



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

REPORT OF DEBATES

Wednesday 4 June 2025

REVISED EDITION

Contents

WEDNESDAY 4 JUNE 2025.....	1
RECOGNITION OF VISITORS	1
MOTION	1
LEAVE TO DEBATE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE	1
SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS	1
DEBATE MOTION FORTHWITH	1
MOTION	9
WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN PREMIER, JEREMY ROCKLIFF	9
STATEMENT BY SPEAKER.....	48
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY BROADCAST ISSUES.....	48
MOTION	48
WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN PREMIER, JEREMY ROCKLIFF	48
ADJOURNMENT.....	120

Wednesday 4 June 2025

The Speaker, **Ms O'Byrne**, took the Chair at 10.00 a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People, and read Prayers.

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

The SPEAKER - I acknowledge in the gallery the presence of the year 11/12 Legal Studies students from Rosny College, who may have chosen one of the more fascinating days to attend parliament. There will be an explainer at some stage during the day.

Members - Hear, hear.

MOTION

Leave to Debate Motion Without Notice

[10.01 a.m.]

Mr WINTER (Franklin - Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I seek leave to move a motion without notice for the purpose of moving the suspension of Standing Orders to enable Notice of Motion No. 145 from being dealt with forthwith.

The SPEAKER - There are no people wishing to speak on the seeking of leave. It is my intention to put the vote for seeking of leave, making sure everyone understands that.

In normal circumstances only government business is done during the budget period. However, matters such as confidence and censure take precedence over that.

Leave granted.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Debate Motion Forthwith

Mr WINTER (Franklin - Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I move -

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the motion from being debated forthwith.

The motion says:

That the House: -

- (1) Agrees the Premier, Hon. Jeremy Rockliff MP's budget mismanagement is doing significant long-term damage to Tasmania.
- (2) Does not support the Premier's plan to privatise public assets.

- (3) Has no faith in the Premier's ability to deliver major projects following the *Spirit of Tasmania* fiasco.
- (4) Further has no confidence in the Premier, the Hon. Jeremy Rockliff MP.

I move this motion today and seek the House's support to do so because the direction that the Tasmanian Premier is taking our state will send it broke. I move it today because when I deeply considered my role, my responsibility to this state, I just could not tolerate allowing this mess to continue. I wish I could stand here and say everything was fine, but I owe Tasmanians more than that. I owe them more than false comfort; I owe them the truth and the commitment to act on it.

If I just sit back and allow this chaos and dysfunction to continue, I am just as complicit as the Premier, and that goes for the House. We cannot, in good conscience, support this Premier. I would never forgive myself if I was complicit in the debt and deficits being built up. The Premier is sending Tasmania broke, and he is not even prepared to admit that he has a problem. This has now reached crisis level and yet he is pretending that everything is fine. What the government has been saying about a pathway to surplus is not true, and if I and other members are going to be honest with Tasmanians, we need to call it out.

Tasmanians deserve leadership that works for them, not dysfunction that works against them. It is time to move beyond the paralysis of the past and focus on the priorities and things that matter to Tasmanians and their communities -

Mr Ellis - Like seizing power with the Greens.

Mr WINTER - The majority of the House has indicated that it does not have confidence in the direction that the Premier of Tasmania is taking this state, and yet he has turned up here this morning.

Members interjecting.

Mr Ellis - He is the Premier of this state.

Mr WINTER - Just look at the list of broken promises: the healthiest state in the nation by 2025; education results at the national average by 2022; keeping Tasmania net-debt free; no deals for minority government. There are the projects: Cradle Mountain cableway; cable car on Kunanyi; light rail by 2025; new Tamar Bridge; full redevelopment of the Launceston General Hospital; underground bus mall; duplicating the Charles Street Bridge; SunCable; northern prison -

A member - Commission of inquiry, Bridgewater Bridge.

The SPEAKER - I am quite sure everyone wishes to stay in the Chamber.

Mr WINTER - Then there are the policies, the paralysis, the broken promise. Those policies and plans are gone and yet the Premier still sits here.

The House has had deep concerns about the direction that this Premier is taking us. When he stitched up those deals, those agreements to form a government, he lost them almost straight

away. It is not up to the opposition to provide confidence and supply to this government. It is the Premier's responsibility to have confidence of supply agreements with the crossbench, which he has not had for a long period of time. The instability of this government is the fault of one person - the Premier of Tasmania. The House has already let its views be known publicly and yet the Premier still sits here.

The debate is very important today. The broken promises are galling, but the situation the state arrives in goes back to one thing, and that is the state of the Tasmanian budget. There is \$1.7 billion of cash deficit this year, heading towards \$11 billion worth of net debt, and a Premier who will not even admit there is a problem. There is a plan to privatise Tasmanian assets. Assets that we have built for 100 years together are now on the chopping block by this Premier. We cannot stand by and let him do this -

Members interjecting.

A member - You want to sell them.

Mr WINTER - So, when we thought deeply about our responsibility to this state -

Mr Ellis - You have not thought about this at all.

Mr Rockliff - You are weak as water.

The SPEAKER - Minister Ellis.

Ms Dow - Have you not got the numbers over there?

The SPEAKER - Members on both sides.

Mr WINTER - We cannot stand by and allow this mess to continue. The Tasmanian parliament needs to stand strong against this agenda. This is an agenda that will send Tasmanians broke. It is an agenda that young Tasmanians will be paying for for the rest of their lives.

The Premier of Tasmania does not have the confidence of the Labor Party. I look forward to the debate later on today.

The SPEAKER - Just to update the House on where we are, we are in the second stage of a three-stage process. The first stage was the seeking of leave, which was granted. The second is a 35-minute debate on the suspension. After that has been moved and, if successfully passed, we will move to the substantive motion.

[10.07 a.m.]

Mr ABETZ (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Honourable Speaker, the party that is still under federal administration because they cannot govern themselves are now asserting that they somehow are going to be able to deliver better government to this state. What did we hear from the Leader of the Opposition? No way to surplus. Well, in his Budget reply speech, what was his way to surplus? Nothing at all. It was crickets -

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Members on my left, I asked members on my right to be quiet during the leader's contribution.

Mr ABETZ - Did we even have an alternative budget?

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - No, we did not. Mr Winter, if he gets his way, will be like the dog that caught the car: the chase was exhilarating, but he has the bumper bar between his jaws and has no idea what to do with it.

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - Let us be very, very clear: this is the man who tells us we need the truth. Well, let us start with where you were born.

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - You have deceived the people of Tasmania: born on the west coast, born at Kingston Beach, born in Hobart.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - The House will come to order.

Mr ABETZ - Whatever the occasion suits - next it will be Launceston. He was there on Leon Compton the other day saying that we have to stop the pork-barrelling -

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - the very next day, front page of *The Examiner* with a \$20 million splurge.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - The House will come to order now.

Mr ABETZ - He tells us, and the Labor Party has told us, that the Office of the Coordinator-General should be abolished - now, he wants it with more teeth. He tells us that he is for privatisation. Now, he is against privatisation. The Labor Party were against the new ships. Now, they are concerned that the new ships are not coming quickly enough. This is a man for all seasons.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Members on my left.

Mr ABETZ - Next, he will be telling us that his surname is actually 'Summer', because that is what suits his purpose.

A member - Wow. That is so cringe.

Mr Winter - Do you know how serious this is?

Members interjecting.

Ms Haddad - Where is your defence of your colleagues? You are just talking about us.

The SPEAKER - Member for Clark. Member for Franklin.

Mr ABETZ - This is a matter that will send chaos to the Tasmanian people and the Tasmanian economy. Who else need I quote but the Leader of Opposition Business in this place, who, less than one month ago -

Ms Haddad - Why are you not defending your Premier?

The SPEAKER - Member for Clark.

Mr ABETZ - said, on behalf of the Labor Party, 'We have said that we are going to be responsible' -

Mr Ellis - He rowed the boat out on that one.

The SPEAKER - Minister Ellis.

Mr ABETZ - '... the state needs stability for a period.'

Ms Brown - Defend the Premier.

The SPEAKER - The member for Franklin is warned.

Mr ABETZ - 'I do not believe the Tasmanians are ready for another state election. It would reflect poorly on all of us. This is a time when we know that things' - and listen to this - 'like business confidence are hanging on a thread.' What an outrageous comment to make -

Members interjecting.

Ms Haddad - Where is your defence of your colleague?

The SPEAKER - Member for Clark, you will be warned if you interject again.

Mr ABETZ - when business confidence in this state is the highest of any state or territory in Australia, when we have historically low unemployment, with a 'three' in front of it, when we have the highest wage growth in the country. The Labor Party are trying to trash our economy by talking it down, knowing full well that if this motion gets up, what is going to happen with the Appropriation Bills, the passing of supply for the benefit of keeping the machinery of government going and payment of public servants? What is it going to do to the stadium that they now allegedly champion? Come an election, things will be on hold for at least a couple of months, if not more. We all know that will blow the timelines for the stadium. You cannot get around this. This is opportunism writ large by the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - It is opportunism for his vanity project because he thinks somehow he might want to become premier - but at the cost of our fellow Tasmanians, at the cost of our economy, at the cost of the stadium, at the cost of Marinus Link -

Members interjecting.

Mr Willie - He delivered this parliament. He called an election a year early.

The SPEAKER - Members on my left.

Mr ABETZ - and so the list goes on and on.

Ms Brown - Defend the Premier - 30 seconds left, defend him.

The SPEAKER - Member for Franklin, you have a warning.

Mr ABETZ - Speaker, we on this side have absolute confidence in the Premier -

Members interjecting.

Ms Haddad - Finally, in your last 20 seconds.

Mr ABETZ - and what is more, the opinion polls tell us that when it comes to a clash between Rockliff and Winter, Rockliff always wins. Should you take us to an election by this terrible act -

Mr Winter - The only person who will be taking us to an election will be him.

Mr ABETZ - that you are trying to perpetrate today, be assured that I have every confidence that Premier Rockliff will be re-elected, because people do not want to see this chaos.

Time expired.

The SPEAKER - Before giving the call to the Leader of the Greens, Dr Woodruff, who has the call next, I will not preside over chaos on this day. This is a significant debate, more so because there is not an eye in the state that is not watching this room right now. Please, all of you, act like the elected representatives that you have been asked to be by the parliament, by the people of Tasmania, and treat this debate with the sincerity and the seriousness that it deserves.

[10.13 a.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin - Leader of the Greens) - Honourable Speaker, this is a serious moment today, and the Greens can just make it as a statement of fact that the Premier has brought this on himself. He has had repeated opportunities to listen to the people of Tasmania and he has repeatedly refused to do that. Poll after poll have made it abundantly clear that Tasmanians do not and will not support a new stadium at Macquarie Point in Hobart. People understand the devastation that it will cost Tasmanians for generations to come. When we saw the Budget delivered last week, we saw in black and white the true costs that are going

to come if Jeremy Rockliff and the Liberals under him continue with a new stadium in Macquarie Point.

What they have committed to is 2500 extra public service cuts. That is 2500 jobs out of a public service that is running on the smell of an oily rag after over a decade of the Liberals' underfunding and mismanagement. He is committed to proceeding with privatising some of our government businesses. These are the businesses that we hold in trust for Tasmanians. They have been built by generations of Tasmanian people and in the public interest they provide us with services that we need and that Tasmanians deserve to keep, because we know that if he goes ahead with privatising any of those services, it will mean the services they provide for Tasmanians will cost more and will be lower quality. That is what happens every single time we privatise services.

He has also already introduced, in successive budgets now, efficiency dividends, which are a cut by another name, and that is exactly why we repeatedly see the removal of staff in a secretive, stealthy way from providing critical services in education, housing, health, child protection, and environmental protection. These services have already been cut, and on top of that, he proposes to cut an extra 2500 public sector jobs. The reason he is doing this is to fund a new stadium that Tasmanians do not want and do not need.

Later today when we get there, I will deliver the Greens' alternative budget, and show there is another way that this Premier has warped priorities. He has repeatedly made choices that have affected Tasmanians' lives for the worst. People are suffering. You only had to hear what happened at the Tasmanian Council of Social Service (TasCOSS) Budget breakfast to understand how devastating this Liberal Budget under Jeremy Rockliff will be, and already is, for those services that are fronting people in our community who are struggling the most. They are doing the work of government and they do not even know if they will exist. They had to flick through the budget papers to find out if they would even exist - the level of disrespect.

When we are talking about Jeremy Rockliff and disrespect, I speak on behalf of the Tasmanian Aboriginal people who have spoken to me and are deeply outraged at another broken promise from a non-Aboriginal person in power. Jeremy Rockliff promised to deliver a treaty and he has walked away from that promise. That is on top of the broken promises he made to Tasmanians at the election, where he promised to cap spending on a stadium to \$375 million. He has repeatedly lied since then, continuing to pretend that that will happen.

He is pushing through corrupted legislation, trying to ram through a stadium that Tasmanians do not want at whatever cost. The Labor Party has said that they will support it unconditionally. The Greens stand firm on this. We stand against a new stadium because what is in this Budget is a disaster and a debt spiral for Tasmania for generations to come.

They have up to \$10 billion on the books and they chose to knowingly put in \$2 billion of debt over the next decade. That is what will come to Tasmanians. It could have been avoided, will be avoided, must be avoided, and we will support this debate.

Time expired.

[10.18 a.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Honourable Speaker, what we are doing in this part of the debate is making an argument for the suspension of standing orders. There was absolutely no

argument put by the leader of government business about why we should not be granting the suspension. Instead what we heard was just a series -

Mr Ellis - You made an argument a month ago.

The SPEAKER - Mr Ellis, you are warned.

Dr BROAD - A series of talking points, including some birther nonsense and so on. He did not defend the Premier until we begged him to actually have a rational debate, and he belatedly defended the Premier. What has changed in this place? What has changed is the Budget. This government is bringing down a Budget that is sending Tasmania in completely the wrong direction. They have had enough warnings. We have been talking about the debt for years, and yet this government is keen on continuing down that same pathway of unsustainable debt. As the Leader of Opposition, Mr Winter, said, this is something that all our children will be paying off almost their entire lives unless we change it. This Premier is not going to change it.

That is why we are here today. We have got to the point where we believe there is no choice but to change the Premier. This is serious. We hear the leader of government business talk about stability. There is no stability. There is no stability because you have not created a parliament with stability. Since this Premier has taken the premiership, what has happened? He lost his own majority when two of his own members walked, then we went to an early election where he promised a majority government and he would not do a deal.

What did he do? There was a minority government and he did a deal. He did a deal for supply and confidence. Where is that supply and confidence deal? It is dead, and it was dead virtually the day it was written. There has been no stability. The argument from the leader of government business that we need to keep Mr Rockliff in the Premier's chair for stability is a complete joke. There has never been any stability under this Premier - never. Not since virtually the moment that he took the job and those two Liberal members walked. Remember that: no stability under this Premier.

This state is headed in absolutely the wrong direction under this Premier, and it has come to the point today where we absolutely have to have this debate. The Premier needs to defend his record, and I do not believe he can. I do not believe that the Liberals can defend their record because it is a litany of failures. The *Spirits* debacle was the highlight, until we saw this Budget. We saw that this is a government that is not changing direction, it is ploughing on off a cliff. That is why today we have to say, enough is enough. This is a Premier who has failed in his job and he has to move on.

He should be doing the right thing and he should be resigning. What we are going to hear today, if this suspension motion gets up, and I am pretty sure it will, is a long debate, because we need to have it. What we will hear from that side is a whole bunch of conspiracies because they cannot face the facts that they are failing Tasmanians. Instead they have to talk about a conspiracy. 'Oh, what is going to happen? Oh, the state is going to blow up or there is going to be no budget', or they will talk about absolutely everything except their own record, because their own record is horrendous.

Every man, woman and child - and their pets - is saying that this is a government that has lost its way. The only people who do not realise it are the people sitting over there. It is

incredible. Heads in the sand. This is a government that is driving the state off a cliff and it has to end. This is a Premier who has failed. There is nothing wrong with Premier Rockliff as a person, but as a Premier, he has failed. He has failed every test. He has failed stability, he has failed on the budget and he has failed on the direction of this state.

Mrs Petrusma - He is more popular.

The SPEAKER - Member for Franklin.

Dr BROAD - Wow. That is a very good predictor of a political outcome, is it? What we want for this state is a direction where this state actually looks like it is going to improve, not a state where we have a Premier and a Treasurer who are driving us off a fiscal cliff. We have been warning about this for years. There is no stability; let us have the debate. We need to have this debate. We need to get the suspension. What we need is the government to actually attempt to defend themselves. I do not believe they can.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Want of Confidence in Premier, Jeremy Rockliff

The SPEAKER - Just before you start your contribution, to explain to people what is happening, we are now on the substantive motion. Each leader has 30 minutes, and all other members will have 20 minutes, to make their contribution.

[10.23 a.m.]

Mr WINTER (Franklin - Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I am not going to stand here today and rant and rave as I heard the Leader of the House do. This is too serious for the sort of interjections we have heard from the government benches; more serious than the Leader of the House today. This is the most serious motion that a parliament can move, and we do not move it lightly because we cannot stand by and allow this Premier to continue down this path. This is too serious. What we have seen from this Premier over the last 12 months, in particular, is a broken budget.

The Leader of the House is quite right: 'What has changed?' he says. Opening that budget paper on Thursday - that is what changed. I could not believe the depth of the debt, the deficits and then the rhetoric from the government about the financial situation we were in. It was not a serious budget from not a serious government, from not a serious premier. The response from the government to its own numbers was to say that there was a sustainable pathway to surplus. There is not. Such a fundamental fact about this Budget has been falsely put to the Tasmanian people over and over for nearly 12 months now. There is no sustainable pathway to surplus. There is only a pathway towards the state going broke under this Premier. If you do not have the fundamentals of a premier who is prepared to be honest with Tasmanians about the situation we are in, then what do you have?

It appears the deals the Premier struck for minority government have collapsed. A sufficient number of crossbench MPs have publicly confirmed that they have lost their confidence in the Premier and question whether the Premier maintains the support required to

continue. Those MPs have indicated they have lost confidence in the Premier because of his financial mismanagement, his appalling handling of the *Spirits of Tasmania* and his plan to privatise Tasmania's most precious assets. The state Budget confirmed that Tasmania will never get the change it needs under this Premier.

It gives me no pleasure whatsoever to move this motion, but under our system of government, if a premier does not have the support of the majority of the House, they cannot continue. Should this motion be successful, I give the full support of the Labor Party for the passage of supply under a new premier.

I also reiterate that there is no question whatsoever about our support for our AFL teams and a stadium.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Members on my right.

Mr WINTER - That is all anything is about for this Premier - that one project. Tasmania Labor is focused on what matters to Tasmanians, and those things are health and education. Yes, we support a stadium, absolutely. We also support having a government that can deliver a budget that is honest, sustainable and responsible, and we do not have that.

Ms Ogilvie - Now you are responsible for the disaster.

The SPEAKER - Minister Ogilvie.

Mr WINTER - This motion is required because it appears the deals the Premier struck have collapsed. He has broken trust with Tasmanians over his handling of the *Spirits of Tasmania* fiasco. The government has given up on the responsibility of managing Tasmania's finances. The Premier plans to sell our power companies, ports and public transport, among other things Tasmanians have built together for 100 years. This Premier thinks he is going to plough on and sell those things Tasmanians built. They are not his to sell, and yet that is what he wants to do.

I do not believe I can, in good conscience, allow this Premier to continue. Tasmania needs change, not more of the same. If we continue the way the Premier plans, our state will be held back for generations by this \$11 billion of net debt, and it will not be this Premier dealing with it. It will be young Tasmanians trying to buy a home, trying to survive, trying to get the health care they need, young Tasmanians going to school. They will be spending \$650 million every year of taxpayer money just servicing the debt that he has built up over only a few small years. We will be spending more on interest rate payments than the entire ambulance service and emergency departments combined.

If he is allowed to pursue this privatisation plan, the assets that keep prices down for Tasmanians and help pay for our schools and hospitals will be gone forever. That is more than \$600 million in funding for schools and hospitals gone. It means the price of essentials like power, car registration and public transport will soar, just as they have in other states that have gone down this path. We cannot allow this to happen.

I have always said the fact that the Premier is governing in minority has given me a great deal of responsibility in this parliament. I take this responsibility extremely seriously -

Members interjecting.

Mr WINTER - and I have, on numerous occasions. I have, and continue to. However, in light of this Budget and the apparent collapse of the deals with the independent members and the crossbench, I have come to the judgment that it would be irresponsible and unjustifiable for me to allow this Premier to continue the way he is. It would be irresponsible for me to let Tasmania run up \$11 billion of net debt, to take from future generations because he will not take any tough decisions. It would be irresponsible and reckless to let him sell Tasmania's future. As the leader of the Labor Party, I cannot support a premier who said he will not be backing down from his privatisation plan. As the state Budget has made clear, the Premier is not willing to change one single thing.

Tasmania needs change. It does not need more of this Premier. We need to change the trajectory of our public finances. We need a premier who is focused on the issues that actually matter to Tasmanians. We need a premier who can competently deliver the projects they have promised Tasmanians. We need a premier who respects the assets the Tasmanians have built together for 100 years. We have none of those things with this Premier, and it appears that at least three of the independent members of the crossbench also have no confidence that he will ever change.

I will make a comment on the crossbench. I understand that members of the crossbench also take their responsibilities seriously, and they will express that in different ways today. Having spoken to members of the crossbench over the past weeks and months, and over the last 24 hours, I know that all of them have taken their responsibility really seriously.

Mr O'Byrne - Well, you have not spoken to me. Do not verbal me.

Members interjecting.

Mr Rockliff - Because you are too weak, that is why.

Mr Ellis - Your lip is twitching, you take it so seriously.

Mr WINTER - The Premier says I am too weak and he will -

Mr Rockliff - Weak as water. You are no leader.

Mr Ellis - You are in administration.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Premier.

Mr WINTER - The Premier will go to the personal attacks today, just as his leader of government business did, because he is angry and upset that he has lost the confidence of this House and he wants to blame the opposition. It is not up to the opposition to provide supply and confidence to this Premier or any premier; it is up to the Premier to take responsibility for

his own actions, for the fact that he does not have the confidence of the crossbench; to take responsibility for his own actions when he took Tasmania to an early election, when he promised Tasmanians that he would deliver stability and confidence, when he said minority government would wreck the economy and wreck our healthcare system.

He is living up to exactly what he promised would happen under a minority government. It is his responsibility to have agreements with the crossbench, to give them confidence that he is the right person for the job. He has failed to do that, and he has to take some responsibility in his actions and his words today. Personal attacks are not going to cut it. They are not going to change opinions. The Premier should be defending his own actions.

The Budget proves beyond any doubt that Tasmania needs change because it proves that Jeremy Rockliff's Liberal Party cannot be trusted with the finances. If you cannot be trusted with the finances, then you cannot lead this state.

In 2014, Tasmania had no net debt. The government will not even admit that. There was no net debt in 2014.

Members interjecting.

Mr WINTER - I know that because it is in their own Treasury annual report. There was \$208 million of net cash in investments in the budget on 30 June -

Mr Shelton - Remember the Superannuation Liability?

A member - You sold the TOTE.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Leader, I will stop you for a moment- I am absolutely sure that all members wish to be here to make their full contribution today. I will not hesitate to remove people. This has to be done with a level of dignity and decorum. This is a serious matter.

Mr WINTER - Thank you, honourable Speaker. You are quite right. That we have interjections from the government over the fact that there was \$208 million worth of net cash and investments in the budget on 30 June 2014 tells you everything you need to know about the denialism of the budget situation that they put us in.

As I said yesterday, to be fair, the start of this Liberal government was pretty fiscally disciplined. There was a relatively low increase in spending. This parliament gave then premier Peter Gutwein everything he needed when it came to the response to COVID. We understood how important that was -

Mr Jaensch - You do not want to take responsibility for the cost of that now.

Mr WINTER - However, since this Premier became -

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Both sides need to be aware of my suggestions about behaviour.

Mr WINTER - When this Premier took the job, there was barely \$1 billion of net debt. Three years later, we are on a pathway towards \$11 billion worth of net debt. It is staggering, extraordinary, reckless, irresponsible. How could anyone support that?

When that budget was brought down, there were not gasps over there. There were cheers from the Liberal Party that have been calling themselves responsible fiscal managers for years. They cheered on \$11 billion worth of net debt, the largest cash deficits every year for 10 years. They cheered it on. One of them stood and clapped. The approach was unbelievable and shameful. This Premier has now posted the three worst fiscal deficits in Tasmanian history. Three years in a row. His budget plans are to make it four from four, five from five, six from six. It just keeps getting worse. He simply cannot manage money.

