted for 793, and 513 donations were actually made to 1396 people.

This is information provided in a helpful infographic by DonateLife, and it does a good job of illustrating just how much the potential donor pool narrows down throughout the various stages. It also illustrates how we need to do everything we can not only to respect and value the contributions made by organ donors and their families but to make it easier and to encourage

the donation of organs. Hopefully, this bill can make a small but meaningful contribution towards saving lives.

The minister mentioned the ability to register online or through the Medicare app or myGov. Recent developments to make it easier to register to be an organ donor are very welcome. The Greens have argued for many years for an opt-out system for organ donations, but in saying that it is important to acknowledge the issue is more complex than it may appear on its face, and indeed there is a range of views in the medical community about this issue.

Contemporary studies on the issue are mixed. Few opt-out systems in the world only consider the opinions of the deceased and not their families. In practice, if a deceased person has not actively consented and family members object to a donation, medical practitioners are often not comfortable proceeding with the donation, even if they are legally entitled to do so.

Some studies have emphasised that because of this, the benefits of an opt-out system are largely limited to the circumstances in which the views of both the deceased and the family are not known, and have estimated the impact of this to be in the range of a potential 0-5 per cent increase in donations.

Some studies have additionally warned that swapping to an opt-out system without accompanying health system education and public awareness reforms can have a negative impact on donation rates. All of that said, many of these studies tend to suggest that if done right, there may be benefits to donation rates of an opt-out system.

To my knowledge, the last time Tasmania examined this issue was during a Legislative Council inquiry in 2007, and the issue does not appear to have formed part of the 2018 national review. Perhaps it is time to consider this matter again.

The *Human Tissue Act 1985* is quite old legislation and has not been amended since 2010, and its age clearly shows. The linking of autonomy to marital status and the assumption that a medical practitioner must be a male are two relevant examples of this.

I am curious about the updating of gendered language in this bill. I notice that clauses that are being amended for other purposes are replacing gendered language with gender-neutral language, but on my read, gendered language remains in the definition of 'senior available next of kin', as well as clauses 7, 8, 18, 25(a), 27 and 29. I assume there is a policy for updating gendered language in dated bills, but only insofar as provisions are already being amended, and I wonder if there can be some flexibility in this policy.

Obviously, if there is a minor amendment to a behemoth legislation like the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, it would be unreasonable to expect OPC to significantly increase the size of a bill just to update language, but if there are only half a dozen or so gendered references in a bill, it seems a shame to not update those as well. I would be interested in the minister's thoughts on this.

Minister, I also have some questions about the proposed amendment to section 28, which sets out that the act does not apply to the removal of tissue from the body of a person permitted under another act. I am wondering if this has been identified as an issue and I am curious whether this is an active legal issue or whether it has been identified as a change that needs to

be made for clarification purposes. Are there any particular acts that have been identified in respect of this clause?

[12.34 p.m.]

Mr WILLIE (Clark) - Thank you, honourable Speaker. I rise in memory of my father, Michael John Willie, and to express my deepest appreciation for DonateLife, who gave my family hope during a time of immense loss and grief and continues to give my family comfort. My family is one of the families that is subject to this bill and I have spoken about my father publicly. He is a man I am very proud of who has had a big influence on my life. He was very well respected in the community and very much loved by his family.

Our experience was a very positive one. I remember the nurses Guy and Verity and the absolute professionalism and the way they walked beside my mum and me at that time. I could not be more appreciative of their approach and just how respectful and open they were. I remember them very fondly. I have participated in DonateLife remembrance services and I think Davin Hibberd is still there. He does a remarkable job connecting families and celebrating the lives of our family members who gave the ultimate gift while also giving others a second chance.

In about 2017, I wrote an opinion piece and I will share that today because it captures how I valued my dad and our family's story, noting that some of the statistics are a little out of date because it is from 2017. I appreciate the minister's update that in the last 10 years the national DonateLife network program saw a 122 per cent increase in deceased donation rates resulting in an 81 per cent increase in people receiving an organ transplant. I will read this opinion piece as part of my contribution.

Of all the conversations we have in our lifetimes with those who are closest to us, none will be more difficult or as poignant as the one we must have about what to do once one of those lifetimes is over. Talking about dying is not easy. It is a conversation that fills us with trepidation, dread, and sadness, but as difficult as the conversation about what we want after our deaths may be, it is also one of the most important to have. It is about knowing what matters to other members of our family.

I have deep gratitude and will forever be grateful that I had the crucial conversation with my mum and dad. It was one of those conversations that just happened in the car one day as we were driving along. What seemed confronting to start with became a deeply enriching human experience.

I am especially thankful and always will be that we had that conversation about organ donation, because when my father passed away very suddenly four years ago, there was no question around what he would have wanted. His death, as profoundly shocking and intensely painful as it was for my family, gave my father the opportunity to offer life to others.

This week is DonateLife Week and it is designed to encourage families -my family has been part of that media campaign from time to time - husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers, and sisters, to have the conversation. Hard as it is, it is important. More than 1400 Australians are today waiting for a lifesaving or life-transforming transplant.

I note that has been updated in the contributions today. One organ and tissue donor can transform the lives of 10 or more people.

Life is made of so many moments that mean nothing. Sometimes days pass and we wonder where they went, then one day a single moment happens that seems to define every moment after that. One of those moments happened in our lives when my dad, Mike, died suddenly of an aneurysm. The shock was unthinkable and from that moment, our lives changed forever. I am not the only person to have lost a much-loved parent, but considering what happened after his death, when we became part of the DonateLife family, I am proud to tell the story of his life and what happened once that life was over to help raise awareness of organ donation. In Australia, 60 per cent of families give consent for organ and tissue donation to proceed. There is more work to be done to encourage all Australians to register their donation decision on the Australian Organ Donor Register. My dad did.

My father, Mike Willie, was born in Burnie in 1952. His dad was a returned soldier and, like many families at the time, they had their ups and downs. His family lived very modestly. He was lucky enough to win a Whitlam government studentship at the end of matriculation to study at the university in Hobart to become a teacher. It was another one of those defining moments. It was where he met my mum, who also had a studentship to train as an art teacher. As you can imagine, growing up, education was at the heart of my family's priorities. My dad loved his work. Over his lifetime, he worked in the positions of school principal, northern director of education and, at the time of his death, he was northern director of human services.

From my first memories of my dad to my last, his love for us was clear. Social justice was a driving force in his life. He was always aware of the difference the opportunity to go to university had made to his life and it was so important to him to give back. He wanted the world to be a bit fairer. It should come as no surprise, then, that organ donation was something Mum, Dad and I openly discussed. We just did not expect that conversation to become so important so quickly when he died at the age of 60. I am grateful we had those conversations. To know what Dad wanted allowed us to facilitate his wishes without a moment of doubt. Mum and I saw the donation as a way to keep his spirit of goodness alive. It seemed to make the world a bit fairer. It gave us hope at a very dark time.

For all of us, whether a recipient or donor, this experience is profound. For my mum and I, this moment made us face our fears. We learned that courage is not the absence of fear, but a triumph over it. The experience of donating Dad's organs gave us that lesson, which we now understand was a gift very early on our pathway through our grief. It was a moment that seemed to give us the tools to find a way forward. I think the seed for my career change from primary school teacher to politician came from Dad's loss. It is a way to continue his legacy. It is important to me to contribute to trying to make the world a little bit fairer, like him.

As we all know, these times are a test of courage and strength, but the harrowing experience of his passing is tempered by the fact that we had been open about his wishes, we had the conversation, and his death breathed new life into people who received his organs. encourage every Tasmanian to have the conversation. I welcome these legislative changes, appreciate the opportunity to speak about my father and, again, express my deepest appreciation for DonateLife and the work they are doing in our communities.

Members - Hear, hear.

The SPEAKER - Before calling the next member, I will say that, as a former minister, I worked closely with your father and he was one of the most respected educators I have worked with.

Mr WILLIE - Thank you.

[12.43 p.m.]

Mr BEHRAKIS (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to give a short contribution in support of this important bill. I commend the minister for bringing the bill to the House. I echo the contributions of all members on this debate and especially commend the member for Clark, Mr Willie, for his personal story about his family's experience. It brings a lot to the debate today.

Across Tasmania, tens of thousands of lives have been touched, and continue to be touched by organ and tissue donation. This includes donors and their families, and those who receive transplants and their families. This includes my own uncle, Dennis Behrakis, who, as I understand it, is Tasmania's longest surviving heart transplant recipient, having had the operation in 1988. Without a doubt, he would not be alive today if not for that.

DonateLife Tasmania coordinates all organ and tissue donation activities across the state, including important services such as raising awareness about organ and tissue donation, encouraging discussion about donation, educating health professionals about the donation process, and offering care and support to donor families. I encourage members to consider supporting DonateLife Tasmania and the critical work they do to increase awareness of organ-tissue donation across Tasmania. I also acknowledge DonateLife's medical and nursing specialists, who provide professional donation services in hospitals and encourage best practice to increase donation rates.

DonateLife has an inspiring collection of stories you can read because people are willing to share their personal experiences. I will read one of those special stories that this legislation enables to be shared. It is called *Ali's Gift* and is shared by her husband, Mark:

Ali was 32. She was my wife and devoted mother of our two beautiful children, James, 3, and Stella, 1. When she collapsed at home in the early hours and called out to me, I knew straight away something bad was happening, but I wasn't prepared for just how bad. I didn't know it at the time but Ali was suffering a brain hemorrhage. She made it to hospital and was still trying to move before being airlifted to hospital. By the time doctors were able to assess her, she had suffered a second bleed and there was nothing they could do. I was devastated, mostly for our children, who would now grow up without their mother. She loved them so very much.

Ali loved medical shows on television and made me watch them more than I liked. Because of this, I knew what was coming next: the question of organ donation. We were registered donors, but registering is the easy part. It was the hardest decision of my life. Hard because it felt like I was giving up on Ali, giving up on us and giving up on our children. Miracles happen, right? Miracles do happen, not just for our family that day.

Ali delivered a miracle to four other families whose lives have been changed forever. It has provided our family with some comfort to know that our Ali

has been able to give something so special to four very sick Australians. If she were a soldier, they would be awarding her a VC. Now Remembrance Day for me will be about remembering Ali and her life of giving to others.

I encourage members to access the DonateLife website at www.donatelife.gov.au and read some of these stories in the Book of Life. I encourage all members to consider becoming registered donors and to have the conversation with their family members about donation. I thank representatives of DonateLife Tasmania who are present today for the very special work they do. I commend the bill.

[12.46 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Minister for Health, Mental Health and Wellbeing) - Honourable Speaker, I thank all those who have spoken in this second reading debate on the Human Tissue Amendment Bill. This is a special time for our parliament where we are sharing our thoughts and views, obviously on important policy, but also on important matters where we can share a lived experience. This is precious. This is special. This is, I will not say unique, but it is exactly how a debate like this should be conducted. I commend, congratulate and thank all those who have shared their views and thoughts during this debate, particularly those with a lived experience.

I thank my shadow, Ella Haddad, who spoke comprehensively about the bill and the history of DonateLife, and showed her strong support for DonateLife, as did other members and contributors to this important legislation. Thank you for that, member for Clark, and also Cecily Rosol, Greens member for Bass. I will come to your questions shortly, but I want to commend you again for your thoughtful presentations, looking at the history going back to 1985, the amendments in 2010 and referring to the federal review. I will address the gender language questions shortly in section 28.

A special acknowledgment to the member for Clark, Josh Willie, for sharing and giving us the privilege of hearing the story of your family and of your dear dad, Michael John Willie. Thank you for sharing that. It is a story that you shared publicly in 2017 on behalf of your family. It is wonderful to know how proud you are of your dad and your family. You give wonderful support to promoting DonateLife and the merit of organ donation in the community, not just in Hobart, but around Tasmania. On behalf of the government and all of us in this Chamber, I say thank you for and congratulate you on your advocacy, because it adds a lot of weight when there is a lived experience.

Likewise, to my colleague and friend, Simon Behrakis, member for Clark, sharing about your uncle. You said he is the oldest heart transplant donor recipient. That is incredible. Thank you for sharing from your lived experience about the merit of organ donation and the merit of DonateLife, and the wonderful work that is undertaken by them and their advocates in the community. I will have more to say about that shortly. I commend each and every member who has made that contribution and back it in.

Organ donations save lives. They transform lives. Just in the last week while visiting the renal facilities just north of here. I had the privilege of meeting two local members of the community who have had a kidney transplant. It was a special privilege to spend time with them, to hear their story, to see the facilities and the services where they attend on a regular basis, and to see the wonderful advocacy they have for others in terms of getting renal services

in Tasmania. They are recipients of a kidney, and their lives have been transformed as a result. That has been very special for me.

It is a privilege and an honour to be in this role as Minister for Health, Mental Health and Wellbeing in terms of the people you meet and the feedback you get. I am absolutely delighted and honoured to be in this role where I meet such incredible people, including the healthcare workers, who are awesome as well.

There has been a call out to register to donate, I think from just about all members, which I totally concur with and support. In my second reading speech I made it clear where you can do that through the various apps - DonateLife, Medicare and MyGov. Do that.

I acknowledge all the DonateLife advocates who are in the community in Tasmania and nationwide. I thank them for their role in promoting the importance and merit of organ donation. I acknowledge Robert Manning. He is a lawyer based in Hobart and has a special interest in this space. He has communicated with me directly and has written to me a number of times over a considerable period. I acknowledge his advocacy.

I said in my second reading speech that in the first 10 years of DonateLife, the network program saw a 122 per cent increase in deceased donation rates, resulting in an 81 per cent increase in people receiving an organ transplant.

I also referred to the fact that the national rate of consent in 2023 to transplants was 55 per cent. Tasmania led the nation with an 83 per cent consent rate for families of potential organ donors. It is an impressive result for Tassie. I am pleased and proud of my fellow Tasmanians, as well.

I wanted to address the member for Bass, Cecily Rosol, and acknowledge her questions, particularly about modernising the gender references in the *Human Tissue Act*. Thank you for raising those important issues. I have taken advice, and unfortunately my department were unable to progress those reforms in this bill. It is a wider piece of work, and I advise that my department is looking at these gendered references in future miscellaneous legislation projects. There is a range of opportunities to update various pieces of legislation, not just in the justice space, but likewise in the health space. I am advised that is definitely on the agenda.

I hope that assists the member with that question. There was a question about the amendment to section 28 of the principal act, and that is for the purpose of clarifying that the removal of tissue from the body of a person that is consented to or authorised under another act will not be an offence under section 30 of the principal act.

The long and short of it is that I urge members to support this, and I appreciate that that will be the case today. I also want to indicate that DonateLife Week is 28 July to 4 August, and the Service of Remembrance in Tasmania is 16 November, so get your diaries out. I am getting the nod on that, and that is certainly something that is worthy of putting in your diaries and noting.

Thank you very much to my department representatives for the wonderful work that they do and likewise DonateLife representatives who are here in the Chamber in the adviser's reserve. I acknowledge their wonderful advocacy and work, and likewise my Department of Health. Thank you very much for your service to the people of Tasmania. It is appreciated.

In conclusion, thank you very much for the opportunity to put forward this Human Tissue Amendment Bill, and I commend it to the House.