As I said yesterday, we have seen that every time there is a political problem he gets Tasmania's cheque book out and pays for the problem to go away. Now that might work on one or two occasions, but this builds up. The idea that you would go and effectively partially nationalise a mine on King Island, to solve political problem: it might work for the Premier in the short term, but it is not an approach that works for Tasmania in the long term.

Members interjecting.

Mr WINTER - He has taken Tasmania's finances from the strongest in the nation to the weakest. He has caused our credit outlook to be downgraded by the ratings agencies.

Mr Abetz - Who wrote this?

The SPEAKER - Leader.

Mr WINTER - This Premier and his party are entirely responsible for this mess. Rather than taking those tough decisions, they have squibbed it every single time.

Let us look at the history of this government and this Premier. He called himself a reformer and yet I cannot think of a single reform that this Premier has ever made that has actually worked. We have a budget problem which is a problem in the making of the Premier's on his own. Now, his only plan is to wreck the budget, stuff the *Spirits* and sell the assets that Tasmanians have spent 100 years building together. It is a fact. It is exactly what he has done, and it is why Tasmania needs change.

The government will be spending interest on interest. We can more than double the size and staffing of our ambulance service and emergency departments if this interest payment was not there. It is not something this Premier has to deal with this year, which is why he is doing it.

He said that he is going to sack 2500 public servants, but not this year. That is in the out years, that is for someone else to do. He said he is going to privatise the assets to pay down the debt that he is building up. He comes in here today and wants to blame the opposition for the situation he is in. We cannot support an agenda like this. Who could? The crossbench has indicated, at least some members have, that they cannot support this agenda either.

This is disastrous. It is selfish budget management. It puts the problems of today onto the heads of the future generations.

Members interjecting.

Mr WINTER - I cannot help but note the interjections from government. This is a the most serious motion that you could possibly move and yet we have a response from government which is anything but.

For Tasmanians, this is like a household where they have overextended on their mortgage, taking out a credit card for the repayments. It is completely unsustainable. I am furious with the approach that they have taken.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Shadow treasurer.

Mr WINTER - Today we have heard from the government that this is Labor's fault that they are in this situation, but it is entirely a mess of their own making. Tasmanians did not vote for the agenda that the government has put forward. They did not vote for a government that wanted to privatise TasNetworks. They did not vote for a government that wanted to privatise MAIB, that wanted to sell Aurora, where they get their power from. They did not vote for this privatisation agenda and yet it is the one that the Premier has put on the table.

There is no mandate for this Premier's agenda. The agenda that he took to the election only a year ago is in tatters. The policies that he put forward are not going to happen. The only policy he has now committed to is the privatisation plan to sell down those assets.

What will happen to the power bills of Tasmanians? When Aurora gets privatised, what will happen to the power bills of Tasmanians who are really struggling, who are on payment plans, who use Aurora because they have a payment plan that looks after them, which puts Tasmanians first? What will happen to them? What will happen to the dividends that Momentum helps to pay through Hydro to help support our schools and hospitals? What will happen if this Premier's agenda is allowed to happen?

The approach that this Premier is taking with TasNetworks puts at risk some of the most volatile and at-risk businesses in Tasmania today. The privatisation plan of the Premier cannot be seen apart from the crisis that we are seeing at Liberty Bell Bay and at Nyrstar.

The opportunity for this Premier to act on multiple fronts is being exhausted by his own actions. The state of this Budget means that if there is an emergency, we do not have a premier who can act. The state of this Budget means that this Premier does not have the financial stability behind him to actually support them. The financial position of this Budget means that if there needs to be support for those businesses, it is going to be hard for him to find the cash.

When TasNetworks is privatised, there will not be a government able to support those businesses through making sure their transmission costs do not rise by more than 25 per cent in a couple of years; that do not continue to rise on the never-never because we have lost the ability to support our economy. That is what this agenda does to real people.

The MAIB is the premier model for that type of insurance anywhere in Australia, and everyone in the industry knows it. When we talk to people about how important this is, what

we hear from them is that it should not be privatised. It is supporting Tasmanians to have lower car registrations. It is the premier model, yet it is a model that this Premier wants to sell.

These would be the most extreme measures any premier has put forward since 1998, the last time the Liberals were stuck in minority in this state, when the Liberals tried to sell our Hydro and they got turfed out. This is the same thing. This is a premier who has put so many of our government businesses at risk -

Mr Abetz - You wanted to do it.

Mr Barnett - You wanted to gut it.

The SPEAKER - Deputy Premier and Leader of the House.

Mr WINTER - through his privatisation plan and we will not support that agenda.

We stood by last year, 12 months ago in this place, and the very first question we asked the Premier was this: Is it true that you have bailed out a Finnish shipbuilder with \$80 million worth of Tasmanian taxpayer dollars?

I do not think he knew the answer to the question and there is certainly no evidence he did. Somehow, in terms of the governance of this government, they had a premier who did not know that his own government was bailing out a Finnish shipbuilder with \$80 million of Tasmanian taxpayer dollars - \$80 million spent with the Premier of Tasmania not knowing about it.

Dr BROAD - That was just the start.

Mr WINTER - That was just the start. The \$80 million was just the start of the questions which started to unravel. This is a premier who oversaw the biggest infrastructure stuff-up in Tasmanian history and for the longest time did not know anything about it: did not know about the bailout and did not know the berth was not going to be ready.

The worst part of all of this, in terms of leadership and honesty, is that when the Premier found out in April last year, when he finally found out that those ships were not going to be able to operate from that new berth over summer, he had two choices.

First choice was to be honest and upfront and tell the tourism industry. Tell them that the ships were not going to be ready and they should stop getting ready. They should stop spending their own money, their own business money. They should stop taking on more debt to support more tourism and freight. He could have told Tourism Tasmania to tell those businesses to stop getting ready but he did not. He did not tell anyone about it. He kept it hidden, kept it to himself so that businesses, like the Latrobe Caravan Park, kept investing, kept getting ready, spending their own money right across the state.

A member - It is a fact.

A member - Rubbish.

Mr WINTER - It is a fact.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Order. Order. If people wish to be given the call to make their contributions, I suggest they listen to this one.

Mr WINTER - Gavin Imlach found out about this on the news - that the biggest infrastructure project that he had been banking on, that he had been investing in for years, was not going to happen, and he is not the only one.

When I met with tourism bodies around the *Spirits* in the middle to later part of last year, I was the one who had to tell them the *Spirits* were not going to be there. I had to sit across the table from them and say, 'I am sorry, this is just not true. These ships are not going to be able to operate this summer.' Tourism Tasmania found out about this on the news. It is not just the debacle, it is not just the broken promises, it is not just the complete incompetence and ineptitude, it is the cover up. It is almost as bad as the crime.

The lack of respect for Tasmanians around this, the lack of respect to just tell them the truth, to own up to your own mistakes. We still have the government trying to pretend as though it was not their fault, put the blame onto the businesses. Every government needs to take responsibility for their own actions, and that is what the Premier needs to do today - take responsibility for his own actions, for the fact that he has failed so badly on these projects. He stuffed the *Spirits* project so badly we still have both of our *Spirits* on the wrong side of the world. We have one *Spirit* that is called defective by the minister responsible. We have another still in Finland. *Spirit IV* is supposed to be on the way. In fact, it should be operating already, and yet it is still stuck on the other side of the world as a floating billboard of incompetence seen everywhere right across the world, including in Scotland.

Tasmanians are embarrassed about the way the government has handled this. It is completely staggering that this has happened, and that there is such a lack of responsibility taken still today by this government around this project. It has cost Tasmanian taxpayers \$500 million more than they were told - \$500 million wasted by a government that could not get it right. We know from Saul Eslake's reporting that in real terms this project is costing our state half-a-billion dollars every year in lost revenue, in lost economic impact.

When I look forward to the economic forecasting in that budget, that budget is in absolute tatters, and it has had negative growth in one year. I think about that. I wonder if that would be different if we had our *Spirits* here. I wonder if we would not be looking at an economic contraction if this government had just got it right, if they just done their very basic purpose as a government, which is to get this project right for Tasmania. This is a project that is so important to Tasmanians - economically, culturally. This is a project that Tasmanians rely on to get their freight right across Australia, and yet we are being constrained by the fact that the government has not been able to deliver these ships. Businesses who want to get their produce onto the mainland are being constrained in a serious way that is holding back economic growth.

For older Tasmanians, this is an important project because they want to go and see the rest of Australia - and good on them. The prices that have been going up and the lack of capacity to get them onto the mainland is an issue. It is a real issue, and it has been totally stuffed up by this government. We are concerned about the way that these government businesses have been managed and have been for some time - the lack of contrition around this project and the fact

that the Premier stood up and acknowledged this in the State of State speech this year. He said, 'The problems with the *Spirits*' -

Members interjecting.

Mr Abetz - You are struggling.

Mr Ellis - A lot of support behind you there.

The SPEAKER - Members on my right -

A member - Grow up.

The SPEAKER - and members on my left, that will do.

Mr WINTER - I am paraphrasing: 'The problems with the *Spirits* have caused us to reflect on the governance of our government businesses.' The Premier said that he had reflected on the way that our government businesses are being run, and his response to that is to sell them - not to fix them, but to sell them. Tasmania Labor does not support the agenda. In response to the *Spirits of Tasmania*, the learning should not have been to sell them, the learning should have been to fix them.

Mr Willie - Merge them first.

Mr WINTER - Merge them. This is a government that has let Tasmanians down for years now - years and years - but the problems have become more exaggerated, larger, particularly in the last 12 months. This is a government that promises things but never delivers them. They promised Tasmanians that we would be the healthiest state in Australia by 2025. For those who are not following along, it is 2025 and we are the least healthy state in Australia. They did not just miss the mark by a little; they missed it completely. In fact, despite spending twice as much on health today as they did when they first came into government, the outcomes are worse. When they talk about the budget, they talk about the spending, but they do not talk about the outcomes, and it is the outcomes that matter to Tasmania. It is the outcomes that matter, because when Tasmanians call an ambulance, they expect to be able to get one.

When I talked to a constituent in the Huon Valley who called an ambulance because he was having a heart attack - he is a former paramedic, Ryan - the operator on the end of the line had to tell him that it would be about an hour away. He knew that if he waited that long, he would not survive.

Mrs Petrusma - A new station is coming into Cygnet and Snug.

Members interjecting.

Mr Abetz - New station at Cygnet.

Mr Farrell - Eleven years.

The SPEAKER - Members on my right, you will all have an opportunity.

Mr WINTER - Did I just hear that? I am not sure whether to respond to that. I actually do not think it is serious enough to respond to.

The SPEAKER - The member will not respond to interjections. The leader has the call.

Mr WINTER - He drove himself into the Royal Hobart Hospital whilst he was having a heart attack because he could not get access to the health care he needed. This is from a government that said we would be the healthiest state by 2025. Tasmania's education results have been underperforming for years now, and when the government promised Tasmanians that Tasmania would reach the national average by 2022, Tasmanians believed in them. There were passionate speeches in this place about delivering education and health and meeting those targets.

Tasmania remains on the bottom of the table when it comes to education. The so-called reforms have not worked, and Tasmanian students are still at the bottom when it comes to their learning outcomes. That is not their fault. We need to have teachers who are properly resourced. We need to have schools and young people that are ready to go. We have a population of young people who are ambitious, confident and want to stay in this state, and they need an education system that backs them in. They need a government that backs them in. We need to start having conversations in this place that are about health and education, about those things that really matter to Tasmanians, but under this Premier we have been doing anything but.

Every four days, a plane load of young Tasmanians is leaving for the mainland, and it is because of policies that do not give them the opportunities they need. We have so many incredible opportunities in front of this state and so many of them are being lost. According to the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (TCCI), there is \$25 billion worth of renewable energy projects that are ready to go, and it is so exciting to have them. Projects like a methanol plant at Bell Bay and HIF on the north-west coast are really exciting, but it is the projects that we have already lost because of this Premier and his policies: Origin Energy, Woodside, Fortescue Future Industries arrived in Tasmania on a promise from the Premier and then had to leave.

They had to leave the state because there was not enough power for them. We are in Tasmania, the home of renewable energy in 2025. It should be our superpower and yet we do not have enough of it to grow our economy. It is a tragedy for our economy that we are not grasping these opportunities because of the inertia in government, because of a Premier who just will not lead on the things that matter.

That is why we have lost confidence. We are confident about Tasmanians and confident about our state, but we are not confident in this Premier. We are not confident that he has the ability to grasp those opportunities in front of us. We are not confident that he is able to manage our budget successfully and sustainably so that young people will not be paying millions of dollars every year just to service debt, so that we will not get into debt spiral where we continue to pay interest upon interest upon interest.

Tasmanian governments have worked so hard not to be in that position. Governments of all sizes, shapes and colours have worked hard to make sure we do not get in this situation, except for one. I will even put the Hodgman and Gutwein governments in that category, but not this government. This is a change that has been led by Jeremy Rockliff. The approach to budget management has been reckless, and that is how we got to today.

What is more reckless: allowing this government to continue or telling them to stop? It would be reckless to allow this Premier to continue to plough on with what he is doing to our state. I will not stand for it. I will not allow him to continue down this path of reckless debt and deficit that will cause massive problems for our state and send it broke.

Honourable Speaker, I commend the motion to the House. I understand that the crossbench has taken this really seriously and I appreciate that. Tasmanian Labor does not have confidence in this Premier.

[10.54 a.m.]

Mr ROCKLIFF (Braddon - Premier) - Honourable Speaker, I appreciate the circumstances in which we find ourselves today. We are in the middle of a budget process where nurses, teachers, police and other hardworking public servants need to be paid as a result of this Budget. We are in the midst of some very significant debates - debates that we have argued over the last three years about stadia infrastructure and our own AFL and AFLW teams, which we have fought for for decades.

There are large energy projects, such as Marinus, for which - a history lesson for the honourable member who just resumed his seat - it was me and Anthony Albanese who signed the first agreement. We have been working through the final investment decision to ensure that we can set this state and its energy future up on renewable energy. We are working through that with the federal government, and challenges along the way.

I have spent 23 years in this parliament, and I, hand on heart, can say to you that I have fought more for vulnerable people in this place than the Labor Party could ever dream of.

Government members - Hear, hear.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Particularly the person who resumed his seat, the Leader of the Opposition, who has demonstrated in the last 24 hours that you are not ready to govern. You are a weak leader. You are prepared to jeopardise Tasmania's future; the stability of this parliament; projects such as Marinus; the importance of budget management; our own AFL and AFLW teams and stadia infrastructure across the state, unlocking that opportunity; and also ensuring that we continue investing in health, education and public safety. You have, by your reckless behaviour today and your weak leadership, decided that you are more important than Tasmanians. The henchmen behind you who pull your strings - we know who they are - are in total control of you, just like the Canberra Labor Party are in control of the state division of the Labor Party. You are not only weak, you are being controlled by others. You are being controlled by others.

During the last six years in particular, it has been a challenge governing - the pandemic, the tragedy of losing six beautiful children, the commission of inquiry; all those areas where leaders and ministers have had to step up. I remember all those things well. Difficult decisions had to be made. We had to open up our hearts and the cheque book to support Tasmanians who needed strong leaders most.

We have navigated through all those areas, such as the pandemic, where we did not know how serious COVID-19 was. For all we knew at that time - and the curves, in terms of fatalities - we did not know if we would lose 20 per cent of our population. The arguments I had in this place about education and whether we should close schools - we were urged to

close them, and as Education minister, I said no. You know what drove me in that decision? It is because, sadly, in this state, there are young, vulnerable children who are safer in schools than they are at their own homes. That is what drove that policy decision and working through the matters of the commission of inquiry.

All I can say is thank goodness that leaders stepped up during those times when times were tough, and thank goodness Dean Winter and the Labor Party were not in control, because it would be a very different state right now. What the member has just demonstrated by his own selfish and reckless behaviour and bullying of the crossbench is that it is more about Dean than it is about the people of Tasmania.

I believe in this state, and despite all the arguments that will be presented today about my level of competence, no one could ever question my love of Tasmania and the Tasmanian people. First and foremost, I have stood in this place countless times, in opposition and in government, and fought for people who have not had the love and the luxury and the good people around them that have supported me through life. I have fought for them because I understand the position and the privilege of where I have grown up - not with a silver spoon in my mouth, by any stretch of the imagination, but with love and care and economic security. I want that for every single Tasmanian, and it will continue to drive me for as long as I am here, either in this position or in having the privilege of being a member of parliament.

By your actions, you have put so much at risk. The motivation for you to move that motion yesterday, and from what I hear - the scurrying around, the 'Oh dear, what have I done?' - it is just like it was in November last year, when you were scurrying around like a chook with its head cut off, not knowing what to do, which would send shivers down the spines of Tasmanians if you ever became leader of this state. You had to back down from your no-confidence motion last year, but you are in too deep now, because you have, as I understand it, the support of enough people in this place to bring me down.

However, can I say this: I will fight to my last breath to ensure that we remain in government and to ensure that we continue delivering for the people of Tasmania. I will fight to my last breath, for all the reasons I have just mentioned, and I will highlight your reckless behaviour.

This day might not end well for me, but this day will define you. This day will define you for the rest of your political career, where you now will have the stigma as leader of being a wrecker. Halfway through the Budget, where we are investing more into health, education, public safety and housing - I would have thought Labor Party values - I would have thought that, but you are putting all that at risk because you had a rush of blood. You got off the phone yesterday from Bluey, and he is pulling your strings.

Mr Winter - Honestly, that is ridiculous.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Well, you can say that is ridiculous, but that is what everyone is saying. Half a degree of separation in Tasmania - sometimes that is good, and for you today, that is bad. You have demonstrated the fact that you are not really for Tasmania and Tasmanians. You are for Dean Winter and Dean Winter only.

I would understand your argument a bit if unemployment was 11 per cent or 12 per cent like it was in the 90s, during the recession we had to have. They were dark days when people

could not find work, where families were destroyed economically and socially. If that were the case, I would get it, but we are debating no confidence today when unemployment is the lowest it has ever been in Tasmania.

Government members - Hear, hear.

Mr ROCKLIFF - We have a state that is almost leading the nation when it comes to economic growth. Yes, we have had to borrow to support Tasmanians and keep people in work.

Mr Winter - What is going to happen in the future then? You will not be here paying for it, will you?

Mr ROCKLIFF - You have mentioned one example that I find extraordinary, and it really defines you again as to where you would leave people in Tasmania. I know you do not care about King Island, because during the last election the Labor leader did not even visit any of the islands, if my memory serves me correctly but there is more to the story Mr Winter. It is not about handing over a cheque to a company which a very fine Tasmanian has put enormous skin in the game to keep alive on King Island.

I remember campaigning on King Island back in 2001 when I announced my candidacy for this job on 4 September 2001, and going to King Island for the first time. They were talking about the island closure back then, and how it devastated that community. Through good work and goodwill and investment that island started working again under our watch, and it has been through some challenging times.

What you do not understand when you say flippant comments about that is that there are 95 workers on that island. Why would we not invest, and co-invest, to keep people working, to give the mine a chance?

Dr Broad - You did not do it for Avebury. You let Avebury go down.

The SPEAKER - Leader of Opposition Business.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Give those people a chance on a small island. Not to mention the importance of Tungsten and our sovereignty. It highlights why you are not fit for this job.

Honourable Speaker, I am very proud of our team. To the points of this motion, where you talk about financial management - you have never offered a single alternative. In fact, you have been there, egging us on, wanting to invest more and more into public services. When we do that because we recognise the need of Tasmanians, such as supporting Tasmanians with the cost-of-living crisis, where people could not pay their power bills. Notwithstanding the work of this government in ensuring we had the lowest regulated energy prices in the nation, Tasmanians were still doing it tough. We reached in and supported them, not because we listen to you, but because we listen to Tasmanians and their needs.

That is why we support organisations that support vulnerable Tasmanians, why we have a food relief strategy, a food security strategy - not a strategy to be a huge investment, to support vulnerable people. That is why we recognised that throughout the pandemic, where non-emergency elective surgery was cancelled - and we are still feeling the effects of that, where that delayed care needs us to reach in and support Tasmanians. We could cut that

\$10 million to \$7 million and get into surplus very quickly, but we will not do it. Imagine if we did what you are saying?

That is why we are reforming, to your word, ensuring that Tasmanians have better access to primary health care through the reforms we have made over successive ministers of health, when it comes to pharmacies delivering more care in the community, cutting red tape in health to support Tasmanians. It is why, despite the fact that we have had federal governments of all colours over the last decades or more that have not invested in primary care or enough GPs, we have because, ultimately, we are the closest to the Tasmanian people being the state government. We hear it when people cannot get into doctors, the insecurity people feel when GPs close and move out of regional areas. We have not said: 'That is all your problem, federal government.' We have said: 'Okay, it is your responsibility, but this state government - a state government with heart, will reach in and keep those services going.' It has cost, but it is an investment in community.

The reason why we believe we can continue to sensibly and sustainably budget our way to a pathway to surplus is because we can continue to have the right settings of growing the economy, of investing in areas and enabling infrastructure, keep jobs going, invest in training - the Earthworks Academy, the Renewable Energy Training Centre, the Water and Energy Trades Centre of Excellence down here, which we have built, and into education. I recognise we have a lot of work to do when it comes to our education results but, by gee, we have given it a good go. We have invested enormously in teachers, training and schools. I do not doubt that our budget would have a better bottom line if we left the classrooms for Tasmanian students as we found them when we came to government. I went to a school where a toilet had been converted into a staffroom, and I could still see the trough in the staffroom. I could not believe what I was seeing; the neglect that you lot left this state.

You can talk about no debt in 2014. You are actually wrong. You spent the superannuation provision account, which is costing us \$400 million a year and contributing to our challenges, incidentally, but I cannot point to a single investment you made that points to a legacy -

Members interjecting.

Dr Broad - The *Spirits*, irrigation pipeline, wind farms, NBN.

The SPEAKER - Members on my left, Dr Broad.

Mr ROCKLIFF - during those four years, when you got rid of the superannuation provision account. You 'what if' it up the wall. I cannot point to a single legacy. You wasted it. We had hay in the barn, you took the hay out and you burnt the barn. That will be your legacy. I would have thought that a Labor Party might well have reached in at that particular time and rebuilt schools -

Mrs Petrusma - They wanted to close them.

The SPEAKER - Mrs Petrusma.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Not close them, but to ensure that the classrooms were up to standard, to ensure we had innovative education policies that engaged students and kept them in school

longer. However, we did all that. We could have chosen not to rebuild schools, invest in year 11 and 12, and invest in getting kids into schools earlier. We would have a better budget bottom line. There would be no Brighton High School, no Legana School, classrooms would be still falling down around our ears, but what are we here for? We are here to support people and grow an economy.

As I have worked to navigate a way through this parliament, I have been honest and said to people around Tasmania that this parliament has actually worked pretty well, despite the difficult circumstances. We have members of the crossbench: David O'Byrne put through a Family Violence Amendment (Protecting People and their Pets) Bill 2024; Labor's own industrial manslaughter bill progressed through the parliament; the Charter of Budget Responsibility Amendment Bill; Ms Johnston's Family Violence Amendment Bill; the Greens' Custodial Inspector Amendment (Protection from Reprisal) Bill and others. You want to blow that up.

Tasmanians looking at this parliament today might not know of the successes we have had together, where none of us have achieved 100 per cent of what we want all the time, albeit we are proud of our team's agenda and the way we keep moving on and forward. However, others have had some success as well. You want to blow that up today and send a signal to the Tasmanian people not only that you do not have the ticker for the top job, but also that you are reckless in your behaviour and that this parliament - We are all adults. We all come from different perspectives, we do not always agree but, actually, mostly we do. This is a test for this parliament: has this parliament got the ticker?

This parliament was elected in March 2024. The people of Tasmania put us here to do a job. I believe they recognise the challenges governments have had to face across the globe and nationally, across all states and territories. I reckon in their heart of hearts, while they recognise areas where we can do better, that we have done, under the circumstances, a fair job in addressing the areas people are concerned about.

You mentioned the *Spirits of Tasmania*, and I have said many times and apologised for that - as I should do as a leader of a government, despite the fact of government businesses and their failures. Despite that fact, we have taken responsibility. We have a minister, former minister, who took responsibility.

Mr Ferguson - I did and I do.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The impact on that minister, Michael, personally - but he did the right thing. He has been held accountable and our government was held accountable. We said we would fix it, and we are.

Privatisation - can we not have a sensible debate, like you put forward yourself all those years ago?

Mr Willie - Take it to an election.

Mr ROCKLIFF - That is why it is also defining for your leadership - because when you speak, Mr Winter, people question whether you really believe it. I say: why would they? Why would they, when you keep saying one thing and doing another?