Members - Hear, hear.

Bill read the second time.

Third Reading

Bill read the third time.

Sitting suspended from 12.57 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

FORESTRY (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS) BILL 2024 (No. 20)

Second Reading

[2.30 p.m.]

Mr ABETZ (Franklin - Minister for Business, Industry and Resources) - Honourable Speaker, I move -

That bill be read a second time.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the *Forest Practices Act 1985* (FPA) and *Private Forests Act 1994* to improve and streamline Tasmania's private forestry management arrangements and to ensure that our private forest resources are managed effectively and efficiently.

There are 11 amendments in total which can be grouped under the following three desired outcomes. First, reducing red tape and improving the efficiency of the private timber reserve application process; second, making the private forest service levy fairer and more equitable; and modernising and clarifying other aspects of legislation relating to private forests and Private Forests Tasmania (PFT).

The amendments contained in this bill enhance the management of our forests. The amendments serve to streamline processes and are in line with the Tasmanian government's policy to reduce administrative costs, reduce red tape and update what are now superseded references in the *Private Forests Act 1994*.

Apart from minor consequential amendments, legislation pertaining to private forestry has not been substantially amended or updated in 20 years. Consistent with the government's commitment to cutting red tape, the PFT board has undertaken a legislative reform project to identify miscellaneous legislative changes resulting from internal reviews and issues raised by forestry stakeholders.

A private timber reserve is private land set aside for forestry purposes registered on a landowner's title. A private timber reserve secures the right to use the land for forestry purposes in the long term. However, any forestry operations on the land are still subject to

regulation under the forest practices system. Currently a private landowner can voluntarily apply under Part 2 of the *Forest Practices Act 1985* to have their land declared as a private timber reserve.

The application is in two parts, with part 1 to be completed by the applicant or landowner and part 2 to be completed by a person authorised by the Forest Practices Authority board, providing details on vegetation cover and on any natural or cultural values on the land. Following a detailed assessment by the FPA board, the board recommends to the Governor that a private timber reserve be declared on the land.

The introduction of a new section 4ZB will bring clarity to land boundary size. A minor boundary extension will be defined as an existing private timber reserve that is proposed to increase in size by no more than 10 per cent or 40 hectares, without any part of a new boundary being within 50 metres of a neighbouring property. A minor boundary extension will be limited to one such extension every three years.

The proposal is for such an application to be assessed and determined by the FPA board in much the same way, however without requiring the public notification phase and the opportunity for objections or appeals from prescribed persons, keeping in mind this is private land. The removal of these requirements is achieved through the proposed amendments to sections 6 and 7 of the *Forest Practices Act 1985*.

Sections 10 and 11 of the *Forest Practices Act 1985* outline the process for the FPA board to recommend to the Governor that a private timber reserve be declared. Sections 13 and 14 provide a similar process for revocation of private timber reserves. There is no legal or practical reason the declaration of a private timber reserve needs to involve Her Excellency. No public policy for this extra layer of regulation could be found. The amendments focus on streamlining this process by enabling the FPA board to declare a private timber reserve. This will reduce the time it takes to process applications and result in efficiency gains for the applicant PFT and the FPA. The legal status and land use provisions that apply to the private timber reserves will not change.

The provision of compensation as outlined in section 16 of the *Forest Practices Act 1985* is repealed. More modern compensation provisions apply and are currently in force under section 41 of the *Nature Conservation Act 2002* and the *Public Land (Administration and Forests) Act 1991*. The repeal of this provision will have no practical impact on landowners and compensation for losing access to timber on their land will remain under the *Nature Conservation Act*.

The bill also clarifies and aligns the definition of forestry rights. Rights holders under the *Forestry Rights Registration Act 1990* will be recognised by the *Forest Practices Act 1985* in a similar way to rights holders under the *Forest Management Act 2013*.

Amendments to the *Private Forests Act 1994* include a suite of amendments to section 6 of that act which aim to modernise and update PFT's legislative functions. This underpins the objectives of PFT to facilitate and expand the development of the private forest resource in Tasmania in a manner which is consistent with sound forest land management practice.

Sections 25B(b) and (c) are amended by the definition of 'net area of forest operation' to remove the requirement for landowners to pay the levy where the first rotation planting is on

previously cleared ground that is non-forest. A new section 25K is inserted in Division I whereby PFT may, in such circumstances as it determines, waive all or part of a levy payable. The levy will no longer be a financial disincentive to farm foresters to establish a new plantation and will encourage the integration of more trees into the agricultural landscape.

The *Private Forests Act 1994* contains several references to 'stakeholder minister', particularly in relation to consultation requirements when drafting PFT's ministerial charter, section 19A; Corporate plan, sections 19D and E; Annual reports, section 32E; Quarterly reports, section 32G; and requiring the provision of information, section 32H. Stakeholder ministry is no longer defined in the *Government Business Enterprises Act 1995*, so removing the references from the *Private Forests Act 1994* will have no practical or legal consequences, and is considered a routine administrative tidy-up.

An outdated legislative requirement for written quarterly reports will be removed from the *Private Forest Act 1994* to enable more contemporary and flexible reporting arrangements. The formal requirements for annual reporting will remain.

Additionally, the bill will modernise the passing of PFT board resolutions without a meeting being convened to accommodate modern forms of communications such as email.

The final amendments relate to consequential amendments to the *Private Forests Act 1994*, including grammatical and spelling errors, and identified superseded legislative requirements.

Honourable Speaker, extensive consultation was undertaken during the review, undertaken by PFT, including face-to-face meetings with key stakeholder groups.

These amendments, as noted earlier, serve to improve and strengthen Tasmania's forest management arrangements in relation to private forestry and to ensure that our private forest resources are managed effectively and efficiently. This is an important bill and I thank the Office of Parliamentary Counsel for its work and the departments in delivering this bill to the parliament. I commend the bill to the House.

[2.37 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to give my contribution on the Forestry (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2024. I can indicate that Labor will be supporting the passage of this bill.

This bill, or one that is almost identical, was tabled in the last parliament, so this is part of the government's machinery-of-government process and clean-up of bills that were tabled and never went any further. It has been messing with me a little bit because I feel like I have actually debated this bill, but I do not think we have. Maybe it was a similar bill or maybe that was because I had the briefing in mind.

Dr Woodruff - It was tabled and we received a briefing, yes.

Mr Ellis - It just got started. We were about five minutes in.

Dr BROAD - Did we just get started? There you go. I could not quite get it out of my head. I thought we had done this bill but, obviously, as the former minister, Mr Ellis, indicates,

I got cracking and that was about as far as we went before that particular parliament died an untimely death.

I had a briefing on this well over a year ago, so I am going largely on memory, but from my point of view, it is largely non-controversial. This is about management of the private forest estate. As the minister has outlined in his second reading speech, this is about trying to manage the private forest resources efficiently and effectively. It is a great idea to reduce unneeded red tape. Making the forest service levy fairer and more equitable is a good thing, as is modernising and clarifying legislation as part of the general legislative clean-up that needs to happen now and then, as language and so on changes over time, as well as picking up commas, typos and outdated terminologies.

The private timber reserve program is about giving landowners certainty. That is really important and we should not underestimate it.

As the minister said, the acts around private forestry have not been amended or largely updated for 20 years, so it is about time. There has been a process of internal reviews and every now and then issues pop up, and that needs a legislative fix. A few issues are incorporated in this.

Giving private landowners certainty about being able to use the timber resource on their properties some time down the track as a resource and income stream means they can plan. I know that some landowners can think about the best timing for harvesting the resource with that certainty. At the moment, we are seeing quite a lot of private resource being harvested in Tasmania. Unfortunately, it seems that a lot of that resource is on trucks heading to the mainland, which is something we probably do not want to see. However, this is private land, and private landowners have the right to deal with products from their own properties in the manner they see fit. Trying to limit what property owners can do with trees on their land would not necessarily be a good thing. The equivalent would be telling a cattle farmer where he could sell his cattle, whether they could go across Bass Strait or whether you could take a load of onions across the strait. While trees obviously take a lot longer to grow than a paddock of onions or a cow, the same principle applies.

We also have to recognise that the Tasmania's forest practices system is a good one. It is world-recognised. This is only a very minor update to our forest practices system, which is, to a large degree, world leading.

I will go through some of the issues this bill covers. I do not see a need for the board to have to recommend to the Governor to sign off on a private timber reserve. That is administratively burdensome and the Governor has better things to do than be part of the administration of private timber reserves. That is a good amendment. As the minister noted in his second reading, it will make things a bit speedier and it is a much better process.

No doubt there will be some commentary from the Greens about minor boundary extensions. From memory - and maybe the minister can clarify - there had been some issues. It was administratively difficult to do minor boundary adjustments to private timber reserves. You might need a minor boundary extension for a number of reasons. It might be because the surveying was wrong, that you are closer to the boundary than you assumed, or that the timber resource is actually a bit better if you move it that way a little bit. From what I recall from the

briefing, if you wanted to make that minor extension, it was almost like going through exactly the same process again. That is not a good idea for a minor extension.

We will probably have some debate around what constitutes a minor extension. I would argue that 10 per cent is a minor extension, bearing in mind that there is a cap on that of 40 hectares. If you have over 400 hectares in a private timber reserve, 40 hectares is a minor extension because you have a lot of timber set aside there. I will hold off on making any comments until we start debating some amendments the Greens have already flagged, which I do not have an official copy of but I have seen.

Minor boundary extensions are limited to one every three years. Again, we will have some debate around that. This is not about creep, about massively expanding the private forest estate. If you want to capture all the trees on your land, you could do that with the first application. It is more about those minor adjustments. If you are dealing with areas of land, I am not sure of the surveying that is required to actually sign off on a private timber reserve. I imagine it might not be down to the level you would need if you were doing a subdivision, but there might be some errors in the boundary. It might not consider topography as well as it could, and therefore minor extensions - there may be more than one needed when you actually have a bit of a closer look at the estate.

In summing up, the minister might be able to give some general comments about the situations where multiple minor boundary extensions may be required, and no doubt we will probably get to that in the debate on the amendment that the Greens have put on the table.

I know that logging next to boundaries can be a very contentious issue, so the minor boundary extension being limited to being not within 50 metres of a neighbouring property gives a little bit of a buffer. I know that former Greens member, Paul O'Halloran, came into this place and raised at length the issue that he faced on his own property where the neighbouring forestry operation cut down trees on his land. I know from my own experience on my parent's farm that where the fence is does not necessarily represent where the boundary really is. I know that on the farm where I grew up, the real boundary around the bush on our property was actually about 10 to 15 metres into the dairy farm next door, but we never corrected the fence.

That is quite common in agricultural properties, and indeed it is common on roadsides, for example, to find that people's sheds are in the road reserve. That happens more than you think. Boundaries are not exactly accurate at times and where somebody thinks the boundary is might not be the boundary. Having a 50-metre buffer is a good thing, bearing in mind that there have been mistakes in the past. You probably want to get your boundaries surveyed properly if you are going to log right up to the boundary of the bush on your farm or property, because you do not want to be cutting down trees on the neighbouring property.

We will have a bit of a debate as well about appeals from prescribed persons. One of the amendments that the Greens will be bringing forward is to widen the scope, which I do not think we will support. I will listen to the argument, but I have a bit of an idea where that one is going to go. As I said, there is no real legal or practical reason the Governor needs to be involved in declaring private timber reserves.

With the removal of compensation provisions in section 6 of the *Forest Practices Act*, I imagine, from memory, that was about potentially having legislative clashes, so it is easier

just to remove it from the *Forest Practices Act* and use the compensation mechanisms that are in the *Nature Conservation Act*. There was an issue raised in court involving the former member, Mr Tucker, but that was an unrelated issue where there was a clash between the *Nature Conservation Act* and another act; I cannot remember which. That was not dealing with this, and that was certainly clarified in the briefing that I had last year.

It is also good that the bill clarifies and aligns the definition of forestry rights. It is good to give people certainty. We do not want any disincentives for establishing private forest reserves, and one disincentive was that you would have to pay a levy on the first rotation planting even if that was previously non-forest land or farmland. We do not want any disincentives. Having more trees in the landscape is a good thing. There are areas of properties whose best use is probably growing trees. The last thing there should be is a disincentive that a landowner would have to pay a levy on the first rotation planting on previously cleared ground.

It is reasonable as well for the act to include a provision to waive all or part of the levy payable. We have seen some examples where there was probably not an ideal outcome, like after bushfires and so on. I am sure the minister could probably produce a couple of examples of where not paying a levy would actually be a justifiable outcome. I will ask the minister to maybe give one or two examples of where waiving the levy would be in the best interests of fairness.

Going through the other issues - removing a stakeholder minister, obviously there is no problem with that. There is no practical or legal consequence; it is a routine administrative tidy-up.

Modernising the way that the PFT board resolutions are conducted and meetings conducted, for example by using communication such as email, is a good thing. The world has moved on a little bit since 1994; things have changed a lot, even with Zoom meetings and other modern forms of communication. We are not talking about letter writing like we did in the past.

In the clause notes it says about dealing with waiving the levy, 'there have been several occasions where PFT has been requested to waive the payment of the levy based on a range of circumstances, such as the devastating bush fires in 2019 or personal hardship'. If the minister could give a couple of practical examples - I have absolutely no problem with that, but it would be good to have on the record the sorts of circumstances that may come into play.

That is what I have to say about the substance of the bill, but I would like to point out how important the private forest estate is in Tasmania. There are large areas of Tasmania that are, in effect, a private forest estate. They have a significant role to play in the Tasmanian forest industry. With the current transition in the forest industry that we are seeing, where there is less timber, especially high-quality timber, available in the public native forest estate, the private forest sector will have more of a role to play. It is the same with plantations.

What we are seeing now is that transition. It would be great to see that Tasmanian timber value added in Tasmania instead of some of those private forests ending up on log trucks heading to Victoria. It is important. We will probably have a philosophical clash with the Greens on the next point that I am going to make, but coming from a farming background, I think of areas of bush on properties as a resource. It can be seen as a crop, but on a long rotation.

From my own personal experience, in about 1996 and 1997, my parents had the area of remnant bush on our property logged, and the vast majority of that was saw log. My parents actually made enough money out of that to buy a property in Burnie, where my father now lives. It can be an asset that can be realised. It can be an asset that the forest practices process ensures is managed in a sustainable way. You cannot log it and convert it to pasture. It is all about forestry, so it will be coming into another rotation. The bush that we got logged is currently growing. It is 30 years later, and in another 30 years' time it could probably be harvested again.

At the same time, the neighbour took advantage of us logging the remnant bush. They also got the remnant bush that was on the other side of the boundary logged, and it was a good outcome for both families. It helped my parents retiring and moving on from farming. That is the way that these private timber reserves can give people in regional community some certainty around the timing of when the asset is realised and when the property is logged. That means that it can be used in a number of ways, such as to use that money to invest in other infrastructure. I know people who have had forests harvested and then have used that money to put in centre pivots or irrigation infrastructure or dams. Other people have used it as part of the process of bringing on the next generation as a part of their succession plan, while others have used it to manage cash flow in poor years and so on. It is essential that property owners have some certainty around an asset on their property and their ability to harvest those trees sometime down the track.