I am not perfect by any stretch of the imagination, but I am giving this a red hot go. I am giving this a red hot go under very, very difficult circumstances. For all my faults, they know where I stand, what I believe in, and what I will fight for as long as I am in this place, in whatever role I play - for as long as I am in this place and, no doubt, when I am out of this place at some point in time as well.

We can disagree on stadiums and on salmon and on a way forward for Tasmanian Aboriginal people, on which I note the comments by the honourable Leader of the Greens. What you do ignore, however, is the overwhelming endorsement of our policy moving forward with truth-telling and healing so that we can resolve, talk, listen, hear, and act on our very dark past in Tasmania. We have overwhelming endorsement in Tasmanian Aboriginal people on that truth-telling and healing pathway forward. That needs to be acknowledged.

Honourable Speaker, I have a minute and 44 seconds to of my contribution. How time flies under these circumstances. There is a lot more that I could say.

I recognise people have made public commitments to what will happen today, but I ask this Tasmanian parliament to think seriously about the consequences. Do they really want to follow a wrecker, who has come in here day-in, day-out since we arrived in this parliament and has targeted individual members with disdain on the crossbench who did nothing more than have the courage to put their hand up to make a difference for the Tasmanian people? I want to commend and thank everyone on the crossbench for doing so, and for the work that we have done to date under difficult circumstances for the benefit of Tasmania.

Whatever the outcome is, I implore this parliament: please put Tasmania first. Please put the Tasmanian people first. They do not want an election. Dean Winter wants an election, because his time is running out. What the Tasmanian people want is stability, certainty and strong leadership.

[11.23 a.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin - Leader of the Greens) - Honourable Speaker, the Greens have worked very hard to achieve positive outcomes for Tasmanians in this parliament, as people elected us to do. We have collaborated with all sides of the Chamber, and we have worked hard to make improvements for Tasmania in legislation, including and perhaps most especially notable are the changes to election laws about donations disclosure. That means that we will all be required to be open and honest with Tasmanians about where we get money to fund us as candidates in election periods. This is just one example of the work that we have done, and we do not take this decision lightly to support this no-confidence motion today, not at all. We believe that a line has to be drawn to hold politicians, leaders accountable for their actions, and we believe that the Premier has well and truly crossed that line.

In recent months in particular he has shown himself to be dishonest and not able to be trusted. That is not to us, but it is to the Tasmanian people. He has shown contempt by lying and breaking fundamental election promises. At the top of the list are the Premier's statements on the first announcement in the state election snap campaign last year where he promised Tasmanians that the amount that would be spent on a stadium would be \$375 million and 'not a red cent more.' He was very clear about that and was questioned multiple times by the media, and by the Greens in parliament over the years since. He promised that the rest of the money would come from public-private partnerships. That never happened. It is very clear that what Tasmanians believed and the reason that the Premier and his government are here and in

a minority government situation today is because of that statement at the beginning of the election campaign.

What we have seen since then is the escalating costs of the stadium and the more information that has come out shows that the costs are continuing to increase, and we are not at the end yet because as we have heard, the stadium itself is only 50 per cent designed. We are certainly not at the end of the costs. We know the stadium, according to Saul Eslake, Dr Nicholas Gruen and now the Tasmanian Planning Commission will cost in the order of something like \$2 billion over the next decade. That is a truly massive intergenerational debt for Tasmanians.

There is radio silence from the opposition leader, Dean Winter, about this issue, about concern for that extra debt. There has been much conversation in this Chamber about the Budget and how devastating it is, and the Greens fully agree. However, we have to look at the choices that are being made by Jeremy Rockliff as leader and that is what we take issue with.

We take issue with the wrong choices he is making; choices which Tasmanians do not agree with; choices regarding which Tasmanians have tried so many times to have their voices heard. People try to speak to Jeremy Rockliff and his government about such important issues like the stadium, like the protection of Kunanyi/Mount Wellington, like the position that we must take on the Pokies Mandatory Precommitment Card; about protection for our beautiful native forests which are under threat by the Liberals - an extra 39,000 hectares that they want to log and burn. They desperately try to be heard about the state of the marine environment, which is edging towards the tipping point because the Liberals have refused to stand up to big salmon corporations, because Jeremy Rockliff has been weak and has allowed them to run the show instead of writing the laws we need to protect our marine environment, to protect our forests and our waterways and our water catchments, to make sure Tasmanians have clean drinking water and soils that will continue to be productive into the future.

Under Jeremy Rockliff there is no money in this budget to respond to the devastating State of the Environment report. It is awesomely frightening how the state of the Tasmanian environment is trending. It is rapidly trending down. Serious recommendations were made and not a single one of them was funded in this budget. Instead, what we have is money towards a new stadium at Macquarie Point in Hobart that we do not need - that we never needed. One of the issues with Jeremy Rockliff in his time as Premier has been his inability to stand up to bullies.

It was so clear that he had a choice when he became Premier. Peter Gutwein, previous premier, made a statement in support of a new stadium in Macquarie Point, which - let us be clear - no one was in the room, but the majority of Tasmanians fully believe that Gil McLachlan pointed at the map and said, 'I want this spot, this is the best spot, give it to me.' Peter Gutwein said yes, and made an announcement in the state of the state speech before he resigned a month later that said Tasmania will have a new stadium. There was no mandate for that, and it was instantly on the nose. People could obviously see, when we have two stadiums, a tiny little state like Tasmania cannot afford a new stadium, either the one proposed at Macquarie Point or the other one that is proposed for Hobart.

We do not support a stadium in Hobart, a new stadium in Hobart. Jeremy Rockliff had a choice at that point in time and what he did not choose was to stand up and back the hundreds

of thousands of Tasmanians who demand and deserve our AFL/AFLW teams. We have been vindicated at looking at the incredible strength of support for the AFL/AFLW teams.

We have in the Devils something that over 100,000 Tasmanian-based people have got behind; over 200,000 people, if you count, I expect, other Tasmanians who are living on the mainland. We believe, we know, that we have the right, we have the capacity, we have the strength to back those teams. However, Jeremy Rockliff did not actually have that in him, and that was the mistake he made. Since then he has continually been dishonest with Tasmanians about what is going on. He was dishonest to Ms Cassy O'Connor when he said that a condition for the Greens signing on to support AFL/AFLW teams would not include a stadium. He was not honest with her about that.

We would never have signed up to a new stadium and now what we hear in the community is what we expected to hear, which is over 70 per cent of people in Bass and Braddon, and I believe something to the order of that in Lyons, do not want a new stadium because they can look at what the Liberals are doing under the Budget, under Jeremy Rockliff. Year on year services are being cut, and we have had serious reductions in services in this budget. There are so many I can go through, but I just want to illustrate a few to make the point. While we are spending money, not just on the idea of the construction of a stadium, but on keeping the whole ship of Macquarie Point Development Corporation going, all those lawyers, all those people, designed to smear the reputations of Nicholas Gruen and our independent Tasmanian Planning Commission panel - who, mind you, are only doing their job because we told them to. It was Jeremy Rockliff's idea to tell them to do that, and when he did not get the result he wanted to hear, he went on the attack.

What sort of integrity is it to attack good-hearted, independent experts who are doing the job you told them to do because they are not giving information that you want to hear? What person would do that? A person we do not have confidence in to lead this state.

A member - Like you do, day in and day out.

Mr Abetz - The queen of personal attacks.

The SPEAKER - Order.

Dr WOODRUFF - We do not have confidence in that sort of leadership, because it is attempting to dismiss the validity of the comments they are making, that the majority of Tasmanians who have made submissions also pointed out to the Premier. It is pretty clear from the response of him and his government that they are taking no notice whatsoever of the submissions and the concerns that people raised in their submissions to the planning commission. That is because they are not letting the planning commission's process run out.

They are bringing in a corrupted process of legislation to ram an approval for a stadium through this parliament - an abuse of legislative processes that has never been seen in the history of Tasmania. I cannot really speak enough about the outrage in the community - not just at having up to \$2 billion in debt and spending over \$1 billion on the stadium itself - but to run a corrupted process like that, which is specifically designed to cut out the community.

It is designed to cut out the information that will come from the planning commission, which in all likelihood will say, 'We do not recommend a stadium because it cannot fit, it would

be a devastating blight on the centre of Hobart, it will cost the state a fortune for generations to come, it will be an act of utter disrespect to all ex-servicemen and servicewomen and their families, and it will be utterly disrespectful to the Aboriginal community'. That is what they are going to say, and the Premier does not want that formal information sitting in front of him.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - I will point out that Dr Woodruff did not interject on anyone else's contribution, and as unusual as that may be, the same respect will be afforded to Dr Woodruff in her contribution.

Dr WOODRUFF - I want to illustrate the priorities instead that the Premier chose to include in the Budget. The northern renal unit redevelopment at Kings Meadows: it currently has 15 bays and the redevelopment is funded for 18 bays, but it is very clear it needs to be 24 bays. The six bays coming out of the northern renal unit that should be funded - there was \$10 million that the state received from the federal government in 2019, but there is no extra money that has been put in there from the state. That is an infrastructure spend that we should be prioritising. It is not good to prioritise building a stadium the majority of Tasmanians do not want when we are not spending money on a renal unit.

It is also an absolute outrage that neighbourhood houses that are on the front line in our communities, with people who are struggling - vulnerable people - have not had the money put into their community connectors that was promised. There is not enough money going into those places, not as was promised. They are there every single day with people who cannot get access to services who desperately need support, people who cannot access services without somebody holding their hand.

At the same time, those neighbourhood house workers are dealing with people who are functionally illiterate. In this Budget, we have now confirmation that Jeremy Rockliff's government is removing all money from the 26Ten literacy program. That is an absolute outrage, in the state that has the lowest level of functional literacy in the country by the last measure. There is no money after the end of this year for 26Ten. That is what people have been told. These are the appalling priorities -

Mr Rockliff - Not true.

Dr WOODRUFF - Well, it is not in the budget paper, Premier. It is not in the Budget, and people in the sector understand it is finished. If there is something you would like to share with us that your minister refuses to tell, that would be great. Community services had to go to the TasCOSS briefing and they were flicking through the budget papers, desperately trying to find out if their services were going to be funded or not. It is the level of disrespect, it is the lack of listening to people that is a signature piece for Jeremy Rockliff's government. For all the talk about transparency and openness, for all the talk about listening to people, it is just words. If there is something that I have learnt in my life that is truer than most other things, it is that you do not judge a person by their words, you judge them by their actions.

We have looked into this budget paper and we have seen devastating cuts. On top of that, we have a Premier now committed to cutting an extra two-and-a-half thousand jobs from the public service and privatising government businesses, the businesses that we desperately need. We need to have buses on our roads; under the Liberals, they have been cut. Buses do not turn

up; bus routes have been cut. We need to have free public transport. We need to have accessible buses for people who have no other form of transport, and there is no way that will happen if we privatise Metro.

There is no way that people will not have an increase in their car rego and that people will not be paying higher prices if we privatise businesses like MAIB and TasNetworks. We are deeply concerned at where Jeremy Rockliff has got to as a leader. I absolutely acknowledge, and want to put on the record, that the Premier did an amazing job of shepherding us through the commission of inquiry. I absolutely commend Jeremy Rockliff as Premier for the work he did in the commission of inquiry. That was an incredibly important point in Tasmania's history and there is no doubt that he did an enormous body of work, and on behalf of all of us, I thank him for that.

I thank him for that, but it is not enough to rest on past deeds, because every day in this place we are called to confront the reality of Tasmanians and their lives, and what they want us to do to represent them. It is so clear that Jeremy Rockliff had a choice on the stadium. He had a choice on the pokies mandatory precommitment card and he backflipped on the promises that he had made to Tasmania. He backflipped on the \$375 million cap and he backflipped on introducing a nation-leading mandatory pre-commitment card that would have helped Tasmanians who are struggling. Instead, we have disadvantage for some of the poorest people in Tasmania entrenched for generations. That would have made all the difference to their lives and he did not make that choice.

Instead, he listened to big corporations and big business and developer mates, and that is the hallmark of how Jeremy Rockliff has run this place. He has always let the big interests and the big corporations run the show. He has never stood up to those people and he has never stood, consequently, for the people of Tasmania. When you have the appalling mass mortality event and the terrible levels of pollution that are going into our very vulnerable and sensitive marine waterways, we must be concerned at a Premier who is incapable of standing up to salmon corporations, multinational foreign-owned salmon corporations, instead of putting the interest of Tasmanians first.

We must have functioning, healthy ecosystems, we must have forests that are healthy and alive, storing our carbon, protecting our biodiversity. Instead, in this Budget, under Jeremy Rockliff, we have had massive cuts over the forward Estimates to the threatened species program, to the natural values management program, to biosecurity. These are core parts of protecting our environment. It is not putting more money in - we are not even keeping pace. We are massively cutting from those areas over the next four years while we are in the midst of an evolving and expanding climate crisis. The threatened species are moving closer and closer to extinction. We have a Premier who will not stand up and protect the extinction of a species like the Maugean skate. He will not stand up to the government-owned Forestry Tasmania business which is flattening and burning the habitat for the swift parrot. It is the swift parrot that would go extinct under Jeremy Rockliff's policies when he is in charge. He is in charge of that.

When every other sensible state and country around the world is moving away from native forest logging and burning in a climate and biodiversity crisis, Jeremy Rockliff's government is walking closer towards doing that. He wants more. He wants to go in harder. This is the sign of a person who is utterly out of touch with the world that we live in and most

importantly, utterly out of touch with the majority of Tasmanians, who we understand do not support native forest logging and burning.

We are concerned about the fact that this motion does not properly capture the reality of the situation. I want to move an amendment to this motion, because what we need to do is - the first clause of the motion is that Mr Winter moves that the House agrees the Premier's budget mismanagement is doing significant long-term damage to Tasmania. The Labor Party's motion is silent on the issue of the stadium. The stadium is the biggest threat to our long-term debt spiral that the Liberals have put us into. It was pointed out very clearly by Nicholas Gruen and by the Planning Commission's dire report that it would affect our credit rating if we continue down that path now. It is concerning that the Leader of the Opposition is silent on this issue when he says he is so concerned about the state of the budget. The Greens are. We know other members of the crossbench are very concerned about it as well.

I move the following amendment -

Clause (1), after 'Tasmania'.

Insert ' , compounded by his plan to fund a new stadium in Hobart'

Clause 1 would read:

- (1) Agrees the Premier's budget mismanagement is doing significant long-term damage to Tasmania, compounded by his plan to fund a new stadium in Hobart.

There is no doubt Tasmanians do not want a new stadium in Hobart. They do not want any new stadium. We are not picking favourites. I know the Labor Party has a position where they support stadium 2.0, the so-called 'second stadium in Hobart' -

Mr Winter - We support building a stadium. You have been complaining we support the other one.

Dr WOODRUFF - but we do not. We understand that Tasmanians are comprehensively - they do not care if a new stadium in Hobart is a little bit here or a little bit there, whether it is on one side of Macquarie Point or the other - they do not want a new stadium. They do not want the money, they do not want the debt. They do not want the outrage with the warped priorities. They do not want a new stadium. We have two stadiums. We have 110,000 people supporting our AFL and AFLW teams. We have a perfectly fantastic stadium in York Park and at Ninja Stadium in Bellerive. We do not want a new stadium anywhere in Hobart and Tasmanians do not want it either.

We move this amendment because it is very important, if the opposition leader is serious about the damage to the budget, that we get the support of Labor in particular, who are moving this motion of no-confidence. This is a serious matter.

The SPEAKER - I will clarify for members that we are now on the amendment and the Leader has a 30 minute contribution to make on the amendment and contribution, starting now.

Dr WOODRUFF - I can inform the House that I will not be spending 30 minutes on this amendment, but I do understand that I have it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER - I am explaining the clock to people, Dr Woodruff. You have an entitlement for it and we are now debating the amendment and not the substantive motion.

Dr WOODRUFF - This is the crux of why we are here today. It started with a number of lies. It started with a promise at the state election. It has been a successive number of lies to parliament and to the people of Tasmania over the last year. It has come to a state of absurdity if it was not such a serious issue. We can all see from the state of the Budget that was handed down last week that Tasmania is in a terrible place when we have more than \$10 billion of debt that the Liberals have walked us into over the next four years. We do not support, will not support, putting any extra burden onto that budget. Instead, we would walk it around, we would walk it back. It is going to be a hard place to get back from that level of debt, but the Greens are committed to doing it. We are committed to working productively in this parliament to work that debt back, and the start of that is not by adding anymore to it. That means we cannot have a new stadium in Hobart, full stop, end of the story.

It is pretty clear that if you care about the state of the budget, if you believe that the budget is being mismanaged, then we need to have support from people in this place to make that statement. We need to make that statement. Every member in this place needs to announce their position about a new stadium in Hobart because it is core to the top line of the motion that we have before us today.

I have no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition, Dean Winter, must do his best to maintain the stability in this place. He must represent the views of Tasmanians. If he is serious in his position as the Leader of the Opposition, he must do that because that is his job. His job is to scrutinise the government of the day. His job is to hold them to account. Irrespective of the motion before us, we are seeing a devastating failure by Dean Winter in his ability to act as the Leader of the Opposition on the matter of the stadium.

When the Labor Party gave unconditional support for the stadium, whatever the cost, they said, whatever the problems, whatever the overreach, whatever the damage, Labor said they would support a stadium legislation approval going through parliament. That is an abandonment of the role of the opposition, and it is important, it is incumbent on Dean Winter as opposition leader, if he is serious about being the opposition leader, if he is serious about the motion that he has brought on today, where he says in its top line, that 'the Premier's budget mismanagement is doing significant long term damage'. If he understands, as we all have, that we have been told by economic experts that putting an extra up to \$2 billion of debt on our books over the next ten years would be bad for our state and our state's credit rating, then he must support this motion.

It is critical for Tasmanians to understand where we all sit on that matter, and it is a critical part of the motion. I will move that now and then I can return and make some other comments depending on how that goes.

The SPEAKER - There are seven minutes left on your substantive contribution after the result on this.

Ms WOODRUFF - Thank you, honourable Speaker. I will move that.

The SPEAKER - You moved it seven minutes ago, so you now either need to resume your seat to allow other speakers. We are now speaking to the amendment.

[11.53 a.m.]

Mr WINTER (Franklin - Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, we do not support this amendment by the Greens because Tasmanian Labor supports building a stadium. We have supported the Premier in his project to build a stadium, and in fact the Greens know that because they have been criticising us for that for the past year. I have given the political support to this Premier to get the legislation through, and I have been criticised heavily for saying that we support building a stadium to get a team because we know that that is the reality of the situation. You can have the Leader of the Greens and the Greens and others saying that you can have an AFL team - 'Yes, team, no stadium', but it is not true, and they know that it is not true. In order to get an AFL team for our state, we know that we need to get an AFL stadium, and that is why it is not included in our motion. The motion today is about the most serious issue in our state and that is the state of the budget.

This is why we are so concerned about what we saw last week. When the Premier talks about the past and things that have happened in the past and about right now, he is not talking about what the budget looks like in the future. He is not talking about what it looks like when we are spending \$600 million just servicing interest; what that will look like for a future government or future premier, future treasurer, who needs to try and balance the books while that is going on. That is why it is so serious. That is why that is included in the motion and the Greens stadium should not be included in it.

The Greens talk about what Tasmanians want. Tasmanians want an AFL team. They absolutely want one. In fact, we have wanted one for decades. It is so exciting for our state that we have now got an AFL team with a conditional licence, that has already provided us with some fantastic people who are now administrating that team.

This motion is not honest because if the Greens were honest about the AFL team and our stadium, they would know and agree that they go together. They have been briefed, I believe, by the AFL team, by the club, I think, and they know exactly why it is important for the business case: why the team cannot exist without it.

Dr Woodruff - We do not agree.

Mr WINTER - I do agree with the Leader of the Greens when she talked about honesty or a lack of it because when the Premier put forward this plan to Tasmanians, in the first case, the case was made that the team was not linked to the stadium, and it was said repeatedly time and time again. Then when it was, there was no Treasury advice. He did not take it to Cabinet, and then Tasmanians saw the state of the deal. That was the start of the problem in terms of the communication of this project. The project is really important to our state, but every policy, every project has to start with honesty.

There was a broken promise. There is no doubt that the broken promise of \$375 million and 'not one red cent more' was broken.

Members interjecting.

Mr WINTER - I am not sure what the government think they are doing - and that the leader of government business is scoffing at this - in saying that it was not broken. There was an interview with the Leader of Government Business on *ABC Mornings* where he claimed that the Premier had said 'plus borrowings.' Admittedly, he came back to the House and corrected the record as he should have done.

Mr Abetz - On one date.

The SPEAKER - The Leader of the House will cease his interjections. The Leader of the Opposition will return to the substantive matter before us which is the amendment.

Mr WINTER - Every Tasmanian parliamentarian needs to make a choice about building a stadium, and we made a choice to support the Premier in building the stadium that he has wanted to do.

That is not what this motion is about. The motion is about the state of the budget because that is what drives the capacity for every future government to actually deliver the service that Tasmanians need. I cannot stand idly by and let them wreck the budget because if you wreck the budget, then you tell Tasmanians you are not capable of governing.

The last year in budget Estimates demonstrates in real terms that there would be a 10 per cent cut in services because of the amount of debt that they are racking up. It will not be this Premier who needs to deal with that problem. It will be a future premier. It might be one from Labor, it might be one from the Liberals, but someone is going have to deal with it unless we take action now. That is why we need to not support this amendment.

We need to focus on what actually matters to Tasmanians, and that is the ability for any future government to deliver the services that Tasmanians need. The Premier said earlier: do I really believe it? Honestly, I really believe this. I am passionately concerned about the way that this budget is heading.

When we saw the state of the Budget, we were aghast, shocked at the level of debt and deficit that he is driving the state into, and that is why every Tasmanian parliamentarian needs to make a choice: do we continue to support this reckless approach, or do we stand up to it? That is the option for parliament today: do we stand up to it or not?

The amendment talks about one issue in the Budget. Yes, the stadium is expensive. I believe there is around \$600 million allocated in a capital sense to the stadium going forward in this Budget. However, let us put that in context. There is \$5 billion worth of infrastructure and this is just one project. Yes, it is a big project, but it is one project. If you wanted to add every single component of what is putting the budget under pressure, you would be running a very long list. The stuff-up with the *Spirits* is costing an extra \$400 million; the fact that we might have to bail out TT-Line. In fact, we almost certainly will, as TT-Line told a parliamentary committee that there is going to need to be a bailout. That is another component of this.

If you want to list them all, we will be here for a long time. Just pointing to one project does not enhance this motion. It actually detracts from it. We will be opposing this amendment because we support an AFL team and a stadium for our state. It is so important for our state that we tell the rest of the country that we support development in this state. Tasmanian Labor

absolutely, fundamentally and wholeheartedly supports building the stadium to get our AFL team. It is a non-negotiable for me.

I have been convinced by talking to workers who were on the Bridgewater Bridge that they want to build a stadium, they want to get to work. I have been convinced by speaking to members of the Tasmanian Devils about why it is so important for the business case. That is why we are not supporting this amendment. It is important for our state that we get this team, that we support the team going forward. Tasmanian Labor absolutely backs this team. This motion is about the Budget, it is about the *Spirits*, it is about the way that this government has been handling Tasmania's budget.

[12.00 p.m.]

Mr ABETZ (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Honourable Speaker, what a turn-up for the cards. Here we have the Leader of the Opposition claiming that, somehow, the Liberal government lied and misled the people of Tasmania in relation to the stadium. Can I remind the Leader of the Opposition and every single one of the Labor parliamentarians that they were elected on a policy of?

Government members - No stadium.

Mr ABETZ - Indeed, no stadium. However, you have the audacity to come in here and say that we have somehow misled or changed.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Members on my left.

Mr ABETZ - Let us be clear: the \$375 million was in the business case at the very beginning as a capital injection and -

Mr Willie - And the private sector would take up the rest.

Mr ABETZ - Mr Willie is half-right. Yes, we would look at public-private partnerships and borrowings. The Leader of the Greens and Leader of the Opposition both know that 'and borrowings' was part of the initial business case. However, they cannot let those words pass their lips because they know it would collapse their negative, disingenuous argument in relation to this stadium.

This will be is a multi-purpose stadium. The Lord Mayor of Hobart initiated a report telling us that there would be a stimulus of \$170 million-plus per annum within the Hobart local government area, not to talk about Clarence, Glenorchy or Kingborough and the spillover to other areas. Just confined to Hobart, this would be a \$170 million fillip to our economy. Her answer to that is: ignore the economics. Do you not love the Greens, the way that they can just dispense with facts and evidence - evidence that they themselves sought.

This stadium will be transformational. I do not understand the Greens' affection for those sewerage works on that industrial wasteland, which is a blot on the cityscape. It has been there for over a decade, plan after plan. Finally, we have a plan. Leader of the Greens, please do not insult us with this alleged concern for the sightline from the Cenotaph. We remember the Greens championing the Eden Project, which would have had a greater height than the stadium.