With those general comments, I would like to highlight that Labor once again will be supporting what is largely an administrative clean-up of acts related to private forest reserves. I commend the department for their work and for their briefing, although it was last year - I cannot remember exactly who did it, and I have lost my notes - but if the minister could add some comment along the way, we will probably deal with some more issues on the amendments the Greens are proposing.

[2.59 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin - Leader of the Greens) - We recognise that parts of this Forestry (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill are administrative in nature and are reasonable, but we are coming at this from a completely different frame. Where it stands out very starkly is the comments by the minister about the purpose for these changes, which is to ensure that our private forest resources are managed effectively and efficiently. Dr Broad made similar comments about private lands and private timber reserves needing to be effective and efficient resources.

Where is protection in there? Interestingly, in the second reading speech and the comments by both Labor and Liberal, we see exactly the same language and approach that we saw just the other day in the racing bill. Without going back and speaking to a past order of the day, I can say that one of the functions and powers within that bill was to have an 'effective and efficient' racing industry. The racing industry is based on using animals to either make profit or for pleasure, depending on your point of view. There was nothing in there about the protection of the animals that are the basis for the functioning of the racing industry. We tried to insert the word 'humane' but both Labor and Liberal removed that.

Here we are today and we have the same approach writ large in relation to native forests in Tasmania. Whether they are on private or public land, all these forests were stolen from the Tasmanian Aboriginal people, the palawa/pakana. They are all lands that are gifted to us in

Tasmania to care for, now and for future generations. It is very disturbing to see that there is nothing in this bill which talks about the protection of natural living ecosystems that are a patchwork across the landscape. That is one of the biggest concerns we have.

What both the minister and Dr Broad talked about as minor changes could in fact be tens of hectares or more, depending on the size of the original reserve estate, and within that there is likely to be a range of species that are threatened, rare, endangered or even critically endangered. We know this from first principles, because applications are made for private timber reserves and such species are found on them. Areas on the application are at times rejected, or the size of the private timber reserve is adjusted on the basis of the quality and the critical habitat that exists within the footprint that is intended to be a private timber reserve.

By the same principle, then, you would see that a whole range of other plants of an unknown quality, an unknown type, that would be included as a minor boundary extension, and this bill would seek to have an extension of that of up to 10 per cent of the existing reserve area for use to be cleared and there would not have to be any additional assessment done at that point, so what might seem like a paper extension, a small administrative red tape matter can represent, across multiple private timber reserves, a substantial increase in threat to the survival of a whole range of critically endangered, endangered, rare and threatened species in Tasmania.

This is so important. We have such limited opportunities for people in the community to be consulted about private timber reserves, to be notified or to have an opportunity for appeal already, yet this bill would seek to narrow that limited range even further. Stakeholders such as the Environmental Defenders Office, the Tasmanian Conservation Trust, Bird Life Australia and Bird Life Tasmania have all made the point that we already have such limited opportunities for the breadth of community to have a say and this limits it even more.

I noted a few things of interest in Mr Abetz's second reading speech. I had a copy that was from last year because this bill, as Dr Broad said, started being debated last year. I noticed when Minister Abetz was making his speech, as I was tracking my eyes down, that it had been changed. The sentence last year said:

The proposal is for an application to be assessed and determined by the FPA board in much the same way; however, without requiring the public notification phase and the opportunity for objections or appeal from prescribed persons.

The SPEAKER - Just to clarify, the speech as circulated was the one that was given by the minister. You are referring to a previous second reading speech.

Dr WOODRUFF - I am referring to the speech that was tabled as the second reading speech last year with the bill when it was tabled.

The SPEAKER - As opposed to the tabling of this one, but you are not saying that the minister read something that was not in the second reading speech that was shared.

Dr WOODRUFF - I am saying that there is a different second reading speech that has been provided to members.

The SPEAKER - That is all I was checking on.

Dr WOODRUFF - Yes, there is nothing untoward here. It is simply the case that there has been a change in ministers since the last time this bill was tabled, and now we have a new minister, Mr Abetz. At the end of that sentence the words were 'and the opportunity for objections or appeals from prescribed persons', but Mr Abetz added in the words, 'keeping in mind this is private land'. I see so much behind those words in the context of this bill, which is really harking back to the days where landowners ought to be able to do whatever they want on their own land because, 'Goodness me, it is my land and I am allowed to do whatever I want.'

We have a completely different world to the 19th and 20th centuries. Here we are at a point in time where there is a global biodiversity crisis, and there is no doubt that that is also playing out in Tasmania and we can see that the critically endangered swift parrot has such a short time horizon under Liberal and Labor policies. They are both on a unity ticket to take away habitat which is essential across the landscape for the swift parrot. We have many other examples, with the masked owl being logged out of its habitat right now in the Arthur River, the Frankland area of the takayna region. We have the beautiful blue giant freshwater crayfish also under threat because of forestry practices. Habitat is being removed on private and public land, and the capacity for animals to survive in a heating environment under climate change is getting harder and harder.

Dr Broad and Mr Abetz would both agree that there is a fight here between the right to do what you want on your private land and the Greens' perspective, which is that we are fighting for future generations. We are fighting to have habitable and intact ecosystems, healthy functioning ecosystems that have a plethora of animals and plants. The beauty of nature that we have in Tasmania is like nowhere else on earth. That is what we are fighting to keep, and part of that struggle is to keep a mosaic across the landscape.

One thing that is never assessed under Forest Practice Authority assessments is the cumulative impact of the removal of particular species. I draw members to the comments made by BirdLife Australia and BirdLife Tasmania. I thank Karen Dick, the convener of BirdLife Tasmania, and Lyndel Wilson, from Terrestrial Birds, BirdLife Australia, for putting pen to paper on this bill. They both hold serious concerns that the proposed changes could lead to significant incremental and cumulative environmental impacts on native bird habitat, as well as the reduced opportunities for public scrutiny about those impacts. They make the point that native forests, private or public, are not wood resources. They are living ecosystems. They are places for extraordinary birds, birds that are under threat. It is not just the iconic birds like the masked owl and the swift parrot; all manner of what we have come to think of as common birds in Tasmania are increasingly threatened. Our own endemic species are also increasingly under pressure. BirdLife Tasmania talks about the death by 1000 cuts, and that is exactly our problem with this legislation.

Having vegetation patches in proximity to each other is critically important for birds moving across the landscape. The mosaic in Tasmania at the moment is very fractured. We need to expand that, to fatten it up, not cut away at it even further. I learned about this from talking with members of the community and esteemed Tasmanian ornithologists around the Westbury Reserve. They made the point that Forico, which has the plantation across from Westbury Reserve, was supportive and understood the need to have a diversity of bird habitat and species to make sure it was not impacting on birds being able to move across the landscape.

If there is a road, if there is a wide area, small birds do not fly across it. They need to travel across small spaces, otherwise they will not travel at all. Every time you have cuts and

removal of this habitat, it makes it less likely that the small bird species will fly between one footprint area and another. They can fly distances, but they will not do it because of the threat of being killed by a raptor or other big bird. As a result, they stay within their little enclaves, and the enclaves get smaller, the genetic diversity of the bird population in that area is diminished and it makes them more vulnerable to infection and more likely to disappear in that area. They do not have resilience.

We are asking on behalf of Tasmanians: why would we not want to have a conversation about how a private landowner can, without any assessment, increase the area of land that can be logged, clear-felled, taken away altogether, up to 40 hectares - it was 50 hectares in the draft? The connectivity of landscapes and habitat buffers that currently exist between remnant vegetation and private timber reserves will be threatened, with impacts on a scale beyond 100 metres of reserve boundaries. Retaining remnant native forests and connectivity for biodiversity is a conservation priority. This is BirdLife Tasmania's view.

BirdLife Tasmania is also concerned at restricting the right to object to 'prescribed persons', meaning that there is no potential for the objection of anyone else concerned or affected in a broader landscape context. Dr Broad asked what our concerns were. We will be moving amendments to this bill. They have been circulated electronically. Members now have a copy of them. We will be seeking to remove 'prescribed' because, at the moment, it would be just a tiny group of people who have the privilege under this legislation constructed by the Liberal and Labor Party, supported by both. That is simply state authority, local council or the neighbour of a property, and anyone else with a legal or financial interest in the property seeking to become a private timber reserve. That is the case for making an application about a private timber reserve. What this bill does is completely remove all those people. It removes the neighbour, so an application for a boundary extension, that is my reading of it.

Dr BROAD - Are you saying a neighbour is not a prescribed person?

Dr WOODRUFF - Not in the legislation. At the moment section 7 has 'prescribed person' being a local authority, a state authority, a person with a legal or equitable interest and an owner of the land. Section 7 in the bill is to amend section 7 in the *Forest Practices Act* to remove 'prescribed person' and to insert 'other than for a minor boundary extension' after 'reserve'. Whether it is for an initial application or an extension, there should be the widest group of people in Tasmania able to make a comment on an application - bodies like BirdLife Tasmania. It relies on a neighbour having an understanding about the quality of the vegetation. Who else will speak up about cumulative impacts? Certainly not the local council, not the state government, not the person who is lodging the application.

The Forest Practices Authority has no mandate to look at cumulative impacts. It is just going to look with a narrow lens at the species on that land, but not take account of the bigger picture of Tasmania. Who will be speaking for the animals, particularly the birds, affected by the cumulative impact of the loss of forests and the connectivity of forests in the landscape? No one, in all likelihood.

It is not just the local neighbours but the ones downstream who are affected by the impacts on the water resource and impacts on animals like the giant blue lobster living downstream. The siltation of rivers has meant, because of forestry and clear-felling, that in parts of the north-west and north of Tasmania these giant blue lobsters have stopped breeding

in the upper reaches of rivers because they are not able to do that in silted waters, and waters are now silted up.

There is a whole myriad of impacts that are much wider than just the neighbour, and much wider than the lens that the Forest Practices Authority has the mandate to speak within.

The Environment Defenders Office (EDO) also makes the point that the changes in this bill are inconsistent with the United Nations recognition of our right as humans to a healthy environment. Australia has voted in favour of the resolution to allow people to have a safe and healthy environment. Tasmania does not have a charter of human rights. The Greens have long believed and fought for, and will continue to fight for, a charter of human rights in Tasmania but our environmental and resource management laws should play a huge role in recognising and giving effect to that human right to have a healthy and safe environment.

One of the critical mechanisms for people to be able to secure a healthy environment, which I would hope all members can agree is a basis that every person should have a right to hold, is to be able to participate in government decision-making about the environment and to make sure that their views are listened to in the process of decision-making.

We ask again, and it will be the basis of our amendment: why would we not open it up for other people to have a say, to lodge an objection, if they have one, or to make a comment in relation to a private timber reserve and/or an extension of one?

This bill makes the situation worse because it reduces the opportunities for this narrow group of prescribed persons - a group prescribed in the act - to make objections to boundary extensions. They can do it on the original application but not on the extension.

The EDO's view is that the bill should be seeking to broaden the scope for public comment and appeal rights relating to the approval of private timber reserves. That could include, for example, removing the limitation of objections for private timber reserves to be made by only prescribed persons, which is something our amendment seeks to do, and revoking subsection 7(2)(ab), which severely limits the grounds of objection from neighbouring landholders. Subsection 7(2)(ab) is again a prescribed person, but a prescribed person who, in terms of an objection, is limited to only making comments.

As it currently is, a neighbour under the act is limited to only making comments in relation to an application if they would be directly and materially disadvantaged if the application were granted. They are not able to make comment about whether the application has been made honestly and in good faith, or whether it is suitable to be declared as a private timber reserve, or whether the person who has legal interest in the land would be disadvantaged if the application was granted. They are not able to comment on whether it would be in the public interest to grant the application. As it currently stands, neighbours cannot do that; only the state government and local councils are able to do that. It is unjust and unreasonable that a neighbour cannot comment on those other things and those other bodies can.

The EDO also thinks that section 8(2)(a) of the act should also be revoked, which is about the granting or refusal of an application for declaring land as a private timber reserve. Section 8(2)(a) relates to whether a planning scheme or special planning order made within the meaning of, or for the purposes of, the *Land Use Planning Act* requires the owner of any land to obtain a permit or other form of approval from a council in order to establish forests or grow or harvest

timber on the land. The EDO is of the view that such land use planning laws can effectively prohibit forestry on certain land.

Old habits die hard. I have a few minutes left and I want to make some of our other comments on the act. There is a strong view from the stakeholders I have mentioned - the Tasmanian Conservation Trust (TCT), EDO and Bird Life Tasmania - that there would be a limit on the number of occasions a person can make a minor boundary extension so that the provisions are not used multiple times by a proponent to evade objections and appeals for what could become, ultimately and cumulatively, a much larger private timber reserve extension.

I recognise that between the drafting of the bill and public consultation, and where it is now, some of the comments in the consultation process were taken on board. The original draft bill was for boundary extensions being able to be 10 per cent or up to 50 hectares, and the current bill is up to 40 hectares. The current bill limits the ability to use the process of a minor boundary extension for a private timber reserve to once every three years as opposed to an unlimited amount of time. We agree with and support those changes that were made.

We have heard a lot of comments from Liberal and Labor members about the proportion of Tasmanian forests in reserve. We do not hear much about the proportion in private or public ownership. According to the United Nations, 22 per cent of the world's forests are privately owned. In Tasmania, according to Private Forest Tasmania's annual report, 32.7 per cent of the state's total forest area is privately owned, and 27.5 per cent of the state's native forest area is privately owned so, 183,034 hectares of native forest are in private timber reserves. That is 22 per cent of privately owned native forests. This compares to approximately 108,380 hectares in conservation covenants, which is 13 per cent.

The current trend in Tasmania, alarmingly, is for a greater hectareage of private timber reserve to be revoked each year than the number of reserves that are declared as covenant reserves. That has not been an advantage for the environment. The environment is not winning here. Between 2015 and 2020, 67 per cent of revoked reserves were converted to pasture or agriculture. I heard Dr Broad's comments about his own family. Too often - the majority of the time - it is not the case that when reserves are revoked, they end up being regrown as forest. Some 67 per cent were converted to pasture agriculture. That is a very big loss of forested landscape.

Mr Abetz - They were the plantations you opposed.

Dr WOODRUFF - I beg your pardon? No. This is in relation to private timber. This is in relation to privately owned land. Some 10 per cent were harvested without any intent to replant. Only 4 per cent were entered into conservation covenants, so we are losing forest overall in Tasmania and in a biodiversity crisis, that is deeply concerning. We need to be growing and expanding. We need to have greater checks on areas that are being deforested, we need to have a proper Forest Practices Authority assessment which includes cumulative impacts across the landscape that does not look at isolated patches of land and does not look at single species within that area without looking at what is happening elsewhere.

I am flagging that I have amendments I will be moving in the committee stage of the bill. Having already circulated them, we hope there is some agreement from members to strike a balance here because the bill as it stands is not standing up for the environment, but for private ownership and the right to do whatever you want on your land. As parliamentarians, we believe

we need to be looking out for the whole of Tasmania, all of lutruwita, now and into the future and all of the special beautiful species that live here and nowhere else on Earth and make sure they are with us in those future years too.

[3.29 p.m.]