Was there a concern for the line of sight? No, not a skerrick of concern at that time because it was their project. If it is a Liberal, Labor, or somebody else's project the Greens do not support, then a lower height is sacrilegious to the Cenotaph. How do you sleep at night? What contorted logic do you go through to be able to argue one thing out of one side of your mouth and then talk the exact opposite out the other side of your mouth?

The stadium is going to be transformational. I was at a breakfast this morning of the Transport and Tourism Forum at Hadley's Hotel. They realised how transformational it will be, not only the AFL bit but the tourism bit. They understood that if we have a 1500-person convention centre, it will stimulate the economy. We could invite international and interstate conferences of substantial size to our state and help employ people. One in six of our fellow Tasmanians is currently already employed in the tourism sector. Can we not grow that, can we not have an aspiration to do even better? We, on this side, have that aspiration. That is why we have been consistent in relation to the stadium, unlike our friends opposite who would now seek to pretend that they support the stadium, knowing that with the original motion they have moved, they may well derail the whole stadium.

I invite the Leader of the Opposition to have a look at the media from Kath McCann when she was asked about what was happening in this parliament today and the consequences for the team. The Leader of the Greens always says we need honesty and integrity in public debate. Everybody knows that without a stadium you cannot and will not have a team. It was the Tasmanian taskforce, under Brett Godfrey, in 2018 that suggested a CBD stadium similar to Adelaide to be linked with our team because that is what was needed for a successful team. That was organically grown, considered and thought of in Tasmania by Tasmanians. Now, all of a sudden, we have this argument that this was somehow foisted upon Tasmania by those terrible bullies in the AFL. No, this was an idea that originated in Tasmania with the Tasmanian AFL taskforce.

The Leader of the Opposition told us he has a non-negotiable position in relation to the stadium. It is a pity he was elected on a policy of opposing it. As I said in an earlier contribution, he can have this non-negotiable position; just do not look behind. Office of the Coordinator-General? Just do not look at the previous policy. *Spirits of Tasmania* - we do not look at the previous policy. We have a litany of Labor twists and turns. We can understand why they are not taken seriously by the people of Tasmania.

I love the idea of what the Greens have done, trying to wedge Labor in relation to the amendment. Much as we would like to see the defeat of this motion, we will not sell our souls in seeking to do so by supporting an amendment which would seek to condemn the stadium. It is such an important infrastructure project for our state, for our young people. We are seeing an uptake in Auskick. Be it at Lauderdale, be it down at Kingston, be it up at Ulverstone, there is a huge uptake. Speak to any law enforcement officer in this state and they say show me a suburb with a high uptake of sport for the youth and I will show you a suburb with a low youth crime rate. These are just some of the social benefits.

Let us not talk about the costing of this - we know that federal Labor will put in \$240 million, which will not be coming our way. There will be \$15 million from the AFL which will not be coming our way, nor the \$360 million from the AFL over 10 years for the funding of football right around Tasmania. We will not have all the sponsorships and advertising coming in to Tasmania for our football team. So the list goes on. That is why even the Hobart City Council's economic assessment had to come to the conclusion - inconvenient

as it was for Lord Mayor Reynolds - that it would provide a \$170 million fillip just to the Hobart economy. How can you ignore that and say that this is somehow going to mug our economy and somehow going to mug our budget? That extra spending in Tasmania will be a great fillip, not only for the economy but for the state government, because there will be elements of taxation along the way which helps them to fund our health, our education, our police, the roads, and all the other things.

Might I add to the Leader of the Greens and, for that matter, the Leader of the Opposition: when you talk about an amount of money, you can only spend it once. You cannot talk to one group and say, 'Yes, \$375 million on health', and then, '\$375 million on housing', turn to somebody else, '\$375 million on education'. You cannot do that if there is a skerrick of integrity within you and within your political discourse.

This is an amendment which we as a government oppose for the reasons I have just outlined. We as a government are committed to this transformational iconic gateway to our city. It is unfortunate, and I do not know what it is amongst our fellow Australians - and we love them all dearly and we love each other dearly, but I do not know what it is. In Townsville they opposed the stadium, they now love it. In Adelaide they opposed it, the Liberal opposition opposed it at the time, and everybody now raves about it. You have a former Liberal premier coming down here encouraging us to build a stadium and get our team going. You go to Perth, Western Australia, exactly the same. You go to the Federation Square in Victoria - Jeff Kennett, I think, addressed a group of about 10,000 people opposing it. He now acknowledges it was one of the worst things he did as leader of the opposition and he now raves about it.

I have every confidence, and that is what I would invite the Greens and those on the crossbench to do: learn from history, see what has happened elsewhere and understand that whilst there is doubt in people's minds, at the end of the journey, people say, 'What a great thing'.

I remember - or I do not remember, sorry, but I read about the Sydney Opera House being built. People wanted compensation for the devaluation of their properties because of the ugliness of the Sydney Opera House. Their properties would be devalued and they needed government compensation. Today it is part of the real estate advertising that the house that is being sold has a vision of the Sydney Opera House in front of it that -

Mr Bayley - Your stadium ain't no Opera House.

The SPEAKER - Deputy Leader of the Greens.

Mr ABETZ - That is how the wheel turns, and that is where you need men and women of leadership who are able to look beyond. I encourage this House to defeat the amendment.

[12.13 p.m.]

Ms JOHNSTON (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to make my contribution on the amendment, and I will give my contribution the substantive motion later on. On this particular amendment, I am looking, in any amendment to a motion or bill before the House, for whether it adds value to what we are considering and debating. If it adds value, I look at the motion in its entirety - and it does not stand alone - the three distinct points made in the motion. They do go to the heart of the Budget that has just been handed down by the government last year. It goes to the heart of where it has been mismanaged. It talks about potential plans to try and

rescue the Budget in terms of private public asset sales. It speaks also to the Premier's inability to deliver major projects, following the *Spirits of Tasmania* fiasco. The question I have is: does this amendment add value to the motion? I believe it does in two ways.

In reference to the *Spirits of Tasmania* fiasco: by including that in the substantive motion, the opposition have clearly indicated significant concerns about major project delivery. It is on the public record that a \$93 million project has blown out to \$493 million, I understand - \$400 million more than initially budgeted. That is serious. It is significant - hugely significant - and certainly, Labor are right to call that out. That is deeply concerning to Tasmanians. It speaks to this government's inability when it comes to project management. The opposition leader spoke earlier in his contribution about the poor handling of the project, the misinformation or lack of information to members of the community about delays and cost blowouts, and the impact particularly on the tourism industry.

It highlights that we have significant issues in the government, in their ability to manage a major project. Arguably, there is no greater project on the horizon than the stadium. We should be concerned about this government's management of the stadium, in particular, when it comes to the Budget and what the implications are. This particular amendment to the motion adds value to component one of the substantive motion about the mismanagement, because it is a major project - the largest, in terms of scale, that this state will see for a very long time.

The record of the government that is clearly identified in part three of the motion, is incredibly poor. I look to the budget papers itself to see what is the risk of this particular stadium over and above the many other risks. I recognise, as the Leader of the Opposition said, there are a lot of risks to the Budget. It is a budget on a hope and a prayer, in many ways but certainly, the stadium, time and time again, comes up as a key risk when it comes to management.

I invite members to look at budget paper one in particular on page 81, where it has outlined expenditure risks and sensitivities, and reflect on how the stadium is key in a number of those risks and sensitivities outlined by Treasury. Under 'general expenditure risks and sensitivities', under 'interest rates and borrowing costs', the papers say:

Tasmania's finances are increasingly exposed to interest rate changes given the increasing levels of borrowings due to the forecast of public account cash deficits over the forward Estimates. If interest rates were to vary from current forecast, debt servicing costs will also vary.

We know, by admission, this government has said it is going to have to borrow significant amounts of money to fund the stadium: \$375 million and borrowings. This project, by the government's own admission, is only 50 per cent designed. They have no idea what their final outcome is going to look like, the final design is going to look like, let alone what the cost of that will be. We have seen significantly, over the last two years in particular, cost increases already and we are only at 50 per cent designed. We are going to be borrowing significantly. We should be sensitive and aware of the key expenditure risks when it comes to interest rates and borrowing costs.

Further down the page, budget papers talk about infrastructure cost increases and deliverability as an expenditure risk and sensitivity. It talks about how infrastructure projects face a range of risks that can impact both cost and delivery timeframes. Absolutely. *Spirits* berth, example 1, your Honour. There are so many other examples - the Kingborough High-

Performance Centre, again another classic example of key risk when it comes to cost and delivery timeframes.

It talks about - these include escalating input costs, labour shortages, supply chain disruptions and unforeseen challenges such as weather and changing ground conditions. Absolutely, but that is all compounded when your project is only 50 per cent designed.

All those things are real risks in any project that are made considerably worse when you do not know what you are doing. You have only got a 50 per cent design and you have a really poor record of project management.

Turn the page over and we talk about borrowings and support and equity contributions to public non-financial corporation sector entities. Here again, the Treasury warns there are a range of risks linked to the government priorities being delivered through Public Non-Financial Corporations (PNFCs) entities including Homes Tasmania, Stadiums Tasmania, and the Macquarie Point Development Corporation (MPDC). These entities are critical to the government's infrastructure and social policy agenda.

To expect the value of equity contributions and associated entity borrowings to support these projects increases materially over 2025-26 budget and forward Estimates but it is still only a project 50 per cent designed. Enormous risk goes with that.

Finally, under 'Specific Expenditure Risks and Sensitivities', it talks about No. 1 Macquarie Point Urban Renewal project. It says on page 83 -

Equity funding is provided to MPDC to progress Macquarie Point Urban Renewal project, after the equity funding is fully utilised, any additional expenditure required to complete the project will be funded through borrowings by MPDC.

Enormous risks. I take the Leader of the Opposition's point that there are many risks to the budget and this budget is badly handled but even in the budget papers it highlights just how significant the stadium is in terms of the magnitude of risk to budget and budget management in the future. The words of Saul Eslake on ABC Radio, I think it might have been on Friday last week, are ringing my ears when he described the budget as a triumph of hope over experience.

Experience tells us this government cannot manage major projects. It is named up in point (3) of the most substantive motion. The biggest project on the horizon is the stadium. It is 50 per cent designed. Any builder worth their salt, any planner, will tell you that comes with enormous risk around cost delivery. That comes with enormous risk around the budget. The Treasury know it. Tasmanians know it. It deserves to be named up in this motion.

[12.22 p.m.]

Mr BAYLEY (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this amendment. We do not know what may well happen over lunchtime in the Liberal Party party room. In the context of my comments on the larger substantive debate, I wanted to say that it gives me absolutely no pleasure to rise to speak on the substantive motion.

The SPEAKER - I will only draw you to the amendment before us. At this stage we have a very long debate ahead of us.

Mr BAYLEY - The Premier is someone who said he would govern with heart, and I believe that he believed that when he said it. It is a range of all sorts of different factors, including the hard right of his party that has helped him make a range of really bad decisions.

The budget mismanagement in this motion is absolutely accepted and it is doing significant long-term damage to Tasmania. That is absolutely accepted, and we see the damage that it is doing. We see it in our health system - the ambulance ramping and the crisis in the health system. We see it in the housing systems and the fact that this government has had to fudge the figures to make it look like they are meeting their targets. We see it in the environment - the underfunding of the environment and the recommendations of the State of the Environment Report, which were an absolute alarm bell for this state, this government and this parliament to come and get things going.

The debt has blown out in this recent Budget, and the deficit blows out in this Budget. What we have seen in previous Revised Estimates Reports is that the government gets it wrong in the Budget. It has to revise its estimates upwards and ultimately come back to this place with supplementary appropriation requests.

Central in the budget mismanagement is obviously the Macquarie Point Stadium. You cannot move beyond that, and that is why the Leader of the Greens has moved this amendment to make sure it is reflected that the long-term damage to Tasmania that has been done by budget mismanagement is compounded by the plan to fund a new stadium in Hobart. It simply cannot be denied.

The stadium is central in undermining confidence in this government, not just in the way it is managing money, but also in the decisions that this government is making. Things like the Cenotaph, for example - in any other situation, the Cenotaph would be utterly sacrosanct and yet they are willing for it to be sacrificed. They are willing to sacrifice the views of veterans and the views of the RSL in their dogged pursuit for a stadium on this particular site, of this size, with a roof. It is utterly disgraceful on the part of this government to be throwing veterans and the ambience and the importance of the Cenotaph under the bus in pursuit of the stadium.

It is utterly pathetic for the leader of government business and others to roll out things like the Eden Project as some kind of wedge for the Greens. The Eden project was a kite that was flown many years ago. It barely got off the front page of the paper. It was not even a development application and there was no proposal, so it is completely pathetic. It shows how desperate the government is to be trying to point to that issue as a means to defend their utter sell-out of veterans. You ignored them. You promised that you would deal with their concerns. You promised you would design a stadium in a way that would address their concerns, and you could not do it because you would not do it. It is utterly shameful.

The polls demonstrate unequivocally that people hate this stadium - worse in the north, not as bad in the south, but still really bad, and it got worse again. Even stadium supporters do not support the Premier abandoning the \$375 million cap and abandoning the process by which it should be assessed. Even stadium supporters have walked away from your government when you walked away from those commitments.

The \$375 million commitment and 'not one red cent more' was a critical commitment by this Premier. It was made on day one of the last election. What does that tell you? It tells you that this government knew that the stadium was a problem. They knew that the stadium money was a problem and they needed to cauterise that risk. They needed to cauterise the issue so that it did not bleed votes away from them. The Premier knew full well when he made that commitment that it was not going to be the end of it - \$375 million for capital expenditure would not be the end of it.

While the leader points to the business case really clearly and says, 'Oh, look, it says 'and borrowings'', when you look at that business case, the borrowings are included in the capital cost. It was always going to be the case as part of that, and you said \$375 million to capital expenditure, but that pointed to borrowings.

When it comes to the confidence of the people around the Macquarie Point Stadium and this Premier, I think nothing has tainted both more than the attack on the Tasmanian Planning Commission and the abandonment of that process. The Premier himself brought the order into this House to establish the Project of State Significance (POSS) process. He can rewrite history as much as he wants about it not being his preferred process. He would have preferred a much easier process and the Major Projects process would have meant that it would have sailed through even faster - that is the subtext of that argument, but the simple fact is that the Premier brought the stadium POSS process and POSS order into this House and it was passed.

We Greens voted against it because the POSS process abandons the planning scheme. Let me be really clear: it abandons the planning scheme. Those protections for the Cenotaph that are enshrined in the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme no longer apply. We were really concerned about that and had deep concerns about the fact that normal planning mechanisms, and normal planning restrictions and rules that apply to every other person, do not apply when it comes to the POSS process. The other reason we are deeply concerned about projects of state significance is because there are no third-party rights of appeal, and third-party rights of appeal are absolutely critical in a democratic society to getting planning right.

It means you can actually test the decisions of decision-makers; it means you can facilitate a negotiation and a mediation between proponents and opponents, and it delivers better outcomes. That is why we voted against the POSS process, but this parliament decided, in its wisdom, to establish that POSS process. Off the Tasmanian Planning Commission went and did its work, and it did it very diligently. It consulted with the community, it established the guidelines, it invited the Macquarie Point Development Corporation to make its submission and it churned through that submission and published a draft-integrated assessment report. What we saw was, in my mind, an utterly despicable attack by this government on the planning commission.

It effectively passed off a legal representation to the process on a legal firm's letterhead as some kind of independent legal advice that it should hang its criticisms of the Tasmanian Planning Commission off. Then it went to work undermining the credibility of the planning commission and its panel: a panel that has on it no less than people like a former deputy solicitor-general, a former treasury boss, and governance and other experts. The leader of government business and indeed the Premier went to task to undermine that body, because the government knew that that body was never going to give a positive recommendation for its stadium.

I want to read into *Hansard*, for the record, a comment by the Premier in relation to that panel - a panel effectively appointed by him - that published a report, as it was requested to by this parliament. I quote from an article in a national newspaper on 22 April. The journalist writes:

Rockliff, who hit out at the report for failing to be independent, doubled down on his initial criticism.

Then there is a quote from the Premier:

My view is they went in there with a predetermined view. From my point of view it wasn't objective.

That is an utterly shameful thing for the leader of this state to be alleging against a bunch of people with expertise that he effectively appointed, simply because they have found a long litany and list of issues associated with the stadium at that location in Macquarie Point.

Lastly, in terms of contempt, it is contemptuous for the government to release for consultation a long bill that bypasses and corrupts the planning process but brings forward here, into this parliament, a planning permit and conditions for the biggest infrastructure project that this state has ever seen, but less than a week into the consultation - it still has a week-and-a-half or two weeks to go - they actually tabled the bill.

Utter contempt. They are not interested in the community's view on the stadium; that is abundantly clear. It was clear from day one. It was clear when the Premier made his \$375-million election day commitment, and it is completely clear when it comes to the Macquarie Point planning permit bill that we now have before us. What an absolute travesty and perversion of process this bill is, and it will be a dark day in this Chamber if ever we get to debate it.

Let me go to the central issue here, which is the dollars that the stadium is going to cost. It is significant. The Tasmanian Planning Commission and others have identified that it would be almost \$2 billion of debt over 10 years, and that it risks our credit rating.

The member who just took her seat, Ms Johnston, highlighted the risk when it came to interest rates, and how that will compound some of the costs to the Tasmanian people and the Tasmanian taxpayer from the debt we incur but of course, if our credit rating is downgraded, that is going to have a direct impact. That is one of the things that will have a direct impact on interest rates. It is clearly an utterly irresponsible and reckless act to be funding this stadium in this budget, and that is why we want to see this amendment brought forward.

The Leader of the Opposition acknowledged that \$600 million is in this Budget to service the stadium, to build this stadium. It includes \$13 million for the Macquarie Point Development Corporation directly, which looks like it is to service some borrowings - \$600 million-plus is a hell of a lot of public servants - when we are talking about sacking 2500 public servants, \$600 million could pay for a hell of a lot of public service. When we are talking about beds in renal units in the north of the state, desperate beds in renal units, \$600 million could build a hell of a lot of beds. When we are talking about housing homeless people and giving them the wrap around services that they need to get back on their feet and make a contribution to communities, \$600 million would be a hell of a lot.

We have heard a fair bit in this Chamber about the TasCOSS forum the other day and how effectively community service organisations have to do better with less. We were told effectively they have to do better with less. Let me just reflect one story that I have heard from a community service provider that provides services to people with acute needs. When you have people with acute needs, be it mental health, physical health, other needs, it can be an expensive business. This organisation was coming to government looking for additional support so it could maintain its facilities. Do you know what it was told? It was told, 'Why don't you focus on people with less acute needs? Focus on people with less acute needs because that will be less expensive.' How is that? It is the 21st century, it is Tasmania, it is a government with heart, and we are telling community service organisations - 'Do not deal with the people who have got really bad problems, even though they are there, they will be fine, just deal with the others because they are less expensive.' Utter shame. Shame on us all, but shame on this government.

The Tasmanian Planning Commission does not stop \$2 billion debt over 10 years. I do not think it stops there. It does not stop at the \$945 million that the government has now acknowledged this stadium is going cost. It promised the world that it was just \$715 million, but now it has acknowledged it is \$945 million. One of the things the Tasmanian Planning Commission did was identify that Macquarie Point is a highly problematic site. It is toxic. It has a range of issues that could affect human health, health of workers, health of patrons, it could affect environmental health, and the health of the river.

Of course, there has been a whole lot of remediation work done on Macquarie Point and we absolutely support that. There has been a lot said about the money that Mr O'Byrne got with the now Prime Minister Albanese, \$50 million, to remediate Macquarie Point and that is great. We full support that but it was remediated for the previous master plan development. It was remediated for housing for parkland and for other development, not a stadium. Not something where you have to dig two or three levels down to build a car park. Not something where you have to drive piles deep into the reclaimed soils for foundations and the like. You know what toxic sites mean? Anyone who has done any development or any managed any development or even observed any development know that toxic site means delay. Delay equals cost.

When this government says \$945 million, they are giving you that assessment based on their previous assessment of the toxic nature of this site and what it would take to deal with it. We can expect that to radically increase. That is with the toxic site.

We are seeing radical increases as has already been discussed with some of these major infrastructure developments already. Things like the Devonport berth has been well aired in this debate already; outrageous levels of cost increase - or should I say underestimation and under communication of how much it will cost.

The Cradle Mountain cable way has gone from \$60 million up \$210 million. Incredible. The sewerage works at Mac Point as well; over the years we have acknowledged that they need to be removed. They have gone through the roof.

While I am on the sewerage works, let me pick you up, Leader, because you try to wedge us on the sewerage works. You try to say, 'You do not support the stadium, so the Greens must therefore support the poo tanks.' Well, let me tell you, leader, if you did not know already, they are on a different block of land. They are next-door to the site. They need to be removed, yes, but they are not contingent on the stadium. Do not try to -

Members interjecting.

A member - Oh, they do need to be removed?

The SPEAKER - Order.

Mr BAYLEY - They need to be removed for a whole bunch of reasons. You can remove them without building -

The SPEAKER - The Deputy Leader of the Greens will cease responding to the interjections.

Mr BAYLEY - I am on my feet. You can remove those sewage tanks whether you build a stadium or not. Trying to wedge us on that is just a ridiculous, pathetic argument.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Members on my right.

Mr BAYLEY - There was one thing that has not been articulated when it comes to cost, and it is buried in these permit conditions - that was raised with us by the Hobart City Council. One of the reasons that the Hobart City Council might be so concerned about this stadium is because it has been identified that a whole raft of infrastructure that surrounds the stadium outside of its exact footprint needs to be uplifted. This is the pedestrians. It needs to be uplifted to cope with -

Ms Burnet - It is \$336 million worth.

Mr BAYLEY - It is \$336 million worth of pedestrian uplift in the streets of Hobart immediately surrounding the stadium. That is why this government has completely botched this project. It is going to cost way more than the \$945 million. That is why we need to see this amendment reflected in this motion.

The \$240 million of federal funding was given for urban renewal at Mac Point. It did not even mention a stadium. It was contingent on housing and wharf upgrade, but it was for urban renewal. Let me just say, this will not be a wasteland into the future without a stadium. There was a previous master plan that had a great vision for this site, including a truth and reconciliation park. I look forward to talking about Aboriginal issues when we get to the substantive motion because that is a major failure of this Premier. The previous master plan had a well worked up proposal for development.

The former treasurer actually put out a statement at the time celebrating the master plan, saying this is going to deliver \$1 billion worth of uplift to the Tasmanian economy. Well, what has this government done? It has gone and paid out over \$1 million to a Melbourne-based developer so that they would not develop on the site. As was reported in this House a few weeks ago, they are now having to pay out the Red Shed of the Hobart Brewing Company for not brewing beer in that shed anymore. We are actually paying people not to do things on this site. It is an absolute travesty.

The AFL deal was an absolute dud. There was no consultation with Cabinet. There was no advice from Treasury, There was no consultation with the Tasmanian people. The Premier was still saying to the Tasmanian people way back in August 2022 on an article that is still on the ABC website that the bid for the team is not contingent on the stadium.

The team has momentum. We know the team can be delivered without a stadium.

Mr Abetz - No it cannot. You know that.

Mr BAYLEY - The Devil's own submission says that a new stadium at Mac Point will increase its revenue by \$5.4 to \$5.9 million a year. We are having this entire debate compromising this incredible site for that kind of money. It is an absolute sham.

We think we can have a team. We do not need a stadium at Mac Point because we have one at Bellerive and one at York Park. The stadium has to be central in this motion, because it is part of the mismanagement.

Time expired.

[12.42 p.m.]

Ms ROSOL (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the amendment moved by Dr Woodruff. I do not believe that we can speak about budget mismanagement in this original no-confidence motion without also speaking about the stadium. As outlined by Mr Bayley just now, we know that the stadium is going to be a significant financial burden to our state going forward for many years.

I want to bring some of the voices of the people of Tasmania into speaking on this motion. Once the no-confidence motion was tabled yesterday, I had a large number of people emailing me with their thoughts on it, and many of them linked this motion with, and I will read some of those comments out now.

Hi Cecily,

I am writing to you in the hope that you will support the no confidence motion in the Premier. The Premier has delivered blunder after blunder in recent times and Macquarie Point Stadium proposed legislation is probably the biggest of them.

Dear Cecily,

I urge you to support a no confidence motion in the government of Jeremy Rockliff should that come to pass. We know stadium will cost in excess of \$1 billion and at a time when our health, education, housing and social services systems are under extreme stress, coupled with the existing debt carried by Tasmania and its taxpayers and it is time for all parliamentarians to take a principled stand against this monstrous waste of taxpayers' money.

Just heard the news. I hope this will enable a move to a sounder government for our special state. Something needs to be done to stop this.

Premier Rockliff's rash and undemocratic behaviour - re: The ill-conceived stadium.

It goes on with other examples. Another e-mail I received -

A major plank of the budget is paying for the stadium. This again is financially irresponsible. There are a range of other costs that will occur, for example the extra \$75 million for the Northern Road. Cost blowouts and the payment of interest on the loan. There is also the proposal to sell parcels of land, which will cause an additional cost in terms of revenue foregone. Quite simply, we cannot afford the stadium.

The people of Tasmania understand that the stadium is a significant part of budget mismanagement and that needs to be acknowledged in this no-confidence motion. The evidence is clear. We have in the budget outlined the many costs of the stadium and what they are going to contribute to debt and to deficit. The people of Tasmania can see that and we in this parliament need to acknowledge that as well.

I speak in support of this amendment and urge people to vote for it.

[12.45 p.m.]

Ms BADGER (Lyons) - Honourable Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to this motion because it is absolutely critical that the stadium is part of that because it is emblematic of all the major projects in this state. That is notwithstanding that it is completely non-essential.

Of everything that Tasmania needs, and for Tasmanians in 50 years' time to look back on what we need, when we are looking at our investment priorities and where they could go. The current literacy levels in this state. The lack of digital connectivity in this state. The lack of health services when we are currently seeing the increases in family and domestic violence, particularly in intimate situations, within Tasmanian homes.

Of everything that we could be investing in, this is not a priority. That is why it is important because if we cannot handle something that is so non-essential properly, if that is the priority, how does every other major project actually stack up?

We have heard the debacle around the *Spirits*. That is at least something that is slightly more essential to people in this state in terms of coming and going, in terms of the economic benefit that it would bring back, than the stadium.

What about everything else that we have to actually be investing in? When we are not investing in the basic services, when they are not the investment priority, we are going to fall further and further behind in this state. It is going to take us longer and longer to economically catch up, to reinvest in the services that we actually need to ensure that all young Tasmanians have the education to go out into the world and thrive, and to ensure that there is housing available for all Tasmanians, and to ensure the Tasmanians who choose to go overseas can come back here or interstate, can come back and bring their families back here and still have a competitive, well-paid job in whatever industry they might have gone out and become experts in.

The stadium process has not only been emblematic of a wrong investment priority, it is also emblematic of the further contempt of proper process and the erosion of democracy that this government under Jeremy Rockliff has been putting forward.

The POSS process, devised to put through special projects, is not even working, so now we have to push through special legislation that is not even good legislation. We are not putting in proper public consultation. We are just going to throw the bill on the table after threatening the Legislative Council. After threatening the other place, we are just going to throw the bill on the table and not take into proper account public consultation. No Tasmanian actually believes that this government is going to take on board their feedback and come into this place and amend that full bill with all of their concerns.

Like my fellow member for the Greens in Bass, I have been absolutely astonished by the number of Tasmanians who have reached out overnight and who have immediately gone and pointed to this stadium as something that is a complete wrong priority and that is an enormous issue for them. The polling tells us the same thing; Tasmanians do not want it. This is not a priority. It is emblematic of all the issues we are currently facing, which is why it is integral to this motion.

Time expired.

[12.48 p.m.]

Ms BURNET (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to support the amendment. The Leader of the Opposition has given clear direction in this debate as to why he wants to move this motion of no-confidence in the Premier in relation to the Budget. However, there is this cognitive dissonance. There is no connection made by the Leader of the Opposition or the members of the government, particularly the Premier, when it comes to the stadium and its cost. It is a significant burden on this year's Budget and it will be a significant burden on the budget for many years to come. This is the debt and deficit that we have to see. The government cannot just say, 'This budget is delivering for Tasmanians; we are going to build the stadium at all costs'.

This cost is not only to the taxpayers of today, but for future taxpayers. If we are just looking at a financial burden, it will be a future burden on taxpayers of tomorrow and probably their children to come. It is a significant burden. This lack of understanding or acknowledgement by the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier and his government is astounding. We have heard from many Tasmanians and we have seen it in the polls that they are concerned about this stadium build. It is concerning. It is not something that we can just say, 'It is okay'.

I will take up another side of the argument that Mr Abetz has put forward. He is talking about how the City of Hobart will benefit, saying there will be benefit to the City of Hobart if the stadium is built. Quite often, we talk about the 'what ifs', so, 'what if' and 'when it happens, this will happen'. Unfortunately, we hear a lot of announcements from this government but also a lack of substance. I believe it was in July 2024 that Mr Abetz trumpeted that we would have a bus rapid transit system. Those people who catch Metro buses now, and those people who have had a look at the budget papers, can see the appalling lack of investment in such vital things as public transport. That should be the priority of this government now, not for a stadium that is yet to be built.

My colleague, Mr Bayley, talked about \$336 million of infrastructure. That is infrastructure to be delivered to deliver a stadium. The government may deny it, but a lot of that will fall to the local council, the City of Hobart. We had a full briefing, and Hobart City Council has done a lot in relation to a neighbourhood plan and urban design, to mapping out how a stadium would fit in that landscape and how it would impact on heritage. We are not even considering the impacts of a stadium on such things as the heritage dollar, which is worth a lot to the City of Hobart, as it is across Tasmania. There would be a footbridge, which is unfunded. I believe it has been dropped for the time being, but it is pretty important. We keep hearing about Adelaide Oval and how important that infrastructure is to Adelaide Oval. That footbridge is very important, but the footbridge we have as part of the Premier's stadium is not funded. Neither is the road access, the path-widening, the bus stops or the Goods Shed removal. We need to remove the Goods Shed and then replace it.

There are many things that are unfunded and many things that are uncertain around the stadium. Therefore, it is important that this parliament considers the stadium when we are talking about confidence. This is at the heart of what is so pressing about the Premier's performance and the Budget for me and for the Greens. To not acknowledge that the Budget is part and parcel; it has to be tied up with the stadium. There are so many funding cuts. There are things like the Urban Congestion Fund. Half of that in this year's Budget and forward Estimates is going to the stadium for the Northern access road. That is a congestion fund. How is that possible? How is a congestion fund, which should be focused on other elements of the road network and infrastructure network, not being considered as something sacrosanct, that should not be touched for the purposes of building a stadium? That is not going to fix congestion. It is a ridiculous notion.

We have talked about the intergenerational debt. There are so many burdens to having a stadium and we cannot depart from that. The Premier has a lot to answer for in relation to this. There is so much uncertainty about the costs that will be borne by the state of Tasmania. We have seen the costs of delivering the stadium go up exponentially. That has an impact on the Budget. It is fundamental to our decision-making and what we should be considering when we are looking at the Budget and the Premier's performance. That is what is under question here. We cannot separate it from the Premier's performance. The stadium is part and parcel of it.

It is his project. The Premier has made so many decisions for Tasmania in relation to this stadium, and we cannot get away from that. That is why this amendment is so important. It is part and parcel, certainly for the Greens and for many Tasmanians from right across the state. They have seen the ineptitude, they have seen what has happened with mega-projects such as the *Spirits* and the Devonport wharf, which I was pleased to visit on the weekend. That beautiful city has a lot of waiting to do, and the north-west tourism industry has a lot of waiting to do. They must be really disappointed. That is one mega-project.

The stadium is a mega-project, and I believe we have to ask the question: can this state deliver such a project? Can this state deliver this project within a budget, the budget that has gone up and up and up? What limit is there on how much taxpayer money the government will spend on this? How much will they continue to allow, 'Oh, look, we have to think about another appropriation bill'. We will need to do that. When it comes to the stadium, that is what we are faced with. We cannot continue to have an open chequebook. We cannot continue to just allow the government to ramp up that debt. We have seen it, we have heard it from Saul Eslake, and we have heard it from Martyn Goddard. The infrastructure projects have not been delivered in

a budget. Things like Montello Primary School in the north-west has missed out on that funding to build in a very impoverished area. It is not built as per the Budget in 2024-25. It is incredibly underspent. This is of great concern. We see this all over the place - infrastructure spending by this government over the previous ten years has been underspent and underdelivered in nine out of 10 budgets. It is absolutely appalling.

The Premier has a great responsibility. When we come to this mega-project, I do not believe that it is going to be built on time and on budget. I do not think this Premier can deliver that. This amendment is a really important amendment for this House to consider.

[12.59 p.m.]

The SPEAKER (Ms O'Byrne) - The question is -

That the amendment be agreed to.

The House divided -

AYES 10

Ms Badger
Mr Bayley
Mrs Beswick
Ms Burnet
Mr Garland
Mr Jenner
Ms Johnston
Ms Rosol
Dr Woodruff
Mrs Pentland (Teller)

NOES 24

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

Amendment negatived.

Sitting suspended from 1.06 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

House of Assembly Broadcast Issues

The SPEAKER - Before giving the call to the Leader of the Greens, I will advise that we are aware of the problems with the broadcast. Work is underway to resolve that challenge. Hopefully we will have a resolution and the very large amount of people who have been tuning in today will have a less frustrating experience. I will give the call to the Leader of the Greens. The Leader of the Greens has seven minutes available.

MOTION

Want of Confidence in Premier, Jeremy Rockliff

Resumed from above.

[2.30 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF - Honourable Speaker, Labor makes no sense that the vote that we had then and Labor's position on a new stadium in Hobart makes no sense to Tasmanians, but the Greens are going to move on because we know we have the majority of Tasmanians behind us. We know that on the words of the motion that we are now voting to - the long-term damage to Tasmania that fundamentally includes the \$2 billion of debt that we will bear as a result of a new stadium over the next ten years. We also know that the delivery of major projects which Labor have put in the motion as a key issue is obviously going to be a huge impact on something like trying to build a new stadium in the middle of Hobart. Labor's position makes no sense, but that is on their heads.

I want to go on a little bit further about my comments about Jeremy Rockliff as Premier in his role with the commission of inquiry. He did undertake important work in establishing the commission and in adopting their recommendations, but there is no doubt that what has happened over the last year since the election is he appears to be pacifying the hard right of his cabinet and backing a position on the commission of inquiry's recommendations that is unravelling the spirit and the purpose of the recommendations that they made and is undermining the position that he says his government is going to take to fulfil the commission of inquiry.

When the commission of inquiry wrapped up early because they were so concerned that Ashley should close and they were so concerned about out-of-home care, they knew that to delay closing Ashley beyond 2024 would continue the risk of children being subjected to trauma. They knew that it was such a dangerous place for young people to remain in. That is why they wrapped up early. The response from this government has been continual delay and inaction on closing Ashley, and now what we have is the earliest closing date at 2028, four years later.

We have seen, much worse even, the change that the Premier has allowed to members of his cabinet in bringing in legislation and policy approaches, which utterly contradicts the recommendations from the commission of inquiry. He, through his Cabinet, is now allowing children to be sent there, sent into a place which is still dangerous, where isolation and other restrictive practises still occur, and where he has a ramped up punitive and damaging approach

to young offenders in a range of youth crime initiatives which are again utterly in contradiction to the commission of inquiry's recommendations.

They are sending more children to Ashley, and they are sending more children into isolation and lockdown, instead of establishing task forces for youth crime that would support young people, funding proper youth services. He is instead putting 'adult crime, adult time' laws on the table. These have been called out by the UN, by experts, by advocates as a direct violation of the rights of children. There is no doubt that what we have seen across his government is a backflip on important policies that he committed Tasmanians to take forward. He has backflipped on the stadium - the \$375 million cap. Now, what we are seeing is he is unable to control the hard right in his Cabinet and we are seeing policies that are unfolding under his government that backflip on the recommendations of the commission of inquiry.

We do not know what is going to happen next. After the vote in parliament today, we will find out. I will say to Labor that we support this motion because as Tasmanians we do not have confidence in Jeremy Rockliff as Premier.

We do not know from this point, if the motion passes, whether the Liberals will be able to form a government on the numbers in the House. That is to be determined. If they are not able to, then it is Dean Winter as opposition leader who has a choice. He can maintain stability. He can save Tasmania from a costly election.

It is he who needs to stand up and do his best to form a minority government, with members of the crossbench by negotiating outcomes with members of the crossbench in the best interest of Tasmanians. The Greens will work in good faith to form an arrangement of minority government. We will always work in the best interest of Tasmanians. We expect Dean Winter, now that he has taken this step, to also put that first and foremost if the opportunity is handed to him.

Tasmanians do not want to go back to a costly election. It has only been one year. Dean Winter, opposition leader, has the call if it falls to his hand to save Tasmanians from an early election. The Greens will work in good faith in any negotiations if that is what comes to place.

Mr Winter - You censured me a month ago.

Dr WOODRUFF - I just want to finish by saying: Premier, from the stadium, from your move towards privatisation, from your abandonment of treaty, contempt of democratic processes and your secrecy and arrogance of your government, Tasmanians have lost confidence in you - and so, unfortunately, have we.

Time expired.

[2.38 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, I take my role as an independent member for the seat of Franklin very seriously. I have always applied my values and my best intentions in all of my actions in parliament. In the previous parliament I was elected as a Labor member and although I was not in the Labor caucus, given I was voted in as a Labor member, I did not vote against a Labor position. I abstained on two votes, but I made a commitment to the people of Franklin in the 2021 election as a Labor member that I would represent them. They would

have expected, all things being equal, that I would have voted for the Labor position. I did that on virtually all occasions, apart from two votes where I abstained where I felt that the positions that Labor took were contrary to the Labor Party policy and platform.

When I made the reluctant decision - and it was reluctant, it was a very difficult decision - to become an independent in this House, I did so in the full knowledge that my commitment to the people of Franklin would be to act as an independent or to fulfil the values that I have demonstrated in my public life for many years and to provide a level of stability and functionality as best I could as an Independent. Everyone was predicting it would be a minority parliament and it was and so it came to pass. I take these positions very seriously.

At the last election it was very clear that the Labor opposition chose not to seek to form government, chose not to have discussions with members of the crossbench. It was left to the Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, to reach out and form an agreement and try to respect the will of the Tasmanian people, barely 12 months ago. It seems like a lifetime ago, but it was really only just 12 months ago where, not only with the election but with the forming of parliament. I think it was 1 May of last year. We are barely 12 months on.

In my discussions with the Premier, we talked about a range of issues and a range of values that I had. At the end of the day, I had a dual responsibility, I think, to engage openly with all members of parliament, but also to respect the will of the people and to assist the parliament in forming a workable government and parliament. Every day since that election I have endeavoured to do that. I have disagreed with the government on many occasions, disagreed with the opposition and the Greens - we have had disagreements. I believe I have conducted myself respectfully in those debates and articulated my view so that people can understand my thought processes and why I landed on various positions.

Again, given my history, a long history in politics and advocacy and social movements, signing an agreement with the Liberal premier was not on my bingo card a couple of years back, but I did it in the best interest of the state. Also, I did not do it with the Liberal Party. I did not do it with the Liberal government. I did it with Premier Rockliff because in our discussions he treated me respectfully and spoke about the things I felt strongly about, and whilst we have agreed at times in parliament, the values that at times he has exhibited in this place and in public life, I felt I could build a working relationship with him in the best interest of Tasmania. That is what I did.

I signed a confidence and supply agreement that was not a blank cheque that could allow this place to form as a parliament and we have a working government and that we collectively could tell the Tasmanian people that we are grown-ups, that we can get on with the job, not a blank cheque. People know every time I get up in Question Time, you could see some of the ministers - and I am not being arrogant about it at all - but some of them wince when I get up and look at them because I am asking a question because they need to be held to account.

This is not a perfect government. I do not think I have ever seen a perfect government. They have made a series of mistakes, and I will hold them to account, and I will criticise them for that but we work in a democracy where at various junctures we go to the people to seek a mandate to govern on their behalf, and we are judged at the end of that period on whether we have done a good or a bad job. That does not mean that we do not have these issues of confidence and supply from time to time.

I make it very clear that I come to this vote on the basis that I started this term of parliament respecting the views of the electorate, articulating my values in my votes and my contributions on the floor as I see fit, and to endeavour to make this parliament work in the best interest of Tasmania. This is a very difficult vote, and this is a very difficult time because when you look at the motion - and let us face it, Tasmanians have become world-class at kicking own goals and I think we are doing that again in some respects.

People generally do not like politics. They generally dislike politicians. They hate elections when they are not due. They want us to get out of their lives and get on and stop mucking about. That does not mean you get a blank cheque. It does not mean that we muck about. We have to find a balance to get things right.

In terms of this motion: the Budget is in serious disarray, there is no doubt about it. For the government to say that everything is going well and we are on track, I think that does not pass muster. This is a difficult budget. It is a difficult time. Yes, there have been historic decisions about the commission of inquiry and COVID-19 that have lumbered this government and our parliament with debt. There is no doubt that is confronting, but there are decisions that have been made.

Again, these things are a matter of choice. As an individual member, I have to make a choice about who I engage with and who is competent. The Budget reply was an opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to present an argument about what he would do differently. I think I needed to hear more. The Budget is in strife, and the government needs to acknowledge that repair needs to start. I would be critical of this Budget because I do not think enough repair is starting. However, I was in a government where we had money in the bank, and we significantly cut public services to the detriment of Tasmania, and it had an impact on the economy. I have never been a surplus-at-any-cost politician, but again, that does not mean it is a blank cheque for the government to spend money on everything. I think that there is always a balance in these things.

The second part of the motion talks about the plan to privatise public assets. I do not support privatisation, and in my discussions with the Premier, he said any proposal for privatisation would come back to this House with a vote. I take him at face value. There is nothing in the Budget which talks about privatisation. At some stage we have to believe people that they are going to commit to certain things, and the Premier has committed to me that any matter of privatisation will come back to this House for a vote.

The *Spirits of Tasmania* fiasco - there is no other word for it. It is a fiasco; it is a disgrace. That is why I removed my confidence in the then treasurer and Infrastructure minister, Mr Ferguson, for his ministerial role in that. Whilst there are still many challenges ahead with the *Spirits of Tasmania* and TT-Line, I felt that it was an appropriate action to take as a member of parliament to withdraw my confidence in that minister. If the Premier had locked in behind him, or if the minister refused to move, I would have been up and about and supporting no-confidence. That may have been consequential, if the government chose to not acknowledge the error, the incompetence and the massive impact it has had on the budget and the Tasmanian people.

The motion moves, further, no confidence in the Premier. The timing of this is interesting, because whilst it is not blocking supply, it kind of is. It is interrupting supply, and it is putting a question mark over supply, and I never thought I would see that in a parliament in Australia.

There is no other way you can say that. It is not just some hand-wringing. Everyone knew. Everyone knew the Revised Estimates Report (RER), and everyone knew this was where the budget was going to go, so why now and why at this point?

I believe in providing supply. I will never vote against the budget of a government. I will argue against it, I will criticise it, but I will not argue against it, because this is blocking supply in a brinkmanship kind of way. I do not take any joy in that. I am not backing - I am not pumping your wings up, I will tell you. We are here because the Budget is in a bit of disarray. The timing, obviously, is because of the stadium bill. People know my position on that and the importance of it to the state and the economy. It is just funny, the timings. I will let other people draw some lines for themselves.

In a contribution by the Leader of the Opposition in, I think it was on the amendment, he said, 'The reason why we are doing this is the state of the budget.' We knew this was going to happen. The budget has been bad for a while. Yes, it is not getting any better, and I would understand if they were moving a no-confidence motion in the Treasurer. I would understand if they were moving a no-confidence motion in the government, because the Budget is a Cabinet decision. It is a government decision.

I could understand those two motions being put, but a motion of no-confidence in the Premier - if the Premier falls because of it, and the government still stands, it is still the Budget. Nothing changes apart from the fact that you get rid of a guy who, in the latest poll, is more popular than you. I have to take people at face value. If you move a no-confidence motion in the Premier and he goes, but you are not willing to move a no-confidence motion in the government and test your numbers broadly on the floor of the parliament, it is just about the Premier.

We do not agree all the time. We have some robust arguments, but over the last 12 months I have had a working relationship where the Premier is open with me. We have had discussions; we have had debates. I have achieved, I feel, some good advocacy on behalf of Neighbourhood Houses Tasmania, on behalf of Dress for Success, on behalf of Hamlet Cafe, on behalf of a range of community organisations and issues, including issues on truth telling. I do not agree with blocking off the pathway to treaty, although I absolutely support truth telling and that process - that is crucially important.

We do not always agree, but I have a working relationship with the Premier. I feel that, if you get rid of him, you just make the government worse, because I do not support the Liberal Party. I do not, with greatest respect. I support the Premier in the work that he does. If he goes, my support goes. That is absolutely clear.

In his contribution, the Leader of the Opposition talked about working with the crossbench and having conversations with them. Apart from cursory hellos, we have not had a conversation in three years. As an individual member of parliament and, I think, a not insignificant member of the crossbench, I thought at some stage you might reach out and start a conversation with me about Tasmania, about how we can make this work. At no stage have you reached out to have a conversation. As an independent member, if I am asked for confidence and supply in whoever in this Chamber, I will work with people who want to work with me.

I will work with people who want to have an open conversation with me. If that changes from today, so be it, but at this point I have no confidence that I have a relationship with you where we can talk about issues that I feel strongly about on behalf of the people of Franklin and behalf of the people of Tasmania. That is the reality, and I take no joy in having to explain that situation publicly. I have never said that publicly before, and it is something that, for a Labor leader, is deeply hurtful.

I understand the Greens' position. You talk about minority government and making it work, and how it is up to Dean and it is up to them - it is also up to you. All the issues that you criticise the government on - salmon, other things - good luck, because the major parties really align on most of these issues. Not all issues - there is a difference between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party - but on the issues that you currently raise, there is not much difference.

Sometimes people call politicians clowns. We do not have to convince people that this is a circus and I think, at the end of the day, we have to try to make things work. Budgets are important to nurses, to teachers, to all the services that rely on it. Budget sessions are a contest of ideas. It is not about blocking supply; it is not about bringing the government down, necessarily.

There will be times for that later in the year or early next year - it may even happen this afternoon or tonight - but as an Independent member of parliament who made a commitment to the people of Franklin to try to make this parliament work, to try to get good outcomes for Tasmania, I cannot support the motion, because if the Premier goes, this government gets worse, and you are not proposing to get rid of the government at this stage.

[2.54 p.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I want to say from the outset that the action that we have taken on this side of the House today has not been taken lightly. We understand what has been entrusted to us in this place by the people of Tasmania, and we have had that in mind every step of the way as we have looked to work with this minority parliament. I note the comments of Mr O'Byrne, and I say that he is entitled to those comments and the position that he has outlined to the House this afternoon.

I have been in this place for about eight years now and I have seen a lot of change during that time. The fiscal and organisational discipline of this government has evaporated, and that has been no more pronounced than in the latter years of the leadership under this Premier, Jeremy Rockliff. It was highlighted in the Budget that was presented to us late last week, in that there are unprecedented projected deficits that have been handed down under the leadership of Jeremy Rockliff. You might say that it is about a team, it is about a government, and we have made our thoughts on the effectiveness of this government pretty clear over many years now. However, ultimately, when you are the leader of a government, the buck stops with you.

This motion before the House is very serious. I do not underestimate that. It does have consequences, but what I say to the Premier and the government is that every step of the way throughout your turn as the government of Tasmania, you have made choices and policy decisions. You have dropped the ball on a number of critically serious projects for this state, the *Spirits* included. Those choices have had significant economic consequences for this state, and you can see that in the budget paper. Others are quite right when they say there has been no accountability by the Premier or Treasurer about the state of Tasmania's finances. The

budget underpins everything this government does. It underpins the ability of this state to function.

We have made it very clear that we will support supply and that we will work with the acting Governor. To come in here and say we are disrupting supply is simply untrue. Unprecedented measures such as this no-confidence motion today come in unprecedented times in Tasmania. This is the worst budget this state has ever seen. You would not know it at the TCCI roadshows. It was all glossy brochures and talking up the government. There was no accountability about the dire state Tasmania finds itself in under the leadership of Premier Jeremy Rockliff. Unlike those on the other side of the House, we support our leader, and we support him putting forward this serious motion of no-confidence to the House. I also thank the members of the crossbench who have supported this motion today.

The Premier has had a lot of resets in this place during his term as Premier. The one he needs to have today is to call it a day, to step aside and let somebody else do that job. He has proved through the Budget, through the ferry fiascos, through the state of Tasmania's health and education systems, the dire state of housing in this state - the list goes on. He has proved that he is not up to the job. As a member of this place who was elected by the people of my electorate and the people of Tasmania, I cannot stand by and let this state deteriorate any more under the leadership of this premier. I cannot do it, and we cannot do it. You have to have a conscience. Surely that is what brings you to this place: to create change for people and to make Tasmania a better place after you leave here. I ask the Premier: is Tasmania a better place since he has served as Premier and for the 23 years he has been a member of this parliament?