Mr ABETZ - I thank members for their contributions. First of all, in relation to the matters raised by the member for Braddon, Dr Broad, thank you for reminding me that I should have thanked the former minister in this area, Felix Ellis, for his contribution in developing this bill, so thank you for that and thank you for Labor's support.

In relation to the minor adjustment that I was asked about, the local council, relevant government authorities and entities with interests in the land will be able to make representations in relation to the minor adjustment. I was asked where and how the board would need to waive the private forest service levy, one that Dr Broad hit upon, which is absolutely right. Where a wood estate has been substantially damaged by fire and the return is therefore substantially less, providing the board with that discretion is appropriate. At the moment the board does not have that discretion for personal hardship, whatever that might be, keeping in mind that the levy does go back to the board, so the board has a degree of self-interest in ensuring that they collect the levy, but they also have a realistic approach that if this is about helping and growing the forest estate in Tasmania, we have to make it attractive and congratulations to the board for seeing and promoting that.

In relation to the Greens contribution by Dr Woodruff, I note what she said. There was nothing new in what was presented; the ideology is the same. I sought to spare the House in relation to my initial contribution from dealing with all the factors about the importance of forestry and how good it is, but I simply remind the House and those listening that wood is renewable, reusable, recyclable and at the end of the day it is biodegradable, and when it is in storage like here, it is actually a carbon sink. If you are talking about carbon in the atmosphere, when we harvest trees and use the wood for building and other purposes, it is actually a carbon sink. Then, as we do in Tasmania, for every tree that is harvested, we do a plant another tree.

Dr Woodruff was correct when she said that the Greens approach this from a completely different frame. That is the case, and I make no apologies that as a Liberal, I start off with a proposition that private property is called private for a reason. It is private. People have worked hard to purchase the land, achieve the land, and it is for them to determine, within limitations, what they do with it. Is this letter correct? No, it is not, because the Forest Practices Authority will determine whether somebody can harvest on their own private land. It is a matter of sensible balance.

The Greens leader also asked - rhetorically, one suspects - where is the protection? The forest protection authority does the assessment.

Mr BAYLEY - There is no such thing as a forest protection authority, minister.

Mr ABETZ - The Forest Practices Authority - thank you very much. I was wondering what word I had used. It does the same thing. Quite frankly, this is the sort of immature interjections in the debate, when you accidentally get the name wrong and somehow that is the end of the world. This is about the same authority doing the work of making the assessments.

Dr WOODRUFF - It's ironic that it was the word 'protection'.

Mr ABETZ - This is private land. We talk about fighting for future generations, I still recall when I was forestry minister at the federal level paying a visit to Indonesia with the Indonesian minister for forestry, who was absolutely delighted that Indonesian timber was used for the London Olympics. Do you know what had happened? Tasmanian timber was destined for the London Olympics and people with a particular green tinge went over to London to ensure the Tasmanian timber, with all its practices, would not be used and instead Indonesian timber was used. I ask rhetorically: does anybody honestly believe in this Chamber that Indonesia has more robust forest practices than we do in Tasmania?

Dr WOODRUFF - Certainly no worse.

Mr ABETZ - I hope that Hansard has recorded that, because when I used to ask in the Senate if the Greens could please advise where they do forestry anywhere in the world better than in Tasmania, it was crickets. I used to put my hand to my ear to try to hear the interjections. Have you noticed how all of a sudden, thankfully, they have gone exceptionally silent?

Mr BAYLEY - Try New Zealand - plantation only.

Mr ABETZ - When Dr Bob Brown was a senator, he was foolish enough to make exactly that interjection. It is a pity we are not allowed Dorothy Dixers here anymore because we had allowed them in the Senate. I got myself a Dorothy Dixier in the Senate and I was able to disabuse the good senator, Dr Bob Brown, of that view and reminded him of the huge amounts of 1080 poisoning that New Zealand forestry use in comparison to the 1 kilogram in Tasmania. We used about 1 kilogram compared to their 1 tonne of 1080.

Mr BAYLEY - Minister, do they use them on native species?

Mr ABETZ - According to the Greens, and we have now had it backed in by Mr Bayley, the member for Clark, the extra use of 1080 is part and parcel of a better forestry practice. Well done.

Mr BAYLEY - I did not say that, minister.

Mr ABETZ - It is now on the record.

Dr WOODRUFF - What is on the record is that you are a science denier and you are not listening to the science on this matter and that is the point. If you want to interject, we will give it back to you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff.

Mr ABETZ - How can I be interjecting when I am on my feet? This is indicative of the mindset that the Leader of the Greens controls the -

Members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER - Minister, I appreciate it is Thursday and we are all very excited because we have a few weeks off. I do ask everyone to be relevant to the bill that is before us and to stick to what is before us. We have to remember that the second reading

speeches can be used in the future as well. I ask the minister to sum up, and ask all other members to let the interjections cease.

Mr ABETZ - Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I trust that my contribution is not deemed as an interjection. I was summing up and seeking to deal with some of the interjections that were coming my way.

We were told that the United Nations requires that we have a healthy environment. Tasmania has about the best healthy environment in the world, and especially if you go up to Braddon on the north-west coast, they have the cleanest air and the cleanest rain that falls from the sky. We have a wonderful state. The sad thing is, with all the wonderful heritage that we have from the wonderful management by our forebears, we have people in this place and elsewhere seeking to trash that reputation and - let me use the term correctly - 'deny' the reality, which is that we have the cleanest air and the cleanest rainwater in the world, and that is something that we ought to be celebrating.

We have adequate reserves. Dealing with this matter, I indicate that the minor adjustments are exactly that - minor adjustments. The initial assessment has already been undertaken to ensure that all the requirements of the Forest Practices Authority are abided by to ensure that we have good sustainable forestry.

In relation to the neighbour, there is now the added protection of the 50-metre buffer. That is something that I would invite honourable members to consider.

The other matter is in relation to objections lodged. Since 2010, there have been 164 applications for new PTRs. On only three of these occasions has the local council made a formal objection to the application. On two of those occasions, the objections were eventually withdrawn and the PTRs were approved. On the third occasion, the objection was not withdrawn - the PTR application was approved, but the local council chose not to appeal the approval. During the same period, three neighbours made objections. On all three occasions, the PTR was approved, but the neighbours chose not to appeal the decision.

On all occasions where objections were received, none were for applications that fitted the minor boundary extension definition in the proposed changes. In other words, even with the proposed changes implemented, the above-mentioned objectors would still have had the opportunity to object.

With those words, I commend the bill to the House.

Bill read the second time.

In Committee

Clauses 1 to 4 agreed to.

Clause 5-

Section 4ZB inserted

Dr WOODRUFF - The Greens have an amendment to clause 5, which I will read.

Page 4, clause 5, proposed new section 4ZB(1). In the definition of 'minor boundary extension', paragraph (a), subparagraph (i), leave out '10 per cent' and insert instead '5 per cent'.

The Greens are already concerned at the capacity of the Forest Practices Authority to be empowered to do the proper assessment that they need to do on these private timber reserve lands. We are very concerned at the idea that there would be an extension of land that would not be subject to that. We think that 10 per cent is very large. We have had feedback from the Tasmanian Conservation Trust that they could understand why an argument could be made for a smaller amount than that - 5 per cent is the amount that has been proposed.

The amendment is that to reduce 10 per cent to 5 per cent, recognising that the amount that has been set at 40 hectares could be a substantial amount. That is the amendment: to seek to reduce it to a 5 per cent boundary extension without a further application needing to be lodged.

Dr BROAD - The Greens have brought this amendment. That was not a very extensive justification for this amendment. One thing we should probably get on the record from the Greens is the answer to a question, which is: are private timber reserves a good thing or a bad thing? That is a premise that we need to get clear, because it seems to me from the contributions from the Leader of the Greens, Dr Woodruff, that it appears that private timber reserves might be a bad thing.

The wild private timber reserves give some certainty to a landholder around some things that they can do on a private timber reserve area, but there are also some things that they cannot do. For example, you cannot clear it for agriculture. This thing works both ways. I wonder if the Leader of the Greens would make a comment on whether private timber reserves are a good thing or a bad thing?

We are getting into an area of poor definitions and semantics. What is 'minor'? The bill says that 10 per cent is minor, but the Greens are saying that 5 per cent is minor. When we come to think about that, the maximum that it can be is 40 hectares. Now 40 hectares seems like a lot of land, bearing in mind that if you are doing a 10 per cent extension that is 40 hectares, then the private timber reserve is already 400 hectares, so in reality, 40 hectares compared to 400 hectares is minor. What the Greens are saying is that the maximum should be 5 per cent. I do not think they are doing a definition change to limit that to 40 hectares, so if a private timber reserve was 800 hectares, then even with this amendment they could still get to that 40-hectare threshold.

10 per cent is a minor boundary extension and we are better off leaving it as drafted rather than getting down to 10 per cent being better than 5 per cent, or 5 per cent is better than 10 per cent. The Greens did not justify this amendment, apart from the fact that it seems limiting the extension of private timber reserves is the aim, and I am not sure why.

Mr ABETZ - The government opposes the amendment. Anything that helps to enhance and extend private timber reserves might be something that is welcomed by those who talk about the need for a forest and timber estate to help us clean up the atmosphere. Why you would seek to put frustration and obstacles in the way defies any genuine explanation other than if you have an ideology which is opposed to anything to do with forestry.

In anybody's definition, it is appropriate to call 10 per cent minor. Five per cent would be even less, but with minor, as Dr Broad outlined, you have a total of 40 hectares. The 10 per cent cannot be more than 40 hectares in any particular circumstance.

It appears that the amendments the Greens are seeking to move are just designed to frustrate and make landholders less likely to convert some of their property to private timber reserves and, quite frankly, I do not get the rationale for that. We will be opposing the amendment.

Dr WOODRUFF - Just to clear up the record, since Dr Broad is confused about the Greens position on this, which is unfortunate. The Greens do not have any confidence in the Forest Practices Code as it stands. The Forest Practices Code is not protecting the natural environment. In no way is it doing that. A private timber reserve is effectively a private timber coupe. Mr Abetz is asking why the Greens would not support this - because we want to reduce the amount of carbon in the atmosphere. A private timber coupe is the same as a Forestry Tasmania coupe. If it is clear-felled it is releasing, depending on the size, tens, hundreds or millions of tonnes of carbon into the atmosphere. That is hardly desirable in a climate crisis. Unless you do not think there is a climate crisis, you would be wanting to do everything you could to keep the stores of carbon in forests across the Tasmanian landscape intact. You could have a private conservation covenant; that would be doing what minister Abetz is saying the Greens would be wanting. That is the correct thing to do in a climate crisis and a biodiversity crisis.

I do not think we are going to achieve agreement on this. Clearly, there is a refusal to understand. The reason that we are concerned about a boundary extension of 10 per cent is that it can be enormous. It is not minor in a planning sense to have a 10 per cent increase. That is a substantial amount, so it should be something which goes to an assessment process. This does not say that it should not be approved, it just says that it does not have to go through any process of assessment for environmental impacts. That is a problem. It is not that the boundary adjustments cannot happen, it is that the boundary adjustments under this are happening without anybody in the community having an opportunity to have their say, without any notification to the wider community and without any assessment of the environmental impacts that that boundary extension will have.

The DEPUTY CHAIR (Mr Behrakis) - The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 7

Ms Badger
Mr Bayley
Ms Burnet
Mr Garland
Ms Johnston
Ms Rosol (Teller)
Dr Woodruff

NOES 25

Mr Abetz
Mr Barnett
Mrs Beswick
Dr Broad
Ms Brown
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Mr Ellis
Mr Fairs

Mr Ferguson
Ms Finlay
Ms Howlett
Mr Jaensch
Mr Jenner
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms Ogilvie
Mrs Pentland (Teller)
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Ms White
Mr Willie
Mr Winter
Mr Wood

Amendment negatived.

Dr WOODRUFF - In relation to the same clause, I move -

Page 4, clause 5, proposed new Section 4ZB, subsection (2). Leave out 'in the previous three years'.

Proposed new section 4ZB is a new section that is being inserted into the act, because the purpose of the bill is to have these minor boundary extensions. The question is how often will those minor boundary extensions be allowed? Where the bill has landed in subsection (2) is:

An extension to a boundary of a private timber reserve that would, but for this subsection, be a minor boundary extension is not a minor boundary extension for the purposes of this Part if an application for a minor boundary extension of that reserve has been approved in the previous 3 years.

We are happy that the bill that we have before us has moved somewhat from the draft bill after the consultation process, but it has not moved as far as we and some of the stakeholders that we represent think it should go. Rather than a minor boundary extension being able to be approved in theory or hypothetically once in every three-year period, our amendment will make for one minor boundary extension to be allowed to each private timber reserve, rather than one every three years or potentially every three years.

This is a reflection that if we are to have these extensions then there should be one extension only. You just get one shot at it. Beyond that, with the time that would have passed since the original application, there should be at that point another process of forest practices assessment of the area to be extended and a public consultation process.

Dr BROAD - I find it extraordinary that the Greens actually think that private timber reserves are a bad thing. We need to put things in perspective here as well. If you listen to Dr Woodruff's contribution to the second reading speech, and indeed the way that she has progressed through these amendments, you would swear that it is a free-for-all when it comes to harvesting forests on private land. It is not.

Even if there is a private timber reserve in place, if somebody wants to harvest those trees, there is a rigorous process to go through that involves a Forest Practices Plan being in place. It is not just, 'Oh yeah, we've got this land that's a private timber reserve, you can go in there and cut down whatever you want when you want'. It does not work like that. There are checks and balances in this system.

Again, there was no real justification in Dr Woodruff's contribution for the amendment that you should only ever get one go at a boundary extension, apart from the fact that it seems like the Greens want to limit the ability and flexibility of private timber reserves. 'In the previous three years' - three years is a reasonable period of time.

I imagine that the fear, obviously, almost implicit in the Greens argument, and indeed in Dr Woodruff's response to the second reading speech, was that this is going to be used in a creeping fashion to put swathes of Tasmania's land into private timber reserves. The question is, what is bad about private timber reserves, apart from it being recognised on a title that the timber can be harvested at some stage, subject to a Forest Practices Plan?

We have seen in this place, indeed in my time in this place, that nothing gets the Greens going like debates around trees. It seems like the Greens definitely have a 'do not touch a single tree' policy. It seems like that is the justification for these types of amendments. It is not based on any sort of evil practices by landowners, grabbing onto as much area of forest as they can to be laid flat and burnt and for species to be murdered and all that. It is simply recognising on a title that people can access that timber at some stage, like I said, subject to a forest practices plan. It is not land clearing; it is forestry. Part of the Forest Practices Plan is how are you going to regenerate it afterwards?

We see the Greens quite often interchanging terminology. Instead of talking about forestry and logging, they talk about deforestation. We have seen it in this place when they talk about deforestation in Tasmania - in our native forests it is all about deforestation. It is not. It is about forestry. It is about, yes, indeed, a tree is cut down, but then it is regenerated and the tree grows again.

We heard a lot of comments about the mosaic effect and all those sorts of things. You cannot just lay flat entire landscapes under a Forest Practices Plan. It does not work like that. The mosaic effect - okay, there are issues with that, but there are better ways of addressing it than basically saying, 'Do not touch a tree, ever'. This particular amendment that Dr Woodruff has proposed is pure ideology. We did not hear any real justification for limiting the minor boundary extensions to once only, instead of once every three years. We will not be supporting the amendment.

Mr ABETZ - In relation to minor boundary adjustments, there is an application fee that is payable. There are costs associated with it. A landowner will not be doing a minor 10 per cent of a maximum of 40 hectares adjustment just as a frolic of his or her own, or because they want some incremental creep every three years. Even with reduced red tape, it will be a costly exercise and it will take substantial time.

We need to support tree growing in Tasmania. Private timber reserves would be very helpful for consideration of our environmental responsibility when we consider that it is estimated that 10 per cent of the wood product import into Australia is believed to come from illegally sourced timber. Would it not be a good thing if a country with a land mass of Australia

could be self-sufficient in timber products rather than relying on imports, which includes about 10 per cent being illegally harvested?

Where there is a demand for wood the market will seek to have that demand supplied. If there is not enough local wood and wood product, it is going to be sourced from overseas. One suspects that from time to time, those who illegally harvest timber elsewhere in the world enjoy the debates that we have in this country about locking up more and more timber and stopping the growth of more timber, because it enables them to have a market for the illegally sourced timber.

In relation to the environment more generally, I remind the House that between 30 June 2016 and 30 June 2021, over that five-year period, four threatened species moved to a lower risk category and five species were delisted –

Dr Woodruff - In Tasmania?

Mr ABETZ - Yes, highlighting the sustainable and adaptive forest management system employed in Tasmania. Our current approach to forest management is supported by the viewpoints of world-leading experts including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the Food and Agricultural Organisation and the International Energy Agency. I note the laughter from the Greens when I talk about the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). It is one of those inconvenient truths, is it not, that when you quote an organisation like that in support of what we do, it can be ridiculed. If anybody else seeks to ridicule anything else emanating from the United Nations you are condemned as a denier and all sorts of things. It is interesting how these things are never really two-way traffic.

Ending sustainable native forestry simply will not reduce our timber needs and this amendment seeks to restrict private landowners from engaging in the timber market. There is a shortage of timber in Australia. We are still sourcing illegally harvested timber products -

Dr Woodruff - We send it to China in shiploads. What are you talking about? We send it all around the world. There is no shortage. We just export it to make money out of the public purse.

The DEPUTY CHAIR - Leader of the Greens, you will note that you were heard in silence by both sides and it would be wonderful if you could afford the minister the same courtesy.

Dr Woodruff - Thank you. I will make my points in my comments.

Mr ABETZ - The reality is that plantation timber alone is not sufficient to meet Australia's timber needs at this stage. Therefore, to have a sustainable timber industry which we seek for Australia and Tasmania, these amendments to try to restrict private timber growers even more is not something we support.

Dr WOODRUFF - Thank you. I would like to hear at some other point from minister Abetz the date of that IPCC advice you keep quoting, because I am pretty sure it is out of date. From memory, we have been around the block on this at the federal level and the state level. It is just slightly beneath you, minister, that you keep quoting such outdated advice. You have said lots of things in the past. You thought women should not go to work and women should

not get the vote, but things have changed. Advice gets updated and if you are watching the science advice -

Mr Abetz - What? I have never said anything like that.

Dr Broad - Are you saying that is what he said?

Dr Woodruff - No, not at all.

Ms Ogilvie - It sounded like you said that.

Dr WOODRUFF - I am just saying that the world, advice, opinions and things change, and that advice that you have continued to quote from - and so do other Liberal climate deniers around the country - is out of date and if you want to have a debate about that another time, I am happy to do it.

I reject Dr Broad's comments that I did not make a rationale on this bill. I did not think I needed to repeat, chapter and verse the things I had said in my second reading contribution, but if you want me to spend more time of the House than is necessary on this bill, I could have gone through it again. As I laid out very clearly in the second reading contribution, our reasons for concern about the fact that the current Forest Practices Authority and their mandates do not cover the issue. They are incapable of doing the assessments that are required to look at the impacts on Tasmanian species of forest clear-felling, the removal of forests. That is the reason, whether it is 5 per cent or 10 per cent, we are talking about an area of forested land, whether it is private or public that has native forests.

Native forests are habitat for all manner of species, some of which are critically endangered and some of which are rare and threatened, and the only type of land clearing in Tasmania is wholesale clear-felling. Whether it is a private coupe or a public coupe, that is the process. I do not use the term 'deforestation'. I think that might have been used once upon a time. I call it what it is - clear-felling. That is the land management practice that is used in Tasmanian forests that are owned by private people or public people and the Greens are concerned about the impacts on ecosystems and species of the form of forestry we practise in Tasmania. That is what we are here to talk about.

This is about death by a thousand cuts. Dr Broad said you cannot lay flat an entire landscape. You are missing the point. The mosaic effect is not about laying flat an entire landscape. It is about taking out this bit and this bit and this bit -

Dr Broad - It gets grown back again. That is the thing. The trees come back. It is not land clearing.

Dr WOODRUFF - Yes, but in that process, Dr Broad, over 10, 20, 30 or 50 years until that forest grows back to an intact state, it is no longer habitat for critically endangered species that need old trees to nest in. Masked owls and swift parrots do not live on saplings that are five years old. They do not live in landscapes -

Dr Broad - Birds moving through a landscape can land on a little tree.

Dr WOODRUFF - Swift parrots do not make nests in trees that are 10 years old. Trees grow back but it is not the intact, healthy, functioning ecosystem that it once was. That is the

difference. Also, in the process carbon emissions are lost to the atmosphere and that is something we cannot afford to be doing in a climate crisis.

I make the point that I have laid out the case for this in my second reading contribution. There is nothing else I wanted to say in that respect, except that if we believe in the science of the people who do this work on our landscapes, it is totally reasonable to want to have a proper assessment of the impacts that are happening in a fast-changing world where the climate is heating and there is more biodiversity loss everywhere. Why would we not want to do that to make sure we are not losing something that can never come back?

Dr BROAD - I have heard the member who has just resumed her seat come into this place and quote from reports on deforestation from international jurisdictions and talk about the evils of deforestation and try to draw a link to what is happening in Tasmania, especially in native forests, when native forests in Tasmania are not deforested. They are harvested and then the trees regrow. That is the key point that the Greens continually overlook.

We are talking about forestry. There is a mosaic effect, absolutely, but the trees grow back. The Greens should be honest when they try and make arguments like this. Instead of talking around it, why not just come in and say what they really believe, which is: do not touch a single tree anywhere. It would be clearer to everybody what you really want because the argument you are making is, 'Climate change, it is an emergency, do not touch a single tree', completely ignoring the benefits of forestry the minister attempted to highlight.

In summing up, he talked about the benefits of having carbon locked up in wood products such as what we see in front of us. I have said this a number of times: what is the benefit of a timber floor compared to the alternatives? The Greens never talk about the alternatives. If we have no timber to put on a floor of a house, we need tiles, we need concrete, we need carpet: we need something that is more energy dense. You cannot regrow a carpet tree, you cannot regrow a concrete jungle, you cannot regrow a tile mountain, but you can regrow trees. That fact is missing every time the Greens talk about their favourite topic, which is protecting every single tree. The minister highlighted the irony of trees coming from other jurisdictions with very little control.

The other thing the Greens continually miss is the fact that half our state is in reserves. Dr Woodruff talked about how much of Tasmania's landscape is in forests, how much of Tasmania's forests are private, how much timber is actually in a reserve, how much timber is in covenants and how much timber is in private forest reserves. The fact is that it is a lot. We are so far in front of every first-world jurisdiction and you never give credit for that. This state, apparently, has not done enough to protect trees in Tasmania. Just come in here and say, 'Don't touch a single tree ever', so that the public will know where you stand, because that is the genesis of your argument. You spice it up with the language and everything, but the core Greens belief is do not touch a single tree ever.

We are talking here about private forest estates. It is private land being able to be logged, but there are limits the Greens do not acknowledge. There has to be a forest practices plan. The forest practices plan considers all sorts of things, like streamside reserves. It is not just lay the whole lot flat.

The Greens should probably stand up and say, 'We are against this because we do not want a single tree touched ever', and then sit down. At least then, the public could understand

where they are really at. What we are trying to do here is trying to strike a balance between a sustainable forest products industry, whether it be on public or private land - today we are talking about private land - and the Greens say that is not good enough, the Forest Practices Authority is not good enough and do not touch a single tree ever because they have zero confidence in the way our forests are managed. The question for them is, where in the world does it better? I do not know. They cannot give a good answer. They talked about New Zealand, but that is plantations. Where are native forests managed better?

What they are going to get to here, and Mr Bayley almost said it, is no native forestry. He might be talking about no native forestry round the world. Well, put your sustainability hat on for a second and compare plantations to native forest. You need to have a good look at this. These arguments were raised when plantations were going in around the state, driven by managed investment schemes, yes, but there was a massive expansion in plantations. The Greens said, 'No way, this is outrageous, you cannot ruin communities by putting in plantations.' I do not know what their alternative was then. Now they are talking about the answer being plantations, but I am sure they have limits because they do not want a single tree touched ever. You start off with native, make sure all that is reserved, whether it be public, and now it looks like they want to lock it up in private as well. The next thing is plantations. We have already seen that in other states. We have seen Carnaby's cockatoos in Western Australia mean that hoop pine plantations cannot be harvested, although they were planted for wood production in mind. You cannot touch them, apparently. This where we are headed.

If you want to compare plantations with native forestry on a long rotation, then native forestry is far in front of plantation forestry on sustainability. Plantations are a monoculture, they are a biological desert, and they rely heavily on fertilisers, insecticides, pesticides and animal control. Native forestry, to a large degree, once it is regenerated, is left to itself for a period of decades to hundreds of years before it comes back to be harvested. That is far more sustainable than plantations. However, we have the Greens very close to an argument that you cannot touch a single tree in the native space in Tasmania. That is what they would really like. Just be honest about it and then I think people will be clearer.

Dr WOODRUFF - This is a genuine attempt to make this a better bill. That is why we have this amendment here. Just because we do not agree with the bill does not mean we cannot try and improve it. That is what stakeholders have asked us to do. We think this is a bad bill, but we think it can be a less bad bill. That is the job of legislators. That is our work. Dr Broad says the Greens have limits. That is the reality of the world we live in. Systems have limits. They are not capable of being endlessly extracted from. They do not continue to work.

Dr Broad - It is renewable.

Dr WOODRUFF - No, this is the point. It is not. Species live there. They are part of our healthy functioning planet. We need to think about the insects there, we need to think about bees; we need to think about all of the animals affected by the loss of habitat.

Dr Broad - Bees are not native.

Mr Bayley - There are native bees.

Dr WOODRUFF - It is unfortunate that you are not listening and aware of the science about the limits in the world, because that is what this is about. It is about having an assessment

of the impacts of so-called minor boundary extensions, of the impacts of clear-felling an area. Tasmanians watching would think it reasonable that we make laws that would ask the question: what are the impacts of a private landowner wanting to expand an area as a timber reserve and, potentially down the track, clear-felling it? We ask the same questions of our public forestry body, Forestry Tasmania. It is just the same.

The DEPUTY CHAIR - (Mr Behrakis) The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES - 7

Ms Badger
Mr Bayley
Ms Burnet (Teller)
Mr Garland
Ms Johnston
Ms Rosol
Dr Woodruff

NOES - 25

Mr Abetz
Mr Barnett
Mrs Beswick
Dr Broad
Ms Brown
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Mr Ellis
Mr Fairs
Mr Ferguson
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Howlett
Mr Jaensch
Mr Jenner (Teller)
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms Ogilvie
Mrs Pentland
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Willie
Mr Winter
Mr Wood

Amendment negatived.

The DEPUTY CHAIR (Mr Behrakis) - The question is -

That the clause as read stand part of the bill.

The Committee divided -

AYES 25

NOES 7

Mr Abetz
Mr Barnett
Mrs Beswick
Dr Broad
Ms Brown
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Mr Ellis
Mr Fairs (Teller)
Mr Ferguson
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Howlett
Mr Jaensch
Mr Jenner
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms Ogilvie
Mrs Pentland
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Willie
Mr Winter
Mr Wood

Ms Badger
Mr Bayley
Ms Burnet
Mr Garland
Ms Johnston (Teller)
Ms Rosol
Dr Woodruff

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 -

Section 6 amended (Notice of application, &c.)

Dr WOODRUFF - We are concerned about clause 6 because it means that a boundary extension can occur without people knowing that it is occurring and having an opportunity to have a say. No minor boundary extension would require advertising, including, as I read it, to the local council or, through them, to the neighbourhood. Could the minister confirm whether those last two things are true? As I read it, there is no advertising, and there is also no advice or anything that goes to the local council either.

Mr ABETZ - The idea of getting rid of red tape for minor boundary adjustments, having dealt with the major allotment, is to ensure that it becomes more streamlined. The council will have been notified in relation to the initial allotment. The minor adjustment will only be 10 per cent to a maximum of 40 hectares. We believe that given the costs associated with a minor boundary adjustment, such things will not be undertaken just for the sake of it. There will be a rationale and a purpose for the landowner to seek to make that application at cost, and we see no reason for that minor boundary adjustment to have to be re-advertised and re-socialised when the initial allotment has already been well and truly socialised.

Dr WOODRUFF - I still do not understand why no notification at all to the local authority would be required. On the logic of your argument, you are concerned about cost and

administrative burden to the landowner, but in order to make a boundary adjustment, they will have to make an application, so there is already some minimum paperwork.

I do not understand why a notification about that change would not automatically be made to the local council. We are concerned about the fact that the rest of the community is not notified, but in particular the fact that the local council would not need to be notified of what could be 40 hectares of clearing, and that they would receive no formal notice of that or other potential impacts on the local area or surrounding allotments that they may or may not own, and reserve areas that they may or may not be responsible for.

I am thinking about where there might be land abutting a coastal reserve, or there are many different places in which that land could come up against a local government responsibility. I do not understand why there would be no requirement for that to be reported to the local council.

Mr ABETZ - I thank the House. I just wanted absolute confirmation that the Forest Practices Authority, in looking at the minor boundary adjustment, does look at the planning scheme for the area to ascertain what matters it should consider. Those matters are safeguarded. We are talking about minor boundary adjustments, and yet again the Greens want to tie it up in extra red tape, extra expense, extra delay, and one wonders why? So we can import more illegally harvested timber from overseas? I really do not understand.

Dr WOODRUFF - It is interesting that you have that response to what is a really simple question. The Forest Practices Authority does, then, make an assessment? I would like to understand what they are doing an assessment of - they are obviously not doing an assessment of natural values - from what you are saying, they are doing an assessment of some things, including the surrounding land.

Could you please give us a bit more information about what the Forest Practices Authority is assessing when a person makes an application for an extension of their forest for private timber reserve? I thought they were doing nothing, but now you are saying they do something.

Mr ABETZ - I cannot give the honourable member an exhaustive list off the top of my head, but I am told that there is a Forest Practices Authority Manual that is used in assessing these matters that is 104 pages long. Therefore, I am sure the House will forgive me if I cannot provide you with a full exhaustive list of everything that is in the 104-page manual. Suffice to say that part of the authority's requirements are to look at natural, cultural and heritage issues, and also the planning schemes. That is part of the 104-page manual.