Mr Ellis - Absolutely.

Members interjecting.

Ms DOW - You would hope he would be leaving it in a better place, but the statistics do not tell that story and the budget numbers do not tell that story, Mr Ellis. You must see that yourself. The Leader of the House came in here today and all he could do was reflect on the previous Labor government. He could not defend his Premier, which was really sad. All he could do was throw stones at us on this side of the House. The majority of us were not part of that government, so it is not even relevant. If you look at the fiscal position that this state finds itself in right now, look at the state of Tasmania and have some accountability for that.

It was not that long ago that we had another motion of no-confidence before this House. That was in the then-treasurer and Infrastructure minister, Michael Ferguson. You are quite right, Mr Shelton. He did the right thing. He took responsibility for that debacle and resigned.

In years gone by, the premier of the day probably would have considered resigning over such a huge stuff-up for this state. There will be generations of Tasmanians who feel the economic impact of that. Aside from the Hydro, the single most important economic driver for this state is the new *Spirits of Tasmania* vessels. The *Spirits* project is already \$500 million over budget and we still do not have a berth. In the Premier's own electorate, there was no berth built. At the time, the Premier was obviously very consumed with trying to keep his government in majority, trying to keep two wayward members of his government from leaving and moving to the crossbench, to even think about that project. The buck stops with the premier of the day. We are an international embarrassment when it comes to that project.

The Premier often mentions what people stop and talk to him about in the street, but I can tell you what they stop and talk to me about. They talk to me about the state of our state. They talk to me about waiting years to see a specialist. They talk to me about waiting years to have their hip replaced. They talk to me about the debacle that this minority government is and the projects it has overseen and failed to deliver time and time again. They talk about the inability of the Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, to manage this state. They also say, 'Why do you keep backing them?' I will tell you what has changed, to go to 'why now?' You only have to look at the Budget, that set of numbers on that page, to say that enough is enough.

The only way out of this, on the government's mythical pathway to surplus, is to privatise Tasmania's assets - assets that generations of hard-working Tasmanians have built and worked in. That threatens the major industries across our state and the livelihoods of regional Tasmanians, and all Tasmanians. The other thing the government is going to do is cut the public Service by 2500. That will be nurses and teachers, who are already working their guts out across their respective workplaces to deliver services on behalf of this government, on behalf of this premier, and that is what he intends to do.

That is why we have taken the action we have taken today. We do not have confidence in this premier. We do not have confidence in his ability to manage the finances of the state, and if you cannot manage the finances of the state then you cannot lead the government and you cannot lead Tasmanians. The buck has to stop and there has to be a line drawn in the sand, and that sits with Premier Jeremy Rockliff.

I believe that when Mr Rockliff became the Premier and said he wanted to lead Tasmania with heart, he meant that. I am not going to personally attack him. That is not what this is about today. This is about the future of Tasmania, the leadership that sits above Tasmanians and the stewardship for Tasmanians and their future. I do not doubt that Mr Rockliff set out to lead with heart. However, I do not think there would be anyone in this place who could not say, hand on heart, that he has not lost his way when it comes to representing the best interests of Tasmania. I am disappointed because I thought he might have bucked the trend of putting the Liberal Party before Tasmanians, which is what this government has done every step of the way. I have been so disappointed because he has not done that. That was illustrated by an early election called last year all about the stability of his government.

He says one thing, does another. He said he would not govern in minority. Well, here we are. It is a chaos of coalition. It is everything the Premier said it would be: It will damage our health system - it has done that; damage our economy, damage business confidence. All those things are on the way down.

Mr Shelton - Business confidence is the highest in the nation.

Ms DOW - Have you read the Roy Morgan poll?

Mr Shelton - How can you say that? You are supposed to tell the truth when you are in here.

Members interjecting.

Ms DOW - Oh, you are, are you? Right, yeah, okay.

Mr Ellis - Is that your response?

Ms DOW - Read the Roy Morgan poll about business confidence.

Mr Ellis - Correct the record. Far out, and you want to be in government.

Members interjecting.

A member - How about the deputy leader of the party has her contribution heard in silence?

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Members on my right and left.

Ms DOW - I tell you, I heard that comment, Mr Ellis, about us wanting to be, and I am sick of those snipes across the Chamber about our ability to be in government. Do you know what? You would not have to do too much of a better job to be better than what you guys are doing at being in government.

Mr Winter - Hear, hear.

Ms DOW - Quite frankly, it is insulting.

Look at the budget. Look at the *Spirits of Tasmania*, the new vessel - where is it? As Gavin from the Latrobe Caravan Park would say, where are they? This Premier has let Tasmanians down. He has had the opportunity - he has been Education minister, he has been Health minister, he has been Infrastructure minister, then he was Infrastructure minister for a little while longer, and then you gave that job to somebody else after the berth 3 debacle. He has had every opportunity to create positive change, to insert and provide influence as the Premier of this state, and to do things differently to what those before him have done - and he has not done that. The state is in a mess. It is the only way to describe it.

Others on the other side of the House have talked about us changing our position - I think it was minister Abetz - and not supporting the stadium. We do support the stadium. If you want to talk about truths, you completely misrepresented our position at the last state election. It was about renegotiating the deal, and it became very clear that there was not the ability to do that. It became very clear that the stadium was required for us to have our own AFL women's and men's teams. The only person in this room who is putting that at risk - it is not us. We are not calling on or wanting to bring on an early election. It is the Premier and the way in which he has mismanaged that project right the way throughout. The Premier is the biggest risk to that project right now. He is absolutely the biggest risk, and you know that on the other side of the House. You know that as well as the way in which this project has been handled.

As others have said, it is an infrastructure project. It is an important infrastructure project for the state. It is contingent on us getting our own team that generations of Tasmanians, now, have wanted. How many amazing players have we lost to the mainland? How many of our young people have gone to the mainland? They are still going, by the way, in droves, because of the lack of opportunity in this state. How many have we lost to play football for other teams? Tasmanians overwhelmingly do want their own AFL women's and men's teams. The greatest risk at the moment - all of the public commentary about this project, particularly today - the

greatest risk to that is the Premier, his mishandling of the project, the timeframes, and the contractual obligations that he has before him.

I want to take just a moment before my time concludes to talk about health. I know that when the Premier became Premier and kept the Health portfolio, he said that he was going to make it a priority for Tasmania. It was not that long ago that he was still talking about Tasmania being the healthiest state in the country by 2025. He does not talk about that much anymore.

I want to put on the record, whilst we are talking about health and the health and wellbeing of our population, that we never stood in the way of the support that was provided by this parliament and government during COVID. Never.

Mr Shelton - You just do not want to pay for it. You wanted us to spend more.

Ms DOW - Why would we? It was an international pandemic, an emergency, something that we had never, ever had to deal with before. It is simply untrue, Mr Shelton, to say that we would do that.

Nor have we ever stood in the way of the commission of inquiry, the very important work that the commission of inquiry did, the importance of those recommendations being implemented in Tasmania, and that there is cultural change in Tasmania when it comes to those findings. We would never do that, and it is dishonest to say that we would and that we did.

Getting back to the state of the health system, which did not improve while the Premier was the health minister, and it still has not. I think, personally, that it is the largest indictment on this government, where we have 68,000 people waiting to see a specialist in this state. They are people who cannot even get on the elective surgery waitlist. You have children on the north-west coast whose parents are ringing up oral health to book an appointment and told to ring back because they do not know when on earth they are going to be able to put them in to give them their dental checks.

This is the state of Tasmania under the leadership of Premier Jeremy Rockliff, and that is a disgrace. We would all hear those stories coming through our offices. I am not sure whether the Premier and his government choose to ignore them, but they come in day by day to my office, and I certainly raise them with the individual ministers about the need for action on these issues.

The problem is, this Premier is far too consumed about his political survival as a member of his team, and his political survival as part of a minority government to actually focus and cut through on the issues that matter to Tasmanians. He has been preoccupied by the stadium project, and yet he has still managed to mismanage that project.

He is responsible for the biggest infrastructure stuff-up in history, in the ferry fiasco. He might have apologised, but he has not been held to any level of accountability about that. As I said, premiers in the past would have resigned over such a significant failure of government policy. They would have. They have resigned over a lot less things - bottles of wine, in other states.

I know that Jeremy Rockliff over the years has done a lot to try and hold his team together. I know that he has been single-handedly responsible for that. To date, he has done

a pretty good job of that, but he has not been able to elevate that to keeping this parliament together. What is clear today is that this parliament - the majority of parliamentarians in this House - do not have confidence in this premier, and they think that it is time for him to go.

I am disappointed that it has come to this point, and I am disappointed that the Premier even came in here today for this debate to proceed. He could have had the decency to accept the fate of this parliament and where his future lies, and to have stepped aside.

As I said, minister Ferguson did the right and decent thing. It is time the Premier did the same. Tasmanians are being let down by this premier, and I have talked about some of those areas. He is responsible for the worst budget position in history, the ferry fiasco, and now he is going to sell off our assets. It is time for the Premier to go.

We stand strong on this side of the House. We thank the crossbench for their support in this notice of motion, and I look forward to the contributions of each of the members of our team on this side, as we make further the case for this premier to vacate the seat of Premier and to enable someone else who is actually going to start to fix some of the serious issues that face Tasmanians and do the right thing by Tasmania.

[3.14 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Treasurer) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, before I share some remarks with respect to the act of political vandalism by the Leader of the Opposition, with respect to the reckless pursuit of an agenda to upend the Premier, upend the government and upend the parliament, which could force an election: before I address those remarks and the impact on the Budget and the impact on the stadium and the Macquarie Point precinct and our economy, I want to put on the record my total and unequivocal support for Premier Jeremy Rockliff. I want to put on the record my admiration and respect for Premier Jeremy Rockliff, not just as a deputy, which I have had the privilege of being for some time, but as someone who has known the Premier since 1991 when he joined the young Liberals. I joined the Liberal students in 1980 and met with Jeremy, obviously, from 1991 and have known the Premier for more than 35 years.

I know him not just as a premier, but as a man who loves his community, on that red soil at Sassafras. He loves his family and I recognise today, Gerry, his mum; Sandra, of course, his wife; Ruby, Lucy and Holly, his three girls who he dearly loves; and, of course, I recognise Rick, because my dad and family grew poppies at Hagley during my growing up years and I also got to know Rick over many decades as well, and have such a high regard for him.

You see, the Premier is not just incredibly hard-working and diligent and dedicated and compassionate: he cares. He is a man with a heart. Why would it be that he would volunteer for Lifeline in those early years, volunteering to care for those who need caring for, vulnerable members of our community? This is a premier who listens, who stands up, and as an attorney working with the Premier with respect to the commission of inquiry, he was totally committed to delivering justice, which this government acted on because of the injustice caused by past governments of more than 40 years. It was the Premier who stood up with our government to deliver justice to those who needed and deserve it. Guess what? It is represented in the Budget as well, and I am pleased and proud of that fact.

You could not get a better role model as the deputy premier than Premier Jeremy Rockliff because he was deputy premier from 2014 - 2022, before he became Premier. Of course, the

six years or more before that, in opposition as deputy to Will Hodgman; loyal as the day is long, loyal and true, dedicated and caring, who loves his community and loves his state, has a vision for Tasmania and is passionate for this state. It is an honour and a privilege to serve in the Cabinet with Premier Jeremy Rockliff and specifically as deputy.

Having said that, this motion is laced with political antics and shenanigans because it is based on upending the Premier, the parliament, potentially causing an election, and undoing the good work that has been done when it comes to progress on the budget and progress on the Macquarie Point precinct and, indeed, progress on Marinus Link, because if we were to go to an election, that would have incredibly serious consequences.

We are in budget week. Last week, I brought down the Budget and I want to say it was great being with the Premier on the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry Roadshow. We were very pleased to receive such positive responses from the Tasmanian Chamber about the Budget, where Michael Bailey said 'We do welcome the government's focus on supporting investments that will boost the economy and help improve budget sustainability. In particular, we welcome the government's continued support for and investment in Marinus and the North-West Transmission Developments, helping to unlock billions of dollars of investment, create jobs and drive economic growth, which will ultimately help with budget repair.'

You see, the Leader of the Opposition knows that this motion is incredibly serious, that has consequences that could potentially not only upend the Premier and the government and/or the parliament, but could lead to an election. This is at a time when the financial investment decision is coming up in just a couple of months. The opposition leader knows this and has done everything possible with this politically motivated motion to upend or cause chaos in the community. The feedback I have had in the last 24 hours from the business community and others is that it is killing confidence. It is pushing it through the floor. The business community does not want another election. The Tasmanian people do not want another election. It was only 23 March last year we had the election, so we are talking 14 months.

We came into this place committed to collaboration and goodwill. The Premier has demonstrated that, and I acknowledge the member for Franklin, David O'Byrne, who has likewise acknowledged that, and the very positive relationship that he has with the Premier. He acknowledged not agreeing on everything, but said he agreed to stability in government for the community, confidence and supply, like other members of the crossbench as well. I acknowledge that and thank them for it, because we are trying to do what is in the best interests of the community, and collaboration and goodwill, as I have said many times, is so important. I want to acknowledge those crossbenchers who have demonstrated that time and again over the last 14 months, and I hope going forward as well.

It is true that the fiscal situation is challenging in Tasmania, but I believe we have the balance right with the Budget. It is absolutely acknowledged that the economy is strong and growing, and you cannot reinvest into those essential services like health and housing and police and education without a strong and growing economy. I believe we have the balance right with a pathway to surplus, but this motion could easily upend the Budget and cause massive risk to continuing supply to our public servants and the services that the Tasmanian people provide to this great state of Tasmania.

It was the Deputy Leader who put on the record that they would be relying on emergency measures for supply. Would they like to outline to the Tasmanian people the emergency

measures that they have planned for the Tasmanian people in terms of public servants who deserve to be paid on time? They know full well that the Budget goes through to 30 June and then we have, under normal processes, up to two months of supply.

If there were to be an election, think about it, and the timeframes in and around that. There is a risk - a serious risk. That is a question that the Leader of the Opposition needs to answer, because there is every chance of upending the Budget, and the concern I have as Treasurer is to ensure that nurses and teachers and doctors and police, and tens of thousands of public servants, are paid, and paid on time.

This is a concern that the Leader for the Opposition needs to come forward and explain, as has been demonstrated through the Deputy Leader - these emergency measures. You can speak to that in your own time. I look forward to listening to that situation.

This is coming from an opposition that still has not demonstrated or put down one alternative budget position in 11 years. I am looking forward to hearing the shadow treasurer, because it may be that the alternative budget will be presented in at least some way, shape or form through the remarks of the shadow treasurer. I am looking forward to that.

We just had an election 14 months ago, and this is the chaos that state Labor are now foisting on this parliament.

I want to address the stadium matter - the Macquarie Point precinct - and make it very clear that again, the Leader of the Opposition's initiative today to upend the Premier in the parliament could indeed upend the Tassie Devils because no stadium, no team. You only have to refer to the public statements today from Kath McCann from the Tassie Devils, where she talked about the project being put in jeopardy. She said, 'Uncertainty presents a serious risk to jobs, investment, growth and the future of the Tasmanian Football Club.' That is what is at risk as a result of the political games, school kid games that the Leader of the Opposition is playing today. I understand there is a president's meeting of the AFL happening this afternoon as a result of their fears and concerns. I do not know what they will say or what will come up, but we know the views of the Tasmanian Football Club and the jeopardy that this Leader of the Opposition is putting this project in. It is a very big concern.

Guess what? There are 200,000 plus reasons why the Leader of the Opposition should reconsider the position that he has created. What am I referring to? The members of the Tasmanian Football Club, and I understand the numbers are going up and up - until potentially today. This is a question that the Leader of the Opposition needs to answer. Does the Leader of the Opposition have the ticker to step up? We do not know -

Mr Winter - Do you?

Members interjecting.

Mr BARNETT - because let us be very clear, we know this is a very serious motion -

Dr Broad - Do you have the ticker?

Mr Willie - Not after delivering the worst budget in the state's history. Zero chance.

Mr BARNETT - This is a very serious motion to be brought against our Premier.

Mr Willie - Not after delivering the worst budget in the state's history. Zero chance.

Mr BARNETT - You know how serious that is, and you have not indicated that you want to lead the state as the premier. You have not said that you want to form a government; you have not said that you want an election. What is it that you want, exactly? I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition belled the cat when she said she wants the Premier to step aside and let someone else do the job.

Why do you want to bring in a motion of no-confidence, but you are not willing to step up yourself? You do not have the ticker, and this is what happened after the last state election. The Leader of the Opposition was not willing to step up because he did not have the ticker. Guess what? The Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, stepped up and built a relationship with our crossbench, and through that -

Mr Winter - I have to point out I was not the leader, so that is probably your first problem.

Members interjecting.

Mr Willie - You called an election a year early. Instability. You delivered a worse parliament.

Mr BARNETT - collaboration, has progressed the best interests of this state. They do not like it; they are chipping in. They do not like hearing the truth.

Dr Broad - You do not have the ticker. They were all doing the numbers while you were sitting here doing this, you know?

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Dr Broad.

Mr BARNETT - They are questions for the Leader of the Opposition to answer and make clear to the Tasmanian people. They are cosyng up today with the Greens.

Members interjecting.

Mr BARNETT - We have heard it already this morning from the Greens. There are expressions of support for Labor and guess what? What does it remind you of? I know exactly what it reminds me of, and many other Tasmanians know as well, and that was the Labor-Greens accord, the Labor-Greens government in 2010 to 2014. In fact, I remember 1989 to 1992 - what a disaster that was.

Dr Broad - How old were you?

Mr BARNETT - I am a little bit older than you, Dr Broad, but look into the history books and you will see a state of economic malaise.

Mr Farrell - I was born in 1988.

Dr Broad - Born in 1988. He was one year old. There you go, it is his fault.

Members interjecting.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Dr Broad.

Mr BARNETT - You know full well what I am talking about - 10,000 jobs were lost and we went into a recession under a Labor-Greens government.

Mr Winter - 7000 in the last three years.

Mr BARNETT - They do not like hearing the truth, but they are cosyng up with Greens today, and the Greens made it clear that they will be supporting this particular motion by the Leader of the Opposition.

Their track record is not good when it comes to economic growth and economic management. We have a strong economy; it is growing, and we want to keep it growing and that is why we have delivered the budget that we have. This particular opposition, raided the Superannuation Guarantee Fund, \$1.5 billion, and now we are paying nearly \$400 million a year out of that particular fund. It is not good; it is not good.

In terms of the government business enterprises, let us be very clear, we are aiming for best practice. That work is ongoing. We are working shoulder to shoulder with business and industry to get the job done and acknowledge with respect to the divestment process, in nearly in every respect, it has to be approved by both Houses of parliament. Let us just acknowledge that on the way through.

There are many questions that the Leader of the Opposition must still answer. I would like, in the remaining time, to ensure that those questions are answered by the Labor Party representatives when they get to it. I would absolutely appreciate an alternative budget being put forward by state Labor because they have not done it in 11 years. They are willing to criticise us and our budget, and yet at the election they committed \$4 billion of spending. They had to change their election manifesto 11 times. In addition to that they had \$2 billion of cuts. Wait until we see their alternative budget because they have got to stand up and make the point.

Tasmania needs stability. Tasmania needs a growing economy and what the Leader of the Opposition is doing is a reckless-abandon, causing grief and causing concern and anxiety in the community, upending our budget process here in the parliament, having every potential to upend the Macquarie Point precinct and plans for a stadium and a team with 200,000 plus members who will be very anxious about their future and the future of the Tassie Devils in Tasmania tonight.

This is something that they need to respond to. The leader needs to answer why he does not have the ticker to step up and to form government. Why does he not have the ticker to make a difference in this state? You are simply criticising. The relentless negativity is continuing. You have got form. You did not stand up after the last election. You are not standing up today. You are simply criticising and causing chaos in the community and a lack of confidence in the community. That is part of your plan, and we do not appreciate that, but we will back the Premier, Jeremy Rockliff: every step of the way he has total and utter support, and we appreciate that.

[3.33 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, this is a very serious matter. My comments in the suspension still hold. The Deputy Premier who has just resumed his seat talked about a lot of things and a lot of things that were absolutely irrelevant to this debate. He talked about the character of the Premier. He talked about the Premier's love for his family, his community and so on. I am absolutely sure that the Premier loves his family and loves his community. I could quite happily say everybody in this place does but it is not about the Premier's love for his community and his family. It is about the Premier's competence.

I think on anybody's judgment, and indeed your own, things were better when the Premier was the Deputy Premier. From the moment he has taken the job as Premier, things have gotten worse. There has been absolute instability in this place, and it has not been the making of the Labor Party; it has been his own making. You dial back the history books. You want to go back to 1989. I just want to go back to a couple of years ago when you lost two of your own members. Two of your own members became independents. That was not Labor's fault; that was the Premier's fault.

Then what happened? We went to an early election to deliver stability. Who called that early election? It was not the Labor Party who called an election a year early.

Mr Winter - I think it was Jeremy Rockliff.

Dr BROAD - It was Jeremy Rockliff, the Premier of Tasmania, who called an election for stability. What did he deliver? Instability. The Premier promised that he would not do a deal to hold on to power. Then what happened? The Premier did a deal to hang on to power. He did a deal - supply and confidence.

Mr Rockliff - That is not true. I said no deals with the Greens.

Dr BROAD - Alright, okay.

Mr Rockliff - You are lying again.

Dr BROAD - Okay, you want to get stuck into me? Well, you have missed your chance because you have spent all your vitriol having a crack at Mr Winter. This is about the Premier's competence.

Mr Rockliff - Nice to see you here this week. You bothered to turn up. Well done.

Dr BROAD - Thank you for that. Again, a personal attack. Okay.

Members interjecting.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Members on both sides. Dr Broad will be heard in silence.

Mr Rockliff - I think you are catching crabs.

Mr Willie - Some of your requests for pairs, Premier.

Dr BROAD - This is the level we get to. You are not even consistent with your own ministers. I have one minister, Mr Duigan, spending a whole paragraph praising me up.

Mr Abetz - And you fell for it.

Dr BROAD - Then we have minister Ellis accusing me of wagging. You are not even consistent with that but I digress.

Things were better when this Premier was actually deputy. What does this Premier deliver? The supply and confidence agreements that he arranged and that he promised would deliver stability have not delivered stability. In fact, they were completely useless. Why do you think we are actually here today?

I heard the Deputy Premier, before he left, say that we do not have the guts. Does the Treasurer have the ticker? Does he have the ticker to roll this Premier? Does anybody on that side have the ticker to roll this Premier, or would they rather roll the dice? That is where we are getting to. That is the point here, unless something changes.

A member - Have you been rehearsing that?

Dr BROAD - Well, I have notes here if you want to have a look.

A member - Not particularly.

Dr BROAD - The Premier is the only one who in reality could send us to an election. If he steps aside or one of you on that side has the guts to roll him, there is no guarantee of an election. There is all this talk, there are all these conspiracies. We have heard conspiracies. The end of the world is nigh. Teachers will not get paid. Nurses will not get paid, apparently. We know that that is not true.

I am sure that Labor and the Greens will get another run a few more times, because that is all you have. It did not work in the federal campaign. All those election ads that you ran did not work. Guess what? They will not work next time now, because people do not believe you. They know that you will do a deal to save your skin.

We have heard that there will be a massive financial crisis if we do not - we have to let the Premier skate through and not vote for this motion of no-confidence. If we vote for a motion of no-confidence, then we are going to an election, and then confidence will crash, and then the stadium will not get built and the AFL team will not happen, et cetera, et cetera. You are ramping up this outrageous scare campaign. None of that is true.

Mrs Petrusma - You think the stadium will still go ahead?

Dr BROAD - The Premier steps aside. That is the answer to this. That is what the parliament is calling for in this debate.

I heard Mr O'Byrne. Mr O'Byrne made a point that he thought it was unfair that we were doing a motion of no-confidence in the Premier when it was actually the Treasurer who brought down the Budget and the Budget is our biggest concern, so therefore we should have brought a motion of no-confidence against the Treasurer. I would argue that would be completely unfair

to the Treasurer. The Treasurer has only been in the job - what, how many months? Seven or eight months. It is not actually completely his fault that this Budget is as bad as it is, because this has been coming a long time.

Who has been the one in the wheelhouse consistently across this period of time? Jeremy Rockliff. He has been in the leadership group longer than anybody in this room. He has been the one who has presided over a series of financial budgets with just financial unsustainability across the forward Estimates.