Dr Woodruff - To be clear, minister, the assessment of the boundary extension is not going to include natural and cultural values, but it will include local planning scheme issues?

Mr ABETZ - No, the exact opposite. Natural and cultural heritage values will be considered and assessed, along with the planning scheme and the other matters that are in that 104-page manual.

Dr Woodruff - In a boundary extension situation?

Mr ABETZ - In a minor boundary adjustment about which we are talking.

Dr Woodruff - Okay, thank you.

The DEPUTY CHAIR (Mr Behrakis) - The question is -

That the clause as read stand part of the bill.

The Committee divided -

AYES 25

Mr Abetz
Mr Barnett
Mrs Beswick (Teller)
Dr Broad
Ms Brown
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Mr Ellis
Mr Fairs
Mr Ferguson
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Howlett
Mr Jaensch
Mr Jenner
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms Ogilvie
Mrs Pentland
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Willie
Mr Winter
Mr Wood

NOES 7

Ms Badger
Mr Bayley
Ms Burnet
Mr Garland (Teller)
Ms Johnston
Ms Rosol
Dr Woodruff

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clause 7 -

Section 7 amended (Objections to declaration of land as private timber reserve)

Dr WOODRUFF - We have prepared an amendment which keeps clause 7 as it is but inserts an amendment to allow any person, not just a prescribed person, to be able to make a representation on an application for a private timber reserve.

This goes to matters that I have raised multiple times in the second reading debate and in previous amendments. As it stands, it is only a prescribed person who is able to make a representation on land that is declared as a private timber reserve. Under section 7(4) of the act, prescribed person is a local authority; a state authority; a person who has a legal or equitable

interest in the land or the timber on the land; and a person who is the owner of land that adjoins or is within 100 metres of the boundary of the proposed private timber reserve.

We are of the strong view that this needs to be opened up. People in the community have an interest, for many reasons other than just being an adjoining neighbour, to have their views heard about an application for an area of forest to be declared a private timber reserve. I will read our amendment:

Page 5, clause 7. Leave out everything after 'section' and insert instead:

- (1) of the Principal Act is amended by -
 - (a) omitting 'prescribed' first occurring from subsection (1); and
 - (b) inserting 'other than for a minor boundary extension' after reserve in subsection (1); and
 - (c) omitting everything after 'granting of the application' in subsection (1) and substituting 'on a ground specified in paragraph (a), (b), (c), (d) (e) or (f) of section 8(2); and
 - (d) omitting paragraphs (a) and (b) from subsection (2) and substituting the following paragraph:
 - (e) The ground for the objection is a ground specified in paragraph (a), (b), (c), (d) (e) or (f) of section 8(2); and

That is a bit complicated, so I will walk members and people who are watching through this. Section 7(1) says:

Any prescribed person who wishes to object to the granting of an application for the declaration of any land as a private timber reserve may at any time before the expiration of the period referred to in the notice relating to the application published in accordance with section 6 lodge with the authority an objection in writing to the granting of the application.

Our first amendment - paragraph (a) - removes the word 'prescribed' in that sentence. What section 7 of the act would then say is:

Any person who wishes to object the granting of an application...

It would continue on as I have just read. It would then allow any person, not only a state authority, a local council authority, a neighbour or a person who has a legal or financial interest in the land itself to be able to make a representation.

The second part (b) of the amendment puts the words 'other than for a minor boundary extension' after reserve in section 1, which is taking clause 7 as it stands from the bill and putting it into our amendment. That remains in there.

The third part of the amendment, part (c), removes everything in the rest of section 7(1) after the word 'application' and it replaces that with a whole bunch of paragraphs from section 8, subsection (2) of the bill. For people who are interested, section 8 of the *Forest Practices Act* is about the granting or refusal of an application for the declaration of land as a private timber reserve. Subsection (2) says that -

- (2) An application for a declaration of land as a private timber reserve shall be refused if the Authority is satisfied that -
- (a) the application has not been made in good faith and honestly;
 - (b) the land is not suitable for declaration as a private timber reserve;
 - (c) a person who has a legal or equitable interest in the land, or in timber on the land, would be disadvantaged if the application was granted;
 - (d) by virtue of the operation of any Act, the owner of the land is prohibited from establishing forests, or growing or harvesting timber, on the land; or
 - (e) it would not be in the public interest to grant the application; or
 - (f) an owner of land referred to in paragraph (d) of the definition of *prescribed person* in section 7(4) would be directly and materially disadvantaged if the application was granted.

Our amendment -

The DEPUTY CHAIR - The time being 5 o'clock, I will report progress.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER - It is now 5 o'clock. Are there any adjournment items? I will take the minister who is very kindly giving up all his opportunities on adjournment to provide us with the answers to questions.

Answers to Question - Robbins Passage-Boullanger Bay - Ramsar Listing

[5.00 p.m.]

Mr ABETZ (Franklin - Minister for Business, Industry and Resources) - Honourable Speaker, I did not realise I was doing that.

The SPEAKER - Well, you might need to think about that.

Mr ABETZ - In response to a question asked by Mr Garland about Robbins Passage and the Ramsar listing, I have received the following from the Minister for Parks and Environment in relation to the question asked by the member for Braddon during Question Time.

The minister has made it very clear on a number of occasions, and again it was reiterated during the debate on the members motion this week, that the government's position is that the nomination must be able to demonstrate that all affected land owners support the proposal. This includes those of neighbouring properties. Any decision to support the listing of a wetland will be based on its merits and the ability of the nomination to meet the strict criteria.

Notwithstanding this, the government recognises the important role of the potential Ramsar listing for wetlands. Importantly, we understand those proposing a future nomination

for the region do not believe a Ramsar listing is incompatible with developments on the site, such as a wind farm.

The minister, Mr Duigan, has advised he has recently met representatives from Cradle Coast NRM on multiple occasions and had follow-up discussions regarding NRM's approach that any Ramsar nomination for the Boullanger Bay to Sawyer Bay. I encourage the member for Braddon to have similar conversations with Cradle Coast NRM to ensure he understands their current approach to this matter. We anticipate there are likely to be ongoing conversations about the issue and remain open to those discussions.

At no stage have we said we are not open to working with Cradle Coast NRM to progress the matter. In fact, we have indicated to Cradle Coast NRM that we will work with them and are willing to consider a request for landowner consent at the appropriate time. We acknowledge the work of Cradle Coast NRM to date and appreciate their willingness to continue an open dialogue with the community and with the government.

Bushwalking - Investment in Tracks

[5.03 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Honourable Speaker. I rise on adjournment to talk about my reflections on some comments from the member for Lyons, Ms Badger. She talked about being an avid bushwalker and how some of the tracks and trails in Tasmania need to be upgraded.

I too am an avid bushwalker. It might be unknown to the Greens but I am. I used to do a lot of bushwalking, certainly before I got married and a little bit after I got married but not a lot after we had children. Now my children are getting to the age where they can start to go on bushwalks with me. Together, with a very good friend of mine, this year. I have done a couple of bushwalks, the first for some time. Early on this year, we walked from Lake Augusta past Lake Adelaide, Lake Neston, Junction Lake and then went through the Never Never to Hartnett Falls and then out at Narcissus.

I agree with Ms Badger that there is definitely investment required in some of our tracks and trails. There is a lot of pressure on our iconic walks. Now, because numbers on the Overland track are limited, we are seeing people being pushed into other walks like the Walls of Jerusalem, South Coast track and places like Frenchman's Cap. In my agreement with Ms Badger, I think we should also think about creating more loops and more options for people instead of having people just do one walk.

Instead of just doing the iconic Overland track, the track, especially through the Never Never, could be upgraded. At the moment it is a lot of bush-bashing and you need to cross a log just above McCoy Falls and it is really rough. Then it joins up to Hartnett Falls and then you are on the Overland track and it is really good. If there could be some investment in the track through the Never Never to join up with Junction Lake, that would give people options to do loops through the back end of the Walls of Jerusalem National Park and join up with the Overland track and those at the southern end of the Overland track. The thing about the walk through the Never Never and places like Junction Lake is they are amazing. They are beautiful.

The Never Never especially: there are a number of, I think there are three or four, beautiful and spectacular waterfalls which end at Hartnett Falls. That could be a spectacular

day walk from the Overland track itself. If there was a lot of investment that would also create loops and give people a lot of options. It is such a beautiful place but it is a really rough track. We did a lot of bush bashing. I know for my daughter who has been on a couple of bushwalks that was bush bashing. That day we walked from Junction Lake all the way out to Narcissus. That was a big day.

I would also like to reflect too on a more recent bushwalk. We went for one earlier in the year, I think it was in January, and then we went for one in the last school holidays. The reason I really like bushwalking is because as a politician it is the only time you really get off. There is zero mobile reception and nobody can contact you as you are uncontactable. I found that was probably the first time in a long time that I have actually been able to just not think about work.

I walked to Frenchman's Cap more than 20 years ago. That time we came in from the other direction, swam across the Franklin River to the up over the top and down to Lake Tahune. There was a hut at Lake Tahune and it was serviceable and not too bad. Recently, in those holidays, again along with my daughter and a good friend and his son, we walked to Frenchman's Cap. The walk to Frenchman's Cap was so much improved to what it was that 20-odd years ago. First of all, the Sodden Loddon was gone. The Sodden Loddon, for those who did not know what it is, it was basically six or seven kilometres of waist deep mud and the track was spreading out and spreading out and spreading out. It was basically, do not worry about staying clean, the best thing you can do is just go straight through the middle because you are going to get muddy no matter what. The Sodden Loddon was notorious and had a really bad reputation.

The walk has now been completely redirected around the Sodden Loddon and it is a beautiful walk at a nice gradient from the highway right through to Lake Vera. That is a significant investment. That has created options for another walk. And then, Lake Vera, the Hut was still the same, but the Lake Tahune Hut was spectacular. It was like something out of an architect's magazine. There is a little mini Hydro scheme there, which means you have lights and limited heating and it is a fantastic place.

We took five days. It was very leisurely. We spent two nights at Tahune Hut. With the upgrades to the track we saw a number of people who were trail runners who were doing the whole lot in one day. They were running from the highway right up to the top of Frenchman's Cap and back in a day. Now, that is next level. Obviously, they are carrying water, they are carrying food and not a lot of weight - they were all stick thin. Running up and down that track is some achievement.

What I reflect on there is probably the opposite argument to Ms Badger, in that, that track, in particular, has seen a significant upgrade, and it has also meant that there are more people using it because you do not have to slog through 6 kilometres of mud.

There could also be some other substantial investments in other bushwalks because we are seeing Tasmania becoming more and more popular. When you are on those bushwalks, you are always meeting people from the mainland. Some people come down every year to do different parts of Tasmania and different walks. Those people do not really need a track as they are very experienced.

I would like to see some extra investment on South Coast track. If there were huts along the South Coast track that could be done in an appropriate manner. That would certainly

improve that walk. Those are the sorts of investments we should also see. There are some magnificent places in Tasmania that are unique. It is fantastic that I get to experience that with my daughter and hopefully other children.

Domestic Violence - Awareness

[5.10 p.m.]

Ms OGILVIE (Clark - Minister for Women and the Prevention of Family Violence) - Honourable Speaker, I rise today to address an issue of paramount importance to our community, and that is the devastating impact of family and sexual violence. One life lost to such violence is one too many. It is deeply troubling that across Australia, a woman dies every four days from violence. This is a stark reminder that everyone has a fundamental right to be safe at home and in their communities. Family and sexual violence affects all individuals across all demographics, regardless of age, gender, socio-economic status or cultural background.

It is not just a woman's issue, it is a human issue. The impact ripples through our entire society, affecting children, families and communities. It undermines our collective sense of security and wellbeing.

There is a poignant analogy that has gained attraction online recently: the comparison of facing a bear in the forest versus encountering a man. It is telling that many women have expressed a preference for being in a forest with bears rather than walking alone where they might encounter men.

This analogy starkly highlights the deep-seated fear and anxiety that many women experience due to the threat of violence. However, this issue is not solely about women. It is a broader societal issue that affects everybody. People of all genders have a crucial role to play in addressing and preventing family and sexual violence. By fostering respect, understanding, and equality, we can collectively create a safer environment for all. It is a shared responsibility that requires the active participation of everyone in our community.

Violence is not limited to physical harm. It includes emotional, psychological and financial abuse. It encompasses behaviours that control, intimidate and isolate individuals. Understanding this broader definition is crucial in recognising the full scope of the problem and effectively addressing it. The Tasmanian Government is unwavering in its commitment to eliminating family and sexual violence. Our investment of \$100 million in the third Family Violence Plan 2022 to 2027 Survivors at the Centre is a testament to this commitment. This plan is a strategic framework designed to drive tangible change and provide meaningful support to those in need.

A key priority of this action plan is increasing the number of frontline family violence workers. These dedicated professionals are the first line of defence in protecting victims and preventing further harm. We are leading the way by meeting our target of the federally-funded positions, having already hired 17 of the 26.4 federally-funded workers allocated to Tasmania. These workers provide critical support and intervention, often acting as lifelines for those in immediate danger. Their presence is essential in ensuring that victims have access to the resources and protection they need.

To ensure effective and responsive services, we have established multidisciplinary family and sexual violence Arch centres in the north and south of the state, with a new centre planned for the north-west. These one-stop centres provide life-changing support, empowering victim/survivors to choose the services they need and when to engage them. By housing specialist sex crime investigators, support service staff and child safety services under one roof, we ensure that comprehensive, best practice support is readily accessible. These centres are designed to be safe havens where victim/survivors can access multiple forms of support in one place and this integrated approach reduces the barriers that many face when seeking help and ensures a coordinated and holistic response to their needs.

We recognise the urgent need for more emergency accommodation. Our Rapid Rehousing Program is expanding with 100 additional homes providing transitional housing for those fleeing unsafe situations. In southern Tasmania, we support newly-constructed homes at Jarrah House and McCombe House. In the north, we are aiding Yemaya Women Support Service to relocate to better premises.

Our Safe Beds program continues to support pet owners affected by family violence because no one should have to leave behind a beloved pet in a time of crisis. Emergency accommodation is a critical component of our response to family and sexual violence. It provides immediate safety and stability for those escaping dangerous situations.

By expanding these services, we ensure that more individuals and families have a safe place to go when they need it most, and this is an essential step in breaking the cycle of violence and providing a foundation for a new beginning.

Protecting victims from further harm is essential. Our Monitoring and Compliance Unit provides 24/7 protection by monitoring offenders' locations. Tasmania's electronic monitoring program, considered a gold standard, offers victim/survivors a discrete duress device and location tracking. This innovative approach ensures immediate support and intervention, enhancing the safety of those at risk.

We are also focused on community education and awareness to change the societal attitudes that enable violence. Initiatives include school programs, public campaigns, and partnerships with community organisations, to foster a culture of respect and equality.

Additionally, we are investing in research to develop innovative solutions. Education is a powerful tool in preventing violence. By teaching respect, empathy and healthy relationships from a young age, we can instil values that counteract the roots of violence. It is crucial that we take the time to listen and understand the experiences of those who have suffered.

We must also focus on the long-term wellbeing of those affected by family and sexual violence making sure families and individuals have the necessary resources to rebuild their lives. This is a holistic approach.

Addressing family and sexual violence requires a collective effort. It is not just the responsibility of the government, but of all of us, every member of the community. Men have a crucial role to play in addressing and preventing family and sexual violence, and we must all work together.

I am deeply committed to ensuring that our government does all it can to protect and support those affected by family and sexual violence. It impacts everybody and we are dedicated to working alongside our teams to create a safer, more supportive environment for everyone in Tasmania because together we can make a difference.

I have a second, very short contribution in the seconds that I have left.

The SPEAKER - You have 26 seconds.

Ms OGILVIE - I want to say Shalom to my Jewish friends. Life is indeed a mystery. It is like a dream, no end and no beginning, but you are here with me. It is like a dream. Let your choir sing and peace be with you.

Family Violence

[5.17 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER - Honourable Speaker, I could not let that go. I will quickly outline some facts about what family violence looks like in Tasmania at the moment. It is very nice to talk about platitudes, about taking the time to listen. Well, we have been listening for 10 years. For 10 years this government have done very little to deal with family violence and finding proper solutions. What I am going to do tonight is read some of the actual facts. I congratulate the minister for making a lovely speech about what they are going to do, but I am going to provide you with some facts now about what this looks like on the ground.

Victims do not have access to what they need in Tasmania, and the 'unwavering in their commitment around tangible change' - I am sorry, they are just whistle words, minister, because not enough has been done for 10 years.

Ms Ogilvie - What did you say? 'Whistle words'?

Ms BUTLER - They are whistle words. They are whistling in the wind words. If you are not aware of that term, that is on you. Let us look at the statistics, shall we? Tasmania has over six times the national rate of women being turned away from crisis accommodation. According to 2021-2022 figures, only 6 per cent of women with long-term housing needs are having those needs met, compared to 18 per cent of men. 63 per cent of female applicants on the housing register need multiple bedroom homes, compared with 30 per cent of male applicants.

An overview of the 'Somewhere to Go' report, prepared by Impact Economics and Policy, details how women and women with children impacted by domestic and family violence are bearing the brunt of Tasmania's housing crisis. The rate of homelessness among Tasmanian women increased by 50 per cent between 2016 and 2021, under your government's watch. Tasmania had over six times the national rate of women being turned away from crisis accommodation in 2021-2022.

An estimated 933 Tasmanian women are returning to a violent partner or entering homelessness after experiencing family violence each year due to a lack of housing. This is the truth. These are the facts. You come into this Chamber and make all these statements about what you are going to do. What you have not done for 10 years is disgraceful.

The report found that 53 per cent of women seeking specialist homelessness services in Tasmania have mental health issues, compared to 33 per cent nationally. Only 6 per cent of Tasmanian women with long-term housing needs are having these needs met, compared to 18 per cent of men. Adult women under the age of 50 are particularly vulnerable, with only 4 per cent having their long-term housing needs met, compared to 18 per cent of women aged over 50 years; and 63 per cent of female applicants on the social housing register need multiple-bedroom accommodation, compared to 30 per cent of men.

Impact Economics and Policy modelling for this report finds that to meet the needs of Tasmanian women and children today, including those who have experienced family violence, an additional 4239 properties are needed, including 342 four-bedroom properties. These are the facts, minister. This is where you are deficient. This is where your government has failed in its policies in relation to family violence over the last 10 years. Building these additional properties will probably cost about \$1.1 billion.

Some facts on fleeing domestic and family violence, minister:

- Between July 2021 and June 2022, 558 women and 624 accompanying children from across Tasmania sought crisis accommodation at the Hobart Women's Shelter.
- 60 per cent of women and children presented at the shelter for family violence reasons: a 13 per cent increase since 2021, under your watch, minister.
- The number of women the shelter turns away is more than double the national figures.

That is what this government has done over the last 10 years - double the national figures. That is not acceptable and I am not going to sit in this Chamber and listen to the minister talk about what they are going to do, with platitudes around all working together and listening. We have been listening for 10 years, minister.

Many of these women and children presented at the shelter multiple times during that period because their long-term housing needs were not met. Family violence is a major driver of homelessness for women and children, with the largest affected cohorts being young children, aged zero to nine years, and young adult women in their 20s and 30s. In 2021-2022, 31 per cent of all adult female specialist homelessness service clients and 40 per cent of all child and teenage clients were experiencing family violence under this government's watch.

Tasmania's Safe at Home response: thank you very much Judy Jackson. That was an amazing policy she brought in. It saved gosh knows how many lives. We were an Australian first on that, a Labor innovation. Thank you very much, Judy Jackson, for what she did for women in Tasmania and to prevent family violence in Tasmania. You will never be able to touch that, minister, if you come in here with platitudes like you did tonight. You must take this seriously, instead of platitudes like, 'Oh, we are listening', 'we all have to work together', 'tangible outcomes'. Nonsense, minister. You have so much catch-up work to do because not enough has been done for 10 years.

As I was saying, only one in every 20 women experiencing family violence and identified as needing long-term housing received that long-term housing here. With nowhere else to go, these women face a choice between homelessness and returning to a violent partner. Impact economics and policy modelling find that every year approximately 333 Tasmanian women

returned to violent partners due to having nowhere else to go and no financial support. We would like to see some proper solutions coming from this government, some real investment. Stop the platitudes, stop the, 'We all have to work together,' in the softly spoken voices. It is not good enough. You have a huge job ahead of you. Get on and do it.

Time expired.

Willow Court Community Workshop

[5.23 p.m.]

Ms BADGER (Lyons) - Deputy Speaker, members of this House might be unaware, as I was until recently, that New Norfolk's Willow Court predates Port Arthur. It is the only complex in the country with a building of pioneering architecture representing each design era from 1830 to the 1960s. Willow Court is of national heritage importance, soliciting preservation.

Before speaking further on the past and, indeed, the future of this complex and the inevitable mark it left on the Tasmanian community, I will read into *Hansard* the Willow Court Statement of Remembrance:

We remember the people who lived at Willow Court. We acknowledge those who have passed away and those who lay in unmarked graves. We acknowledge the people who are still living with the trauma of a system that separated them from their family and community, and for the trauma suffered on this site. We acknowledge the impact of these experiences on extended families as past residents learn to live a life on their own terms. We acknowledge the work and dedication of past Willow Court employees.

That statement of remembrance was co-written by Emily Dudgeon and Carla Paul, who is here with us this evening. Carla spent more than seven years of her youth locked in high-security wards at the Royal Derwent Hospital. This statement is one of several important outcomes from the Willow Court community workshop held in November 2023. Based on a system change model, the Willow Court workshop was professionally facilitated and attended by over 50 people from all walks of life and professional backgrounds. The workshop concepts came from a place of frustration in the community as parts of Willow Court deteriorate further while some other parts prosper. Willow Court fatigue is the term the community has conferred on the topic because, when this precinct is raised at any level of government, it is put in the too-hard basket, or plans that are made do not progress beyond a brochure or an overview. Graffiti, destruction, arson and disrespectful use are ongoing causes of irreversible damage, resulting in demolition of some buildings.

Community members came together due to the lack of a concrete, well-funded, well-consulted upon, trauma-informed, holistic, long-term vision with social licence for the site for respectful commercial and training use. The Willow Court community workshop called on the Tasmanian government to step up and commit to a master plan for this significant site. While the creation of any good master plan is done in consultation with the community, businesses, users and all levels of government, in recognition of its original uses, it is essential that past Willow Court residents, families and workers who choose to participate in any planning process are both heard and listened to. Their views must be the foundations upon

which respectful future uses can take place and preservation of this nationally significant site can occur, and Carla's Statement of Remembrance is a wonderful beginning.

Respectful, genuine interpretation is critical, and kudos to the Derwent Valley Council, who in 2022 endorsed the Willow Court Ethical Principles and Guidelines for all partners and developers.

Sadly, Speaker, I am shocked at the influx of emails I have received since being elected about the insensitive use of parts of this site for ghost tours. Today, revered *ABC* journalist Judy Tierney wrote to the Greens, prepared to stick her head above the parapet to call this out. Judy wrote:

It recently came as a nasty shock to hear ghost and paranormal experience tours at the old asylum are still being run, with the wording of advertisements implying visitors might see ghosts or feel their presence. The ads also imply you had to be 'brave' to join one of these insensitive and inappropriate tours. A commercial venture based on fantasy and exploitation of those individuals who were condemned to this bleak and often cruel home. It is my belief that this is ethically evil.

There is no reason that the Willow Court Barracks Precinct's future could not be better. It could be a place for innovation and for immersive interpretation of the human rights journey that has played out there over 170 years. It could be a cultural heritage and arts precinct, with education and interpretation opportunities that is a driver of the Derwent Valley economy.

It is a place that could have youth social enterprise, offering training and experience in tourism and hospitality. There is no shortage of heritage building maintenance opportunities in this state, but here is a site for young people to get those skills and for people to be re-skilled and given new employment opportunities.

Earlier this year, we saw the new Corumbene Community Health Hub open in conjunction with UTAS. There is now a much-needed community health centre and a tertiary training centre in the Derwent Valley. Already at Willow Court we have seen the success of the world-class restaurant and the temporary lease for the Derwent Valley Art Gallery.

The arts have played a pivotal role in the valley in recent years. It would be wonderful to see a more permanent place of some kind there, and why not this precinct? After all, the benefits of the arts are that they enrich, heal and connect people from all walks of life.

A master plan process is not meant to undermine or override existing management operations or processes. It is meant to complement processes by considering future use, providing a best case, most prosperous blueprint which all levels of government and a wide breadth of stakeholders can draw upon. This would be a tremendous outcome from years of work, passion and determination on the part of the community to maintain the integrity of this historic site. Before it is too late, the state government needs to act to protect the Willow Court Barracks Precinct and preserve it for future generations.

In my remaining 30 seconds, I would like to concur with Dr Broad's contribution earlier. The future use of our parks and tracks is all about striking the right balance. There are so many tremendous opportunities for basic new infrastructure, some of which Mr Broad outlined.

I hope he will join me in meeting with Minister Nick Duigan and presenting some of those sensible opportunities for improvement.

I have seen people trail run the South Coast Track, which probably has several more kilometres equivalent to the Sodden Loddons of Frenchmans Cap than Frenchmans has. I do not necessarily condone that or encourage it, but well done to anyone who can do it.

The SPEAKER - I am playing favourites. I am going to take the member for Bass because he has tried every time just behind the bit, but the rest of you were all very, very, very on song together.

R U OK? Day

[5.33 p.m.]

Mr FAIRS (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to speak about 12 September 2024, which is R U OK? Day. You might be asking why I am speaking about September this early in the year. It is because we as MPs are noticing, and especially I have noticed, the amount of emails, questions and comments we get. We get flooded. Some resonate with you and this one certainly did. In fact, it ripped my heart out.

A very good, brave Tasmanian by the name of Steven Moore has pledged to ride his bicycle 200 kilometres in one day for R U OK? Day. I want to get the word out and hope that others may donate to his cause. Come September, starting at Woolworths, George Town, where Steve is employed, he is riding to other Woolworths stores in Scottsdale, Mowbray, Launceston, Legana and finishing back in George Town, I am informed that the ride will roughly take 10 to 12 hours to complete, starting at 6.00 a.m.

A member - That is a big loop.

Mr FAIRS - It certainly is. The question is, why is Steven doing this? Steve has pledged to do this ride in honour of a friend and colleague who tragically ended his life by suicide.

Steve tells me that his friend suffered with mental health most of his life. When he was at work, you would not know he was troubled, and when he was in the streets, he was always genuine to everyone. I am sure that those words ring true for a lot of people - it certainly does resonate with me - who know someone with mental health issues. So often people hide their struggles, whether it is depression or anxiety, and that is what R U OK Day is all about.

R U OK Day is a national day of action when we highlight the importance of meaningful 'are you okay' conversations, and remind all Australians and Tasmanians to start them any day of the year. The R U OK mission is to inspire and empower people to meaningfully connect with those in their world and lend support when they are struggling with life. Work focuses on building the motivation, confidence and skills of the help giver, the person who can have a meaningful conversation with someone who is struggling.

R U OK contributes to suicide prevention efforts by encouraging people to invest more time in their personal relationships and building the capacity of informal support networks - friends, families and colleagues - to be alert to those around them. It encourages people to have a conversation if they identify someone with signs of distress or difficulty, and connect them to appropriate support long before they are in crisis.

Anyone can donate to Ride for Ben by going to ruok.org.au/fundraisers. Last time I checked more than \$8000 had already been raised, and I am sure that figure is going to rise. Steve is a local champion. I congratulate him and commend him on what he is doing, and I wish him well on the challenge.

Vale Mick Lawrence

[5.34 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin - Leader of the Greens) - I rise tonight to pay tribute, as my colleague Mr Garland did earlier this week, to a beautiful man, a Tasmanian surf legend and environmental champion, Mick Lawrence. A generation of surfers were mentored by Mick, and Shayne Clark from Surfing Tasmania has described him as a godfather figure who helped many Tasmanian kids over the years who were struggling.

Shayne said that when Mick's son, Tim, was killed in an accident in 2017, he and some friends got Mick involved in Surfing Tasmania, where he went on to become president and later joined the Surfrider Foundation.

Mick used his passion for the coastline and oceans and his writing and filmmaking skills to work on the Surfrider national campaigns. He went on to set up the Surfrider Foundation in Tasmania and has campaigned for decades to protect our oceans, including campaigning in recent years to protect the oceans from impacts like seismic blasting. He recently formed Friends of the Bay to counter the expansion of industrial-farmed salmon in Storm Bay.

I met Mick in my office not very long ago to discuss his advocacy and defence of Tasmania's southern beaches. It was another connection with Mick that reminded me of what a laconic, genuine, warm and caring human being he was. He was determined to work with other people to keep Tasmania's oceans wild, free and pristine, and he was really concerned about the harms to Clifton Beach from the Petuna Fish farm, and harms from microplastics and other pollution from salmon farming to the whole of the marine environment that he was seeing in his surfing around Tasmania, particularly in the south in Storm Bay.

I was really struck by his tenacity and care for his local community and other surfers, as well as for the oceans. He had a deep-felt connection to lutruwita's wild places. He was a true nature lover, not only enjoying surfing but also paddling rivers and bushwalking.

He will also be remembered for his affinity with the rugged south west, and his particular skills in passing on its special history and environment to those who are newly discovering the magic of those wild places. The tour manager for Par Avion, Greg Wells, said, 'Mick just had this great wealth of knowledge and understanding of the south-west area. He was such a good person to hang around with and was so mature and well read'. Par Avion's managing director, Shannon Wells, said, 'I noticed that every time one of his tours returned to the airport, all the passengers were still smiling'.

One of the most enduring memories was and will remain the joy that he brought to other people. He was kind, funny and wise. He was a mentor to surfers and marine campaigners, and he was a force to be reckoned with. When something good needed to happen, he was the champion.

Stacey von Dongan succeeded Mick in becoming the Surf Tasmania president, and she remembers him as a man who was determined to make sure that girls and women in the state had an equal opportunity to participate in the sport. He was a fantastic mentor for so many generations of young girls and boys in getting into the love of surfing.