Things are getting worse. Things are getting worse and worse and worse. It is not as if you have not had warnings about the budget. I have been talking about how unsustainable the budget has been for years. It is not just me. The Fiscal Sustainability Report way back in 2021 should have launched the biggest red flashing light up in the executive building, even bigger than all the red from MONA Winter Feast at the moment. It should have been an alarm bell because we are tracking along the worst-case scenario. It said a couple of things. 'It said the size of corrective action required to maintain fiscal sustainability increases over the projection period.' In other words, if you do not do something about the current budget problem, it gets worse and the corrective action becomes worse and worse. It also said, 'Early action to correct fiscal deterioration will mitigate the severity of the measures required to effectively maintain fiscal sustainability.' That was back in 2021. What has happened since then? Growing deficits, growing debt, and a government that is not going to do anything about it. Why is that? It is because the Budget is based on a fraud that you are going to cut funding next year. We have \$11 billion of debt and what are you going to do about it? Nothing.

Members interjecting.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Members on my right.

Dr BROAD - The Premier can vacate the chair and give us a go if he wants. That is an option. This is the problem with the government, with the Liberals. They come up with these stupid arguments, these absolutely ridiculous arguments that do not hold water anywhere around Australia. It is insane. Here you are pointing your fingers at us. You are the one who is bringing down the Budget that is setting us in a filthy big black hole of debt and then you are pretending everything is fine.

Do you honestly think that spending \$1.5 billion more than your income year on year, getting worse and worse every year, is alright? That is what they think. There is going to be some magical mushroom fairy who is going to absolutely turn things around overnight because you do not want to do anything about it.

That is why the situation in this parliament has changed. The situation has changed because we opened the Budget. You did not have to get very far into the Budget to realise just how far this government has fallen. Look at your fiscal measures. You are failing just about all of them. Debt blowing out, repayments blowing out, but you are going to give Treasury \$3.3 million to sort it out? As if. It is absolutely insane.

Who has been at the helm as we have seen the state and this parliament, the instability, the lack of financial accountability, the biggest infrastructure stuff-up in Tasmania's history? It has been Jeremy Rockliff, the Premier. He has to stand up and acknowledge that he has failed. As I said in my contribution earlier today, I have no problems with Jeremy Rockliff as a person,

no problems at all. As a premier, I do have a problem with Jeremy Rockliff because he has not displayed the requirements that we need for a premier, because he cannot fix problems. One of the Premier's most important tasks is to fix problems. It is not to pretend that problems do not exist.

We wind back the clock to 2014. Where are we now compared to 2014? Where are our education results? They are worse. They are worse than they were in 2014. The Premier will not acknowledge that. He talks about year 11 and 12, the extension schools, all the money he spent on infrastructure at schools. He talked about primary schools, he talked about the condition of primary schools, loves infrastructure, loves cutting the ribbons.

What are the education results today, including the time when he was education minister? The education results are worse under you. You have to acknowledge that. When you started to where we are now, your 11 and 12 changes have failed. How do we know they have failed? The results have gotten worse. Why will you not review the results of the 11 and 12 extensions? Why will you not do that? It is because you know you failed. They are not working. That was not the solution that Tasmanians wanted and needed.

Now, what have we got? Education results: worse. Health results: worse. How about housing? More on the waitlist? It takes almost two years to house somebody on the waitlist, and yet we have this government time and time and time again just spin and just spout garbage like 10,000 houses, 4000 houses. Last year in the budget, it said in your glossy little blue document that you had constructed over 3000 houses. You absolutely had not. I pointed that out. Thankfully, this year, you did not use those words but you still say stuff that is complete nonsense. You says you have done 4000 social and affordable houses. The reality is that you have done subdivisions. You have counted everything: beds in shelters, MyHome clients all count - everything that you could possibly come up with to meet this target. What is it delivering? It is delivering a record wait for housing.

You still say, 'social and affordable.' How many affordable homes have you constructed in this period, when you reckon you have done 4000? How many are affordable out of that 4000? You know what the number is? It is two. That is how insane this government is. It is patting itself on the back for 4000 houses to solve a problem that is getting worse, but how many affordable houses in your 'social and affordable'? Two. How many houses have you delivered out of your land supply agreements? Six or seven? You have done subdivisions. You are counting all the beds in Fountainside for the medical workers as addressing a homelessness and housing problem.

This is what this government does. How many times have I seen the Premier solve a problem by doing a report? You ask for a report to be done, then you get the report and nothing happens. You set a target like 200 per cent renewable by 20-whatever. You have not added a single wind turbine, but you keep saying: 'Our target is 200 per cent renewable energy.' The reality is that we are a net importer of energy now. Under your watch, we have gone from Tasmania being renowned as the home of renewable energy to having to import brown coal power from Victoria to keep the lights on. Sometimes that is a good thing because they are actually paying us to take that power. Sometimes it works, except when the cable was cut. What happened then was you had to buy in diesel generators. Those are the risks this government is taking with the state. If something goes wrong with Basslink again, we are going to have to get diesel generators again.

What is this government doing about one of the biggest issues in the modern world, energy security? We have not seen any action. They talk about Marinus. Where is Marinus? It is years away. Our wind farm approvals are years away. You cannot even get something like the coastal policy fixed. This government has completely lost its way, and it is Jeremy Rockliff, the Premier of Tasmania, who has been at the helm. That is why we have no confidence. It is not about the Premier as a person; it is about his capability to be Premier.

They say the best predictor of future outcomes is past outcomes. The past is a good predictor of the future, and that is not a future that we want for this state. We do not want to be opening a budget next year and seeing \$13 billion or \$14 billion. We do not want to open a budget next year and see asset sales. They have to start to turn things around but there has been no action. It has just been finger in the ears, 'La, la, la, let us just hope that there is a massive financial windfall to pull the state out of its current financial situation.'

The state's finances are the biggest issue. There have been a lot of comments and the Greens are always going to want to make their point about the stadium, but that is not the biggest issue in town. The biggest issue in town is the financial direction of this state. The financial direction of this state is the number one job of any government. That is why it is called the Treasury benches, because they are the ones who control the money. They are the ones who set the direction and sign the cheques. At the moment, things are heading in the wrong direction. This is a premier who has been at the helm the whole time.

When I looked at the Budget, I thought, 'This is a government that has given up'. Last year, when we opened the budget, we thought, 'Things are just getting worse'. The government then came back to the well with an enormous supplementary appropriation. We thought, 'Oh my God, things are just getting worse and worse.' None of the savings they promised were being delivered. All the strategies in the last budget were obviously not working. We opened the Budget this year and we saw the same nonsense.

It is clear that this government has given up, and it is clear that this premier has given up. He has given up on fixing things. It seems like all he is doing is trying to hold on until the next election and lay the biggest fiscal financial landmine he can for the Labor Party, hoping that we will actually try and fix it and things will be so dire we will lose votes and maybe they will come in after one or two terms. That seems like the government strategy. There can be no other explanation for a budget with this structure. It is just reckless, so we have to speak up.

As my colleague, Ms Dow, said, we do get talked to. I have been talked to a number of times and been asked, 'Why can't you just put the state out of its misery?'

Ms Ogilvie - Elections? Awkward things like that?

Dr BROAD - There are elections, but we understand that there is a confidence issue. This is a confident state, but the risks now outweigh that. We have reached the point where, if the Premier does not want to resign and the Governor says, 'Yes, let us go to an election', the risks of that are less than letting this government that has given up stumble along for another three years. How can we, in good conscience, let this government stumble along for another three years, burying us deeper and deeper in debt, not fixing problems, and so on and so forth?

There are some glaring issues this government is simply not addressing and there are severe headwinds coming. This government is in complete denial. They talk about business

confidence. Well, Roy Morgan has business confidence in this state the worst in the country, and it has plummeted. You have to look at housing approvals and be petrified about what we know is coming. As sure as night follows day, when there are no housing approvals, there will not be houses to build. That is going to put severe pressure on our building and construction industry. However, this is a government completely in denial.

The Budget points out the risks of population stagnating. Population in Tasmania is stagnating, young people are leaving at the rate of a planeload every four days, but the government just simply will not acknowledge there is a problem. That is why there is a problem; because this government will not even acknowledge the problems that exist and, as a result, it will not do anything about them. These problems do not go away. They get worse. We are faced with a whole bunch of policy scenarios, impacts on Tasmanian people and impacts on Tasmania's finances that are just getting worse. That is why today we have made a stand. That is why we have no confidence in this premier. That is why he should do the right thing for the state and resign.

[3.53 p.m.]

Mr JENNER (Lyons) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, I made it clear yesterday where I stand on this motion, and believe me when I say I did not take this decision lightly. I have consistently and publicly voiced my concerns about the government's financial direction since the day I entered parliament, so my position today is unlikely to come as a surprise to anyone.

I was the only member of this parliament who voted against last year's budget, not because it was politically convenient but because it was fiscally irresponsible. I could also see the trajectory the government was on: mounting debt, unsustainable spending and a complete lack of discipline. This year's Budget does not course-correct. It confirms every fear I had. It locks in structural deficiencies, drives us further into debt and offers no credible plan to restore the balance. It is not just disappointing; it is deeply alarming. I will be outlining my concerns with the Budget in greater detail during my budget reply because there is a lot that needs to be unpacked, and I know there are many other members who wish to contribute to this debate.

The Budget is, of course, a significant issue. It speaks of the government's priorities, its financial discipline and its vision for the state's future. However, it is not only that issue we are facing. There are symptomatic challenges across nearly every portfolio, from the underfunding of frontline services to the erosion of public trust in the government, to the growing pressure on families and communities across Tasmania. We cannot afford to treat this budget as though it only exists in a vacuum. It is one piece of a much broader puzzle, and right now the picture is deeply concerning, and as leader of the party and the government, the Premier is ultimately responsible for all of this. It has happened under his watch.

On the second point of the motion, I believe my position has been made crystal clear both in these Chambers and beyond. The potential sale of GBEs and other public assets as a means of revenue-raising is deeply concerning. It is a short-term solution to a long-term problem, like selling the family silver for quick cash injection. There is no denying that the government needs money, but selling off public assets is not the answer.

I have seen this played out in the UK, where privatisation of essential services has led to profit-driven decision making at the expense of the public. Private companies prioritise their bottom line, often cutting services that may not be profitable but are crucial to many in the community. Once these assets are gone, they are gone for good, and the public are left paying

the price. As we have seen in Victoria, you can only sell the public assets once. It is a short-term fix with long-term consequences. Once these assets are gone, they have gone for good, and so is the steady stream of revenue and strategic value they provide.

When the next financial crisis hits, and it will, there will be nothing left to fall back on. No safety net, no leverage, just a deeper hole and fewer options to climb out of it. Selling off public assets might balance the books today, but it leaves future generations to pay the price tomorrow. You can only sell the family silver once. I will never be on board when it comes to public asset sales for the reasons I mentioned before, but I would like this to be put onto the record again.

Turning to the third point of the motion, once again I have made my position abundantly clear. I have not minced my words on this issue in the past and will not start now. In fact, I do not think my vote on this motion should be a surprise to anyone. I have been consistent, not just in what I have said in this Chamber but how I have voted, and where I have stood on every one of those issues. My position is grounded in principles, not in political convenience, and I have made no effort to hide where I stand.

The ferry fiasco was undeniably one of the worst cock-ups this state has ever seen, with the blame being tossed around by the government in every direction except the mirror, leaving no one else untouched by its controversy or finger pointing. Embarrassingly, the cock-up was even big enough to be broadcast in the UK.

We have had seven years to build a suitable port and still it cannot be delivered anywhere near time. A quick glance at the Geelong Ports website shows they had their end of the deal wrapped up in just two years, and it is already been operational for another two years. They have had access to the exactly the same information as we have, yet somehow this government just could not get it together.

We have also recently witnessed the berth cost-blowout from its original \$90 million to an eye-watering \$490 million. That is more than fivefold increase in costs, a staggering escalation that raises serious questions about transparency, planning and financial oversight. Tasmanians deserve to know how a project that was initially pitched at \$90 million has somehow ballooned out to nearly half a billion. This is not just a minor miscalculation, it is a massive fiscal blowout, and it highlights exactly why there are growing public concerns about how this government manages major infrastructure projects.

I no longer have confidence in the Premier to deliver on major infrastructure projects, both on time or on budget. Unfortunately, it is clear to see why. There are a number of other things that have made me lose confidence in the Premier, such as the refusal by this government to increase the budget in the Integrity Commission and a failure to provide mental health support for retired police officers just to name two.

I believe we are dealing with a minority government that continues to behave as though it holds the majority and that is where this issue of the Premier stems from. I believe in power and potential of minority governments around the world. I have seen minority parliaments function effectively and deliver strong, stable outcomes when parties are willing to collaborate in good faith with each other. This government does not seem to want to do that. Minority governments can be a strength. It can encourage transparency, foster negotiation, enable

a wider range of voices to be heard in decision-making, but it only works when all parties respect the reality of the numbers in the Chamber and are prepared to engage constructively.

We cannot have a single party trying to govern as if they hold the absolute majority, ignoring the will of the parliament, dismissing the dissenting views and clinging to power it no longer has. This approach is simply arrogant.

I am more than willing to work constructively and collaboratively, but only under a leader who respects the reality that Tasmanians elected a minority government for a reason. That result sent a clear message. Tasmanians want accountability, cooperation, and a different way of doing politics. Any premier who fails to recognise this is not just ignoring the number in the Chambers, they are ignoring the will of the people and they will not have my support in this House.

Let me be absolutely clear, I am willing to help make this parliament work under a different leader, whether that is a Liberal leader or a Labor premier, I believe constructive government is possible, but it will require genuine cooperation, and a willingness to work together. If we do go to an election, it will be because either the Liberal or Labor Party refused to form government, not because the independents refused cooperation.

[4.02 p.m.]

Mr BAYLEY (Clark) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, I start my contribution to this motion at the very, I think, human level and say that I am deeply saddened to take to my feet today. I know that Jeremy Rockliff is a very good person. I think he has a good heart, and he absolutely believed that when he said that he would lead a government with heart. He believed that he could deliver, but an issue after issue he has failed. He promised big and he has under-delivered. It is sad to be debating a motion like this. I accept that it is so serious and has a great gravity, but good heart does not necessarily equal confidence, and we have clearly expressed through our leader Dr Woodruff that we Greens do not maintain confidence in Premier Rockliff.

This under-delivery, I would like to point out, is in significant part due to the capture of the Liberal Party by the right wing of its party. It is clear that Premier Rockliff and his good heart has been pushed to the limit and to let people down in the way that he has.

The Greens have treated this motion with the seriousness that it deserves. In the absence of Dr Woodruff yesterday, we met to discuss it this morning where we resolved and confirmed our position. Dr Woodruff communicated that to both the Premier and to the Leader of the Opposition and then publicly announced it. We are aware of the gravity. This is a serious matter and so I take to my feet today in that context and offer these comments in that context.

The Budget is truly bad. We have significantly debated that already today and the budget reply speeches are part-way through, but whether you look at health, housing, education, environment, the budget is really terrible. Health: we still deliver some of the worst outcomes in the country. When it comes to housing: the Budget bakes in failure. It literally bakes in failure with a housing waitlist that is growing to over 5000 people and those 5000 people are waiting longer - and it is not 5000 people either, it is 5000 applications - it is couples and families, so it is way more than 5000 people.

When it comes to education, some of our results are the worst in the nation behind only the Northern Territory - literacy, numeracy and other indicators. When it comes to the environment, the State of the Environment Report that was released last year, a decade late, was a truly alarming wakeup call on so many different measures. It showed trends going downwards, whether it be sea surface temperature, whether it be other measures in terms of threatened species and the like. It demonstrated a significant crisis.

When it comes to the marine environment, I will read a couple of quotes from two scientists, Dr Coughanowr and Dr Lisa Gershwin. They have been reported as saying:

It is rather scary because it is a visible indicator that something is really bad right now.

Dr Gershwin said:

It's too much, the ocean can't take it. The ecosystem is teetering on collapse.

Despite the fact that our environment is what underpins us all as humans, and indeed as an economy in an island that trades on its clean, green reputation, we have seen an utterly woeful response from this government to the State of the Environment Report. From what we can tell, not a single target, not a single measure in the State of the Environment Report was specifically identified and funded in this Budget, and that is a crying shame.

Central to the budget crisis is of course the stadium, and that has been debated at length today. It adds \$2 billion over 10 years to our debt, risking our credit rating - \$600,000 or thereabouts in this Budget alone. There have been promises from this Premier to cap the public spending and also to deliver a process.

The cap promise was delivered on the first day of the election - \$375,000 and 'not a red cent more.' It is a deliberate decision the Premier made to try to cauterise this issue, knowing it was undeliverable. The total cost has blown out already from \$715 million to \$945 million, and we know that it is only going to go northwards. With risk, with a toxic site, with all the complications of this site, with the project only 50 per cent designed, we know that it is going to be significantly more costly. It is going to be significantly delayed. That will increase costs because the Tasmanian taxpayer is on the hook for every single dollar of cost overruns and in fact, we have to pay a penalty to the AFL for any time blowouts. It is truly a dud deal the Premier signed us up to.

When it comes to the process, we are incredibly alarmed. The POSS process was brought into this place by the Premier. He has concocted an excuse to abandon that process based on the Tasmanian Planning Commission's draft report. It is abundantly clear that the only reason he is abandoning the POSS process is because he knows that it is clear it is not going to deliver a positive recommendation for the stadium. In concocting an argument against the process, he has called into question the reputation, the integrity and the professionalism of the panel itself.

I read into *Hansard* again something the Premier said, as reported in an article on 22 April of this year. The journalist says Rockliff, who hit out at the report for failing to be independent, doubled down on his own initial criticism. This is the quote:

My view is that they went in there with a predetermined view. From my point of view, it wasn't objective.

That is an appalling thing to do. It is an appalling thing for the leader of our state to do to an independent process that he himself has stood up via the order that came into this place. It demonstrates woeful disregard for not only the professionalism of those panel members - esteemed panel members no less - but also a willingness to do anything and to go to any levels to get this project up, including perverting the process.

Not much more than a month after the Premier made that comment, there was a letter from the head of the state service to the planning commission that contradicted the Premier. The head of the State Service says:

Thank you again for the professionalism, expertise, and substantial work of the commission on this project.

What is it? Did they go in there with a predetermined view and they were not objective, or were they professional experts and did a substantial amount of work? I think we all know the answer there.

I spoke earlier about the bill that has been tabled in the parliament, but it is utterly contemptuous to be releasing this for public comment and then put it on the table of this House with that comment period still to continue. Worse than that is some of the stuff that it continues. I quote from a well-known barrister, Greg Barnes, who regularly writes in the *Mercury*. He wrote on Monday:

Clause 34 in this bill is an extraordinary piece of work. It says that there are no rights of appeal to any court, tribunal, other person or body in respect of decisions made in good faith under the legislation. This is perhaps the most dangerous and blatant attack on the rule of law that we have seen in Tasmania in recent years. The effect of this is that if you are harmed by an action made by a minister or bureaucrat in the construction of the stadium, then too bad.

That is an indictment on this legislation and on this Premier, to think that they would be prepared to put a bill into this House that perverts the process so substantially that we have eminent lawyers and commentators basically demonstrating that this is one of the most dangerous and blatant attacks on the rule of law. It is truly a shame.

Lastly, the blackmail of the Legislative Council - to blackmail the Legislative Council and say, 'If you do not pass this legislation, well then the stadium is dead and the team is dead', knowing that is entirely not the case. The POSS process grinds on. The head of the planning commission has made that very clear to the Macquarie Point Development Corporation, and it is written in your own legislation here. It says here in Schedule 4 - Legislation Revoked, 'State Policies and Projects (Project of State Significance) Order 2023'. If this does not pass, that order remains in place and the planning commission continues to do its work, including the public hearings that they have already scheduled.

The stadium is central to the criticism of the Budget and also our lack of confidence in the Premier. It is easy to criticise the Premier and articulate our lost confidence, but I want to turn to Labor for a moment. I do not say this in bad spirit, but you have pointed to the *Spirits*

and your scrutiny. You have pointed to the stadium and that you will scrutinise it. That is great. You have pointed to the *Spirits* as an example of how you scrutinise, and that is great, but it was too late. You did not scrutinise the *Spirits* and identify the problems before they were made.

Mr Willie - Nobody would know anything if we had not asked the questions.

Ms Haddad - It was us who exposed that.

Mr BAYLEY - We still spent the \$500 billion. We have had the cost. We have had the two-year delay. We have the businesses that are now delayed.

Mr Winter - Where were you?

Mr Willie - I took the terms of reference to the Public Accounts Committee and set up the inquiry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Members on my left.

Mr BAYLEY - The Labor Party is writing a blank cheque for the stadium. Now is the time to scrutinise the stadium. Now is the time to stop this legislation. Now is the time to stop us spending \$2 billion and racking up \$2 billion of debt, not nitpicking and finding the problems in two years' time when we have already blown the budget by \$500 million. Not in two years' time when the timelines have already blown out.

Full credit to you for unpicking the *Spirits* fiasco, but the damage was done - a \$500 million cost, two years' delay, a huge cost to the economy and the businesses, as you articulate. Scrutiny is great, but let us do it at the right time so we avoid the mistakes. That is my point. You are writing a blank cheque for this stadium and it is a massive mistake. It is the *Spirits*, mark two.

We do not support the GBEs. They increase costs, they reduce services. The Budget ruled out some GBEs -

Mr Abetz - 'We do not support the GBEs'?

Mr BAYLEY - Do not support the sale of the GBEs, my apologies, leader. We do not support flogging the GBEs. We do not support some GBEs like Forestry Tasmania and Tasracing, let us be very clear, but in terms of selling GBEs, we are not supportive of that as a strategy to plug holes in the budget.

While the government has ruled out some - TASCORP, Port Arthur, Tasracing, TasRail, Endura and the Public Trustee - there are others. We are deeply concerned about Forestry Tasmania and the 800,000 hectares of native forests and plantations that it manages; TasNetworks, with its poles and wires; and Aurora, the very entity that sends us our bills. A fire sale is not a solution to a budget crisis. They are public assets; they operate in the public good and they need to remain in public hands.

Clause (3) of this motion, 'there is no faith to deliver major projects', and, of course, the context is the *Spirits*; I have touched on that and the impact that it has had on the tourism market

on business-owners and the like. I want to make the point that if you are a homeless person and you cannot afford a holiday, the *Spirits of Tasmania* is not a huge concern to you. If you are a child in Ashley and you fear for your safety, you are not thinking about the *Spirits* and the delay and the wharf at Devonport. Major projects for people have to be seen in context. For example, for Aboriginal people, the major projects that they care about are things like treaty, land return, and heritage protection. These are the things that are important, and these are the things that the Premier has also let Tasmanians down on.

There is one thing worse than ignoring somebody's issues full stop, and that is probably agreeing to do something about it and then not delivering at all. I was at the Reconciliation Breakfast yesterday morning, as I know some others in the Chamber were. It was a pretty powerful event. There was 1000-odd people there; it was a massive event. Aunty Theresa Sainty and Uncle Jim Everett puralia meenamatta were both there and they both spoke very powerfully about both the Liberal government and the Labor opposition in terms of its support for activities that desecrate country, for opposing logging and the like, but one of the things they were most upset about was the government's abandonment of the treaty process. They are clearly profoundly let down by the Premier's walk back on the promise of a treaty. Truth-telling is one thing, but they made it very clear that truth-telling without a direction, without a pathway to treaty, is actually meaningless.

There was shock, there was disappointment, there was anger. It was really palpable. It was so palpable that Jim Everett walked out with some other members of the Aboriginal community. He walked out in an incredibly respectful way, respectful to both the Premier, to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and to Reconciliation TAS as well, and he said:

I respect you, but I'm sorry, my community has asked me to walk out, and they've asked me to go away and start thinking about how do we get Jeremy Rockliff to come back to the table on treaty.

And he said exactly these words.

Don't give up on us. Put treaty back on the table.

It is incredibly upsetting, incredibly disappointing, and an incredible driver of no confidence that the Premier has so willingly walked away from treaty in the face of, and at the request of, clearly, the right-wing elements in his party.

When it comes to land returns, one of the most profound and important things for Aboriginal people, nothing has been delivered since 2005. A couple of years ago, government squibbed the opportunity for something quite groundbreaking - Kooparoona Niara National Park, an Aboriginal-owned national park, returned to Aboriginal-ownership, managed by Aboriginal people.

It is an absolute indictment on this government that private land owners, people like Jane and Tom Teniswood and others are actually leading the way when it comes to land returns. They are actually returning their own land to Aboriginal people to deliver land, justice and equity and they are absolutely showing up the government that holds hundreds of thousands of hectares of public land, really critical public land, that they can not find a way to return it back to Tasmanian Aboriginal people. It is a real shame, it is a shame on the government, but it is ultimately a shame on us all.