Whether it was through teaching kids to surf, educating visitors to Tasmania's Wilderness World Heritage Area or fighting for his local community, Mick changed lives and he made this island a better place. His energy, knowledge and passion will be sorely missed.

On behalf of the Greens, I say, 'Vale, Mick', and to his wife, Robyn, and his friends and family, I send our most heartfelt condolences for your loss. It is this island's loss too. We have been so blessed to have him here with us, and he will remain in our hearts every time we look at those southern beaches.

Nurses' Wages

[5.39 p.m.]

Ms ROSOL (Bass) - I rise this evening to draw attention to concerns that ANMF have raised in the last few days. The first concern relates to what ANMF refers to as wage theft from nurses.

In November last year, an industrial agreement between the government, ANMF and HACSU members entitled nurses to receive a personal protective equipment (PPE) allowance of \$2.70 per hour for the times they are required to wear an N95 mask for more than 70 per cent of the shift. In response to COVID-19, hospital staff are frequently required to wear N95 masks to protect patients and staff from infection. While this is important for reducing the spread of disease within our hospitals, nursing staff report that wearing the masks for long periods is unpleasant and uncomfortable.

The PPE allowance compensates nurses for the inconvenience of wearing N95 masks. ANMF report that some of their members in the south and the north-west of the state have received the PPE payments, but others have not. Meanwhile, in the north, no members have been paid the allowance, and the back pay nurses are now owed in some situations adds up to thousands of dollars per nurse.

ANMF have raised this issue with the department of health, but have been met with stonewalling, with no information given about when nurses can expect to receive their back pay. The department have indicated this is due to insufficient staffing within payroll. It is simply not good enough that nursing staff who must wear masks for extended periods are not being paid the allowance they are entitled to - the allowance that has been agreed to by the government.

Insufficient staffing within payroll is not an acceptable reason for staff not to be paid the allowance to which they are entitled. In a climate where the government is using vacancy control committees to cut staff across the department of Health, it is doubtful payroll staffing issues will be addressed anytime soon, bringing into further question the government's commitment to addressing the issue of back pay anytime soon. Understaffing, coupled with a disregard for difficult working conditions, are what health staff can expect going forward.

When will all nursing staff required to wear masks for extended periods receive the allowance the government agreed to pay them? I call on the government to fulfil their obligation and back pay nurses as soon as possible, as well as to ensure all nurses who wear masks receive payment of the allowance in an ongoing, timely manner so they do not need to fight to receive what should automatically be paid to them.

The second ANMF concern I draw attention to is the seclusion of voluntary paediatric patients on the Wombat Ward at Launceston General Hospital. Paediatric patients who are voluntarily admitted to Wombat Ward for mental health issues are routinely being placed in a locked unit, something that should only take place after application to the Mental Health Tribunal, following a mental health assessment.

Patients' rights are being contravened, but when ANMF members have raised this issue, completed Safety and Learning System Report Complaints, spoken to management, lodged protected interest disclosures and raised the matter directly with the Health Complaints Commissioner, they have been fobbed off, meaning their child safety concerns remain unanswered and voluntarily admitted mental health patients on the Wombat Ward continue to receive inappropriate treatment.

The Greens join with the ANMF in voicing concern at this situation. Children deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. They deserve to have their rights respected, protected and to receive care and treatment that is appropriate to their health situation.

The Greens are also concerned about what this indicates about the government's response to the Commission of Inquiry report. We know that in the past, children have not always been safe within government institutions, and the government has committed to making government services, including hospitals, safe for Tasmanian children.

Yet here we are advised of a situation where children on Wombat Ward are not safe and the government response has been inadequate. The Greens call on the Government to listen to the concerns of ANMF members, to investigate SLRS reports and concerns raised by nursing staff into the seclusion of voluntary mental health patients on Wombat Ward, and to ensure paediatric patients are receiving appropriate safe treatment that complies with the *Mental Health Act 2013*.

Honourable Speaker, it is simply not good enough that in a government health service, nursing staff are not being paid allowances and back pay they are entitled to, and paediatric patients are not receiving appropriate care that will help them heal and recover.

Thank you to the ANMF for the work they do in fighting for the rights of nursing staff and advocating for the safety and well-being of patients within Tasmanian hospitals. We call on the Government to act on both these situations.

Baulds Road and Tollymore Road - Concerns
Health Sector - Access to Diagnostic Mammograms and Angiograms

[5.45 p.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about a road safety issue in my local community. I am very pleased to see that the Minister of Infrastructure, the Deputy Premier, is in the Chamber this afternoon to hear this.

I am bringing a concern directly from my constituent. I asked a constituent question about this particular issue some weeks ago and have received a response from the minister. My constituent still has outstanding concerns. It is the road corridor between Baulds Road and Tollymore Road on the Bass Highway at Flowerdale in the north-west.

My constituent owns a residence along this corridor of road. He is concerned about the line of sight from his driveway, then the changes that have been made to the road, and how that impacts on his ability and his family's ability to get in and out of their property. There is a remaining stump that was left from a tree that was partially removed from the side of the highway and he would like to see it removed by the Department of State Growth. It was left for him to do and he believes that should not be at his own cost. He has discussed at length his concerns with the representative from the Department of State Growth (DSG) who came from Hobart and met with him at his property. However, since that meeting and the concerns that he outlined, he has not heard a single thing from that representative. I would really appreciate his concerns being followed up and the itemised concerns he raised with that officer from DSG.

The other point I want to make about this particular corridor of road is that there have been speed limits and signage that has been removed that needs to be reinstalled. I believe that some of the residents along this road corridor have raised concerns about the current speed limit still being at 110, which makes it difficult for them turning in off the road where there is no lane to get over into, to pull over safely to allow large trucks and other vehicles that are using a very busy freight corridor across the north-west coast, to safely get around those vehicles as well.

These concerns are not unwarranted. I have met with these residents at their property and had a good look at these issues. I ask the Minister for Infrastructure to follow this up for me, on behalf of my constituent. I will be putting it in writing to you with their personal details to enable you to contact them directly.

The other issue I want to raise is in relation to vacancy control, particularly across the health sector and in relation to the north. I know Ms Ogilvie has been out again the past few weeks talking about the Breast Care clinic that is going to be launched in Hobart very soon. I want to remind the minister, and particularly the Health minister, about the fact that issues around access to diagnostic mammograms have been long standing in this state. There was some funding that was provided by the federal government. I believe it was a federal Liberal government in 2019 that provided funding for better access to diagnostic mammograms for women across the north of the state. It was not that long ago that there were a number of women who spoke up across the state, which I believe prompted your announcement during the state election on the Hobart Centre. However, there is a dire need for better access to diagnostic mammograms in the north of the state.

It means that women and men have to travel interstate to access these important diagnostic procedures. It means there are delays in accessing treatment and the diagnosis of breast cancer and how far their stage of breast cancer has advanced. It is very serious. I would appreciate an update from the Health minister about what he intends to do to make sure that those women are perhaps subsidised, or there are better supports put in place to ensure that they can access those diagnostic mammograms.

If we are going to cut and not fill positions with radiographers across the state, that is only going to further exacerbate this issue. I would like to see a response from the government on that.

The other point I want to make is on access to angiograms across the north of the state. It is a very important diagnostic tool when we look at cardiac disease. I know that there are a number of people from the north-west where I live who wait for long periods of time, taking up valuable hospital beds, waiting for routine angiogram procedures that are very important in detecting the extent of their cardiac disease and the damage to their heart tissue. This has been raised for a period of time.

The government's solution appears to be to build a cardiac centre in Launceston in the out years. There needs to be an immediate response and an intervention take place to ensure that people from the north-west and the north of the state can get access to angiograms faster and that we look to find more cardiac beds across the north of the state as well before these renovations are done for this new heart centre. There is an immediate need. That is why I raised it for a significant period of time prior to the election as shadow health minister.

I want to see some action from this government. I do not want to see radiography positions cut across the service because that will mean these people are waiting longer.

Australian Energy Policy

[5.50 p.m.]

Mr WINTER (Franklin - Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about Australian Energy Policy. When the Albanese government was elected, for the first time in 10 years, we had a coherent national energy policy. Australians were relieved about that because they had watched in horror as the coalition nationally destroyed a prime minister, Malcolm Turnbull, over his belief in climate change and his proposed energy policy, the National Energy Guarantee. We have members in this place who were a part of bringing down that government and that prime minister.

Since we have had a federal Labor government, we have had a coherent energy policy and it has been all about renewables. It has been all about bringing more renewables online to replace coal and gas, and to prepare Australia for the future. Australians, and worldwide, understand the real risk of climate change.

Tasmania is in a fantastic position to benefit from that not just in terms of our contribution towards action on climate change but the economic opportunities that are offered here. We are the home of renewable energy in Australia. We have the best renewable energy resources anywhere in Australia. Our Hydro has been invested in for 100 years and we have the best wind resource in Australia and potentially in the world.

We have a massive investment pipeline and Clean Energy Tasmania and the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry estimate that pipeline to be about \$25 billion worth of investment wanting to come to Tasmania to invest here in renewable energy proposals generation like at Robbins Island and Whaleback Ridge. Like the industry that can come to Bell Bay in your electorate, Speaker, through ABEL Energy and their methanol proposal, through HIF in the north-west coast at Hampshire, which is an incredible opportunity for us to manufacture e-fuels.

All of this comes from having a coherent national energy policy, which is great for Tasmania and we have benefited from in terms of that investment pipeline.

I am concerned that the proposal from Peter Dutton and the federal coalition puts all that at risk. Since that policy announcement has been made, shock waves have gone right through the renewable energy industry. These are people who are looking to invest in this state.

When we asked the government earlier today whether they supported Peter Dutton's nuclear energy proposal, I expected the answer to be no. What we got were two answers of incoherent nonsense, akin to the incoherent nonsense we have heard from the federal coalition for 10 years when they were in government, and now the nonsense that is coming out of Peter Dutton's mouth when it comes to nuclear energy.

Australia has a policy. It is a policy that is in the best interest of, not just the country, but also this state. We have an opportunity. However, today we heard from minister Abetz what was effectively economic vandalism. He said that he welcomed the discussion into nuclear energy policy; an outrageous thing for a Minister for Industry and Business to say in this place, clear evidence that he is not prepared to stand up for Tasmania best interests. He said, given the dry nature of our weather at the moment, we are importing coal-fired energy. He is quite right, but you know how we could replace that? New wind turbines at places like Robbins Island and Whaleback Ridge.

He said the question that Australians should be asking is, would it be better to have nuclear rather than coal? The question I would ask Australians is, would it be better to have nuclear or clean, green, renewable hydro and wind from Tasmania: power that can come from Tasmania's historic investment in Hydro Tasmania? Our historic investment in our people, in our skills, in our engineering expertise, which has been borne out by decades, 100 years in fact, of investment in our people and our expertise and our potential to manufacture and turn our entire manufacturing sector into a green sector so that we can manufacture green hydrogen, methanol, e-fuels, aluminium, zinc, all of these processes can be 100 per cent renewable. They are not though because this government, in Tasmania, as well as their coalition colleagues in Canberra, are not committed to renewable energy.

It is deeply concerning. It is not just the Liberal Party. It is the the Liberal-Lambie Coalition. Earlier, this evening, it has been reported that Tasmanian crossbench senators, Tammy Tyrrell and Jacqui Lambie, indicated that they are willing to consider removing the legislative prohibition of nuclear energy federally. That means you have Jacqui Lambie, saying she represents Tasmania but lining up to allow the Coalition to move towards a nuclear future, instead of a renewable energy in Canberra, and then aiding and abetting this Liberal government in Tasmania.

This is not in Tasmania's best interest. The approach that we need to take in Tasmania, across the country, is to invest in renewables. It is the cheapest form of energy and it is the best form of energy for Tasmania.

We can do everything that the rhetoric talked about when Malcolm Turnbull was prime minister. He said that we would be the battery of the nation. He talked about pumped hydro. They do not talk about that anymore. They have stopped. Lake Cethana appears to have been scrapped. Half of Marinus has been scrapped.

This government has made Tasmania the hardest place in Australia to build a windfarm and it appears to be deliberate. We have projects like at Robbins Island, ACEN's proposal, which has been on the drawing board for seven years, trying to be a part of the renewable energy future, backed in now by a coherent national energy policy. Then you have Whaleback Ridge, an incredible opportunity for Tasmania to actually double our energy production. It took them four years to get this government to agree to let them put a DA in.

That is their commitment to renewable energy. It is devastating because I can see the opportunities in Tasmania. I can see the opportunities for jobs, for safe, secure, well-paid jobs in manufacturing. We can do it in Tasmania. We have done it for 100 years. We can continue to do it but we need a government in Tasmania, a Liberal-Lambie coalition in Tasmania, that is committed to it and is prepared to stand up, and a coherent national energy policy that is based on science, based on the facts, based on economics, and based on a renewable energy future for our whole country.

Regional Communities - Legerwood

[5.57 p.m.]

Mr WOOD (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, one thing that we can all agree upon in this place is how wonderful it is to have the privilege and the honour to get out into our local communities and spend time listening and meeting and talking with the people who live in our in our electorates and help them with their concerns, where we can. Tonight, I want to speak briefly about one of our regional communities in our electorate of Bass, Legerwood. Legerwood is situated in Tasmania's north east, in rich pastoral land, sheltered by wooded ridges and hills. Tasmania has dozens of these little villages tucked into valleys and hills. Legerwood, situated between Scottsdale and Ringarooma, is one such hidden gem.

What first took me to Legerwood in late 2023 was a plan to get to know it better as one of the parts of the Bass electorate that are perhaps less prominent on the state map. I knew before my visit that it had significant tree carvings, but what I found when I arrived was so much more. In getting to know the town and its people, down the track I was also able to help them obtain an important community asset.

At the end of World War I, Legerwood's grieving families of the fallen planted a memorial avenue of pine trees along the main street, along with other mourning communities, other trees and other roads right around the country. The enormous tree carvings that are there now were created when this memorial avenue had to be removed about 20 years ago. This decision was made due to safety concerns following an infestation of tree blight. Determined to retain its memorial, however, in 2004 the Legerwood Hall and Reserve Committee commissioned a chainsaw sculptor to carve a series of sculptures into the remaining tree trunks

based on the lives of the people they represented, their own fallen community members. Extensive historical research into the lives of the fallen soldiers and their families ensured the carvings depicted stories of those they represented as accurately as possible. Surrounding trees were also removed due to the effects of the blight, and they were sculpted to depict scenes of the Great War.

I found on my visit to Legerwood that day that this is not the only attraction; there is also a visitor information and history centre and a community garden. Legerwood's background as a thriving hub for timber, sawmilling, beef, pork, dairy and pastoral industries saw rail come to the town. The first train drew into Legerwood station in 1911. As well as freight, trains also transported residents to and from regional centres and delivered day trippers for their countryside outings.

To create this memorial, through work undertaken by volunteers, the old rail yards have been cleared and a beautifully restored original railway carriage installed. The original signage from the station, which is over 100 years old, was rescued from a scheduled tip run and stands proudly on display. The carriage is full of historic photos and memorabilia that give a fascinating insight into the area, as well as souvenirs and timber.

Time expired.

The House adjourned at 6.01 p.m.