When it comes to heritage protection, this is something that drives Aboriginal people really strongly. Since July 2021, former minister Roger Jaensch came into this place and tabled a report that said that the *Aboriginal Heritage Act* does not work, it is not providing effective mechanisms for protection. Since then, we have had Robbins Island, we have had a cable car on Kunanyi assessed, we have had Arm End assessed down the Derwent, and it is still not been updated. Promise to be updated, acknowledged as failing. Promised to be updated, not delivered.

Look what can happen, Government can turn around and write a piece of legislation like this in a matter of a month. A month to get a big project up like a stadium, but they cannot even deliver new Aboriginal heritage protection to deliver ancestral heritage for some of the most precious and irreplaceable heritage on this planet. It gets worse than that, because when it comes to the Tarkine tracks on the Takayna coast, this government has given \$10 million to save face with four-wheel-drivers and to upgrade and expand facilities in the north-west. This is explicitly against the advice of its own statutory advisory body on Aboriginal heritage. Not just the Aboriginal Heritage Council, it is also against the explicit advice of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. Two statutory bodies say, 'Do not do this, it is a bad idea, get Aboriginal Heritage surveys, you probably cannot do it.' Yet, it has been ignored.

We know what happened last time, the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre had to take this government to court under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* to get it to do two Aboriginal Heritage surveys for the tracks they wanted to open on the Takayna coast. What happened when they did that report? As soon as the government commissioned that report, it came back and the government said, 'Well, obviously we cannot do that anymore. It is going to damage too much Aboriginal heritage.' You have not even done an Aboriginal Heritage assessment when it comes to these tracks on the Tarkine coast. In fact, he did a market analysis first. He did a market analysis to see how many people wanted to come and drive on these areas, before he did an Aboriginal Heritage assessment. That is a dear shame.

While I have a minute left, for people working in community services supporting problem gamblers, the mandatory pre-commitment card is a major project. This is a major project because it will save lives. It will stop domestic violence. It will stop crime, and it will absolutely help people's mental health. In the worst-case scenarios, or best-case scenarios, it will stop suicide.

This government and this premier have abandoned it. They had gone to an election promising it. He had met with the Hoteliers Association and said that minister Ferguson would not be the minister post-election; that came to pass and we know what has happened since then. They have orchestrated a couple of reports to create the case for abandoning it, and now it is a piece of history. This is an absolute travesty as well.

These are major projects for people, as well. It is not just about the *Spirits*; it is about the things that are important to us as Tasmanians.

We do not have confidence in the Premier. When we step back and ask ourselves the question, do we have confidence in this Premier? whether we are looking at the Budget, whether we are looking at broken promises, whether we are looking at failed commitments, it is clear that we cannot have confidence in this Premier.

[4.22 p.m.]

Mr ABETZ (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt the band is back together again. Greens and Labor are back together again, when previously they have said no deals. This motion will only pass the House if the Greens and Labor Party vote together. It is a very basic mathematical equation. Greens and Labor together always cause chaos. The Leader of the Opposition has walked in at a very convenient time, because I have to say I would have thought a better speech could have been prepared for the Leader of the Opposition. Then I thought it could have been delivered better as well. The most disappointing thing about it was the lack of content. It was weak. It was disjointed. You have to ask yourself the question: when the Leader of the Opposition had a choice between stability in this parliament -

Mr Winter - It is not my job to give your government stability.

Mr ABETZ - the stadium continuing, or having a raw grab for power, as his mentor Paul Keating said-

Mr Willie - How are your numbers going? We heard you are on seven, will you get to nine?

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Members on my left.

Mr ABETZ - 'If you have got a choice, always back in the horse called self-interest.' That is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition has done today: backed in the horse of self-interest, undoubtedly following the example of his mentor, Paul Keating.

The assertion has been made that it was this terrible budget, these terrible depths of debt that we are in.

Mr Willie - 'Intergenerational theft' I heard someone call it once.

Mr ABETZ - What we did not hear was what would they actually cut? Where is their path to surplus? Absent. Indeed, had the Labor Party been elected, the Tasmanian budget would have confronted double the amount of election promises made by the Liberal Party, double the amount. The opposition know that to be true but, of course, that is their fiscal responsibility: 'We will spend twice as much as the Liberal Party but there will be less debt, there will be less expenditure and somehow we will balance the budget.' You cannot keep speaking out of both sides of your mouth, as the Leader of the Opposition does all the time, and expect the people of Tasmania to believe you.

This disruption to the parliament will upset the trajectory for the stadium, and you do not need my word on that. This is a report in today's media:

Kath McCann, the club's general manager of marketing, corporate affairs and social impact, broke down in tears at a press conference on Wednesday morning as uncertainty surrounds a parliamentary vote.

Well done, Leader of the Opposition, well done to every single Labor member who occasioned that breakdown at a press conference. The supporters of the stadium know what your game is. Everything is dispensable in your grab for power. I would have thought a responsible Labor

Party might have come to the conclusion, in fairness, to get the Budget through, get the vitally important stadium legislation through, 'and then we might try and pull our trigger'. However, I suspect the Leader of the Opposition, in his immaturity and inexperience, had a rush of blood to the head and thought, 'I will make a no-confidence motion the centrepiece of my budget reply', never thinking a few on the crossbench might take him up on it -

Mr Winter - Why is it that you will not defend your premier?

Mr ABETZ - Here he is, like the dog that caught the car, no idea what to do with it. In all the speeches from those opposite, we have not once heard that the Labor Party is ready for government, that should the Governor or the Lieutenant-Governor call on the Leader of the Opposition, that he would be able or willing to form a government. In other words, it is just an attempt to cause chaos. How irresponsible.

During the Leader of the Opposition's contribution, he commented about the government's support for a struggling mine on King Island. There are 95 jobs at stake. Do you throw those 95 people on the scrap heap, or do you go to a body like the board of Tasmanian Development and Resources and say, 'Is it appropriate to extend some support to that mine?' not for the mine's sake, not for the business's sake, but for the 95 workers who put bread and butter on their table courtesy of that employment opportunity.

Mr Winter - Why did you never announce the support?

Mr ABETZ - The interesting thing is that the Leader of the Opposition then says, 'Why did you not do it elsewhere?'

Mr Winter - No, I did not say that. I said why did you not announce this support?

Mr ABETZ - I am sorry, you cannot have it both ways in these discussions: either it is a bad thing to do, or it is a good thing to do. Nyrstar was also mentioned. The Premier and I met with the international CEO of Trafigura yesterday, I believe it was, to see what can be done. I had a discussion before the last federal election with my Labor counterpart in South Australia. After the federal election, I spoke with a former Senate colleague, now minister, Tim Ayres, about Nyrstar. Yes, we are concerned about these issues. We are getting on with the issues, but somehow Mr Winter thinks that being in government is like waving a magic wand and you can fix everything. There are processes to go through and, as we know with Nyrstar - the zinc works, as we affectionately call it, it is sort of symbiotically linked with Port Pirie. There are issues that need to be resolved federally and in two states, and we are working together to protect the workers.

In relation to Liberty at Bell Bay, while I will not disclose everything that was said when the Premier and I met with Mr Gupta, we were very clear. The first question asked was, 'Are workers entitlement protected?' This is what this government does. It does it behind closed doors, in the boardrooms or elsewhere because that is what motivates us.

One of those rare lucid moments of the Leader of Opposition Business in this place, Dr Broad, was when he told us that a Greens' motion of no-confidence, if successful would cause chaos. He was right on 6 May and those words are correct again on 4 June, less than a month later. It still remains the case.

Cheap shots have been fired in relation to the *Spirits of Tasmania*. That was a regrettable, despicable, unacceptable situation. Everybody in this place knows there is new management, a new CEO, a new project manager and a new board. Things have been redesigned and recontracted, and we are now on the pathway forward. The recovery process is done. It has taken quite some time to get there and achieve it. However, every time the *Spirits* come up for debate, there is never once a suggestion as to how things could have been improved or what Labor would have done -

Mr Winter - Bring them home? Not try and lease them out as a floating refugee camp? Build a berth before the ships arrive?

Dr Broad - If we do, you say we are not experts.

Mr ABETZ - All it is is relentless negativity. We are told that we need to get rid of this premier, allegedly, for the sake of the state when this state currently enjoys the best categorisation by the business community for business confidence of any state or territory in Australia, the highest business confidence. What is more, the workers are benefiting from this because we have historically low unemployment levels: 3.8 per cent. Further, with this historically low unemployment level, we have the highest wages growth in the country. We have a Labor opposition allegedly committed to workers - they want jobs, high-paid jobs and certainty - seeking to wreck because they do not want the government to be seen in the light in which it should be portrayed as having helped deliver this business confidence, low unemployment rate and the highest wages growth in the country.

We also had the intervention somewhere along the way about the need for an ambulance service in the Huon, completely overlooking the fact that in his own electorate there will be two new ambulance stations, including one in the Huon Valley at Cygnet.

In the Leader of the Opposition's speech, we heard all sorts of propositions for spending, but no cuts. A punter sent me a text message recently, and Mr Willie, the member for Clark, might be interested in this. The message said that during the election:

Willie's office was so full of 'No stadium stickers' I could hardly get in the door.

I trust you have recycled them, Mr Willie.

Mr Willie - That is not true, because I did not have an office.

Mr ABETZ - The Labor opposition comes to this place and says the government has not done this correctly or that correctly. If Labor had stuck to its word, there would be no stadium whatsoever. They are the ones who have done the backflip, and I suspect they did the backflip because of pressure from their federal masters. This is the galling thing about this motion. This is a party that is still under federal administration. The federal Labor Party does not trust the Labor Party members - read potentially parliamentary leader and others - to run the affairs of the Tasmanian Labor Party in this state. They do not trust them, and I suggest for good reason - one of those few occasions where I agree with the federal executive of the Labor Party. How can they have any credibility and present themselves to the Tasmanian community as being ready for government when they are under administration because their own mob do not trust them?

One thing people can know about the Liberal Party in this state is that we manage our own affairs.

Mr Winter - They kicked you off the executive, did they not?

Mr ABETZ - They may well have done, Mr Winter, but here I am. The Labor Party like to air their dirty washing. I think there might be a person who has a seat in this place sitting over there - currently the seat is vacant - and I do not think you have anything to crow about. Mr O'Byrne's contributions show to me what a mature, capable, genuine individual he is in comparison to that which the Labor Party members in this place are currently dealing up, and when you listen to Mr O'Byrne you cannot help but think, 'Now there is potentially a true Labor leader.'

The Greens talk to us about donations -

Members interjecting.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Members on my left.

Mr ABETZ - The Greens talk about donations and the amounts. Let me remind this House that the Greens were the beneficiaries of the biggest corporate donation in Tasmania history - of Australian history, I believe - of \$1.6 million.

Peter George's campaign was bankrolled to over \$1 million. I suspect the figures coming out will be exceptionally interesting.

We were told by the Greens that the Premier had been dishonest, contemptuous, he was lying, et cetera. He was nothing of the sort and the record shows that the business case for the stadium at the very beginning said a \$375 million capital injection and borrowings. It was in last year's Budget as well.

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - What we have from the Greens in particular is more spending, and yet this is a motion about the Budget not being sufficiently targeted.

Can I say to the Greens: this is not about the affordability of the stadium, it is about the non-affordability of not having the stadium. What we had and have had is a grab bag of dislikes from those opposite, but with no clear pathway to surplus budget balancing or indeed even leadership. I say to the crossbench exceptionally seriously, there is the old analogy of out of the frying pan and into the fire.

I happen to think the Premier is a good bloke. I happen to think the Premier is competent. I happen to think the Premier is capable. Be exceptionally careful, crossbench. You may end up with a winter election, which would be bad in both meanings of the term - a cold election, and with premier Winter, or the Governor potentially calling on Mr Winter. Would you really want Mr Winter and the Labor Party being in government of this state?

A member - More than you.

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - We also had the issue of the Eden Project from the Greens.

A member - Here we go.

Mr ABETZ - Yes, here we go. The hypocrisy that is exposed by this has you cringing, as you ought, because the hypocrisy and duplicity of saying the stadium would desecrate the site, but somehow your project would not. The amazing thing is, we were told that the Greens amendment was vital, it was integral, it was fundamental, it was central to the motion. Now, all of a sudden, it is not.

You are still going to vote for the motion despite acknowledging that what you said was vital, integral, fundamental and central has been wiped out of the motion. You could not jag it in there, but you are still going to vote for it. In that case, your hyperbole of it being vital, integral, fundamental and central was all false. It was just trying to get a vote. When that does not happen, all of a sudden it is no longer vital, it is no longer integral, it is no longer fundamental, it is no longer central. That is why people do not believe the hyperbole of the Greens. One day it is vital, the very next no longer so, and we just move on.

To Mr Jenner, can I quickly say, in relation to the *Spirits*, the alleged blowout in the cost of the berth, I outlined to the PAC exceptionally clearly and closely that the \$90 million was always a fanciful figure -

Mr Winter - Yet your government thought it was true.

Members interjecting.

Mr ABETZ - The management and board at the time, with respect, had no idea what they were doing. We now have reasonable figures -

Mr Winter - Your government knew nothing about it.

Mr ABETZ - reasonable assessments and that is why we are on the path forward -

Mr Winter - And this Premier knew nothing about it.

The SPEAKER - Sorry, is there a position that has changed while I have been out of the room, that interjections are allowed? The Leader of the House has the call.

Mr ABETZ - Thank you, Speaker. In the few seconds remaining, we on the government side have complete confidence in the Premier, and the case has not been made out that there is any alternative in this place better than the Premier. As a result, if Mr Winter or anybody else does not take over the premiership, we will be taking the people of Tasmania to another election which they do not want, which they can ill afford, and which Labor themselves said just one month ago was unnecessary. It remains unnecessary.

[4.42 p.m.]

Mr WILLIE (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, I will start my contribution by agreeing with a number of members. The Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, is a nice bloke in politics and I have no

ill will towards him. He has done quite a lot of good when he has been in this place, and I think the height of his career was when he was deputy premier and the Education minister. He started off with a rocky start, excuse the pun. He sacked two teachers from every school and four teachers from every college, and I was a teacher in a public school at that time. It was very challenging to manage that, but he did recover, and I can say within the public system where I worked, he was quite well respected.

I would have to say that Liberal voters within the public education system are probably in the minority, but he was well respected across the political divide by the workforce and he did some good. We have historic literacy problems in this state. I was the shadow minister, a first term MP in the other place, and he was so well respected. Even with my teaching background, I struggled to get traction in those first few years, I can tell you, because he was commanding in that role. He did some good.

Evidence-based teaching practices are really important in Tasmania, and I tried to push him from opposition - do the U1 phonics check. I know that the AEU at the time had a few issues with it. It is okay. I was trying to give him some political support to follow evidence-based practices, and we know that a systemic approach to literacy teaching using phonics is evidence based and it is making a difference. So, he has done some good.

The school lunches trial - a very good program. He criticised me when we had an election policy, said there is no such thing as a free lunch, but he is now implementing that in disadvantaged schools where there are kids I know who turn up to school who were not turning up to school before because they get fed and they get looked after, and their engagement has improved in schools. I do not have any personal ill will to the Premier, but that was the height of his career - deputy premier, Education minister, the stats were going up. I think he was at the height of his career. When he became the Premier things started to go south for him. I must say I have lost some respect for him from that time as deputy premier.

He led his government into minority. He could not keep his own team together. Those members said that they did not feel like they were listened to, that there was a very autocratic approach to leadership and so they left. They sent his government into minority over things like the stadium. They quoted at the time, I think, that they were not being listened to - and it caused chaos for that particular project. It was in one planning process and they forced it into another planning process. We now have another bill for a third planning process. That project has been a mess from the start because of poor governance. I will talk about that a bit more in a moment.

He fell into minority. He could not manage the last Parliament. He decided to call an election a year early because of the instability, because he could not manage two members of his team. At the election, I remember the traffic lights. There were the traffic light ads that said do not elect a coalition of chaos. I think he was saying it in the media at the time too - 'Do not do it, Tasmania. It will crash jobs. It will crash the economy. It will crash the health service.' It has turned out that that is true. This has been a chaotic government. There have been 7000 full-time jobs lost since he led his government into minority.

We are seeing this government struggle when it comes to managing the economy and the budget. The Treasurer stood before and was talking about business confidence. I have to say, I went to the Hobart TCCI Budget Roadshow Breakfast and I went to the Launceston one too, and when the Treasurer was talking about business confidence and a strong, growing economy,

there were smirks in the room. They were not buying it. There was outright laughter when he got to the debt slide and went, 'Oh, I do not want that on the screen', and flicked it off really quickly. People were laughing at them.

Where are they today? The Treasurer is talking about business confidence today. Where are the industry groups today? We know the Premier's office has been ringing around, 'Can you come and stand with me? Can you try and support me?' They are nowhere because they know this government is terminal. They are not standing with the government today in their time of need. They are silent - absolutely silent.

The business confidence statistics that the Treasurer quotes all the time is a survey of 500 people. There was a Roy Morgan business confidence report out recently and it said things like - I would take things like the Roy Morgan business stats over the 500-person survey any day of the week. It said that there are large declines in Tasmania, down 17.2 points to 86.4, and clearly now is the lowest of any state. There has been a large decline in another state, South Australia, so we are at the bottom of the pack when it comes to business confidence. The Treasurer is going around the state saying that everything is great. Businesses are hurting, they are struggling, insolvencies are up, the cost of doing business is very difficult at the moment and the Treasurer is saying, 'Everything is fine. Do not worry about it. We have the best confidence in the nation.' It is not actually true. That is why I think there were people smirking on Friday at the Treasurer when he was saying these sorts of things.

When it comes to this government, this Premier has been very poor when it comes to governance. There is nothing starker than the stadium project. Whether you support the stadium or you are against the stadium, good governance matters. There are lots of things I have said on the public record about the way this has been handled by this Premier.

He stood in this place in September 2022 saying that the stadium was not part of the deal. I know from my work on the Public Accounts Committee that was not true. Back in 2021, this government signed up to 11 workstreams with the AFL, which included a stadium. Behind closed doors they were working on a stadium with the AFL, while publicly saying it was not part of the bid. I think that was the first mistake.

Second mistake: they did not Treasury advice. It was the biggest deal the state has ever signed and they did not even ask the financial experts over in the building over there that they are trying to flog off; did not even ask them for a view; did not go to Cabinet for a collective decision. The Premier signed it unilaterally. Failure of collective governance on that side.

I would have thought the Treasurer at the time might have asked, 'Can we have a look at this please, Premier?' This is the biggest deal that the state is about the sign ever. Can we have a look at the details please? Did not ask, did not make a collective decision. Then, in the election campaign, we had the Premier promise Tasmanians, because he knew that he was struggling with these sorts of things, he was shifting the goal posts all along the way, \$375 million we are going to invest in it, not a red cent more.

'Not a red cent more.' We are going to get the private sector to pick up the slack to make up the difference. That is what he told Tasmania in an election campaign, and we know that was not true, either. They are trying to massage the words now, do not say red cent anymore, \$375 million plus borrowings. Sure, there was \$80 million - I think - in borrowings in their original business case. They are not being honest about that either. If you are going to make

Macquarie Point sell assets or borrow and then sell assets, that is government funding. It is capital investment.

The whole lot is being funded by the state government. These are the sorts of issues that this premier is presiding over. It is why people are losing trust in this government flat-out. We have also had the TT-Line debacle, an international embarrassment. I have been up close on that issue, again, on the Public Accounts Committee, where we have done the hard work to get the answers out of this government and the government businesses about what went wrong. We needed to do that to hold this government accountable so that these things do not happen again.

It has prompted some reform from that side, but their response to the ferry fiasco was to come up with some merger, another thought bubble. 'Put that in the paper, that looks good. We will merge these companies, that will solve the problem,' when it was a governance issue. Our leader, Dean Winter, and I announced some governance reforms in the wake of the ferry fiasco. What did the government say at the time? 'That is more red tape, do not worry about that. Do not do that.' What do they do a couple of months later? They picked up our document, went 'That is not bad, actually, we should copy some of it,' and half of it went into the government's policy document.

That is what this government does. They do not address the real issues. This is what this premier does: he does not address the real heart of the issues and he just skates through. He says; nice things to nice people in meetings, says the right things. People walk away from meetings with this premier often feeling like they have been listened to and that something is going to happen, but nothing ever changes. Nothing ever changes.

This parliament is struggling. This is a parliament that was delivered off the back of an election that happened a year early because the previous parliament was struggling. It is not up to the opposition to provide the government of the day with a working majority. You are supposed to do that work as the Premier and make sure when you walk into this place, that you have confidence and supply agreements written down so you can hold people accountable if they start walking away from it.

This premier has been governing without a working majority. He said that he had a verbal agreement with Mr Jenner, no written agreement. You cannot govern without a working majority and come into this place every day and expect everything to be rosy, especially when you are handling things so poorly. I will go to some of the Budget matters because that is in the motion.

Before I do that, I will address some of the Treasurer's comments too, around alternative budgets. Let us scotch this whole thing for good. Alternative budgets are not delivered by any opposition anywhere in the country and I will tell you why. It takes six months with the full resources of government, government departments, Treasury, and the community making submissions to develop a budget.

Mr Jaensch - The Greens do it.

Mr WILLIE - Yes, and it is a work of fiction, just like yours were in opposition. They never came true - yours, it was an absolute work of fiction.

The SPEAKER - Minister Jaensch.

Mr Jaensch - The Greens do it. The Greens do it. The Greens do it.

A member - And do they ever have to deliver it? You have to deliver a budget that a government can deliver.

The SPEAKER - Minister Jaensch. I am not sure who I can hear - the member for Clark.

Mr WILLIE - Full resources of government, community input, departments with all their modelling feeding into this process and a state budget is developed.

Mr Jaensch - The Greens do it.

Mr WILLIE - A state budget is developed. What they are asking is - and this is a made-up Tasmanian thing because they fell for it in opposition - they were goaded about it from the government of the day, and they fell for it. What they are asking is for the opposition, a couple of members and maybe some staff to develop a full alternative budget in four days, in four days after the budget is delivered.

Mr Jaensch - Say what they would do.

The SPEAKER - Minister Jaensch.

Mr WILLIE - Do you know why that is particularly problematic at the moment? It is because they cannot keep a budget. The numbers are moving around so fast that their budget was out of date within five months last year. It is because they are not delivering honest budgets or fronting up about the problems in the budget.

If you wanted to develop an alternative budget based off theirs, do it on their numbers? Their numbers are a joke.

I feel sorry for the good people at Treasury who are dealing with these problems at the moment and a government with its head in the sand directing them to fudge the budget every year. We know the forecasting in the Budget is an absolute joke - 0.3 per cent government expenditure across the forward Estimates. It is flat.

They talk a lot about that time between 2010-2014: the government expenditure, I guess harshest budget from that time was 0.8 per cent. What they are actually projecting in the budget is worse than that time that they always carry on about because they are not being honest. The debt liability now. They came to government without any debt; the debt liability now is worse. It will be worse than the superannuation liability. They talk about that all the time but the legacy they are leaving Tasmania is worse and the trajectory is horrible. It is out of control. The debt in this budget is completely out of control. Not only are they going to blow the budget because they have got dodgy forecasting in it, and they are just going to come to Parliament and ask for more money like they did this financial year. Nearly half a billion dollars more. Not only are they going to blow the budget, so the debt figure gets worse. The debt is completely out of control. There is no pathway to surplus. When they are saying that they are trying to reassure Tasmanians there is not a problem when there is a massive problem.

The cash flow statement for anyone listening shows the horror. The cash position is what is used at a federal level. There are cash deficits that are absolutely out of control, the biggest in the state's history - \$1.7 billion cash deficit for this financial year. Until they get that under control, the debt is spiralling out of control. It will not stabilise, and the debt repayments will go up every single year. That is the trajectory they are on: \$650 million in the last year of the forward Estimates is the figure, but that is only going to get worse because they are going to blow the budget and the debt is out of control. It is not stabilised. It is not manageable.

It is taking a greater share of the revenues every single year. If you cumulatively add them up across the forward Estimates, there is over \$2 billion worth of interest repayments, which does not pay down the debt. It just services it. They are going to spend more on interest repayments than they will on ambulance services and emergency departments across all of Tasmania.

It is going to get worse because the credit rating agencies, in response to their last year's budget where they were denying the problems, said that there was weakening governance, a lack of fiscal discipline, that their fiscal strategy was not worth the paper it was written on because they had no intention of following it. They set some thresholds in those statements. I think S&P said 120 per cent of debt to revenue ratio, they will downgrade them. I think Moody's was 130 per cent.

This Budget is worse than last year's. A credit rating downgrade is on the cards because they have risked that by denying the scale of the problem. It is future Tasmanians, my children, other people's children, who will have to deal with this Premier's legacy debt. The Liberal legacy debt \$47,000 per Tasmanian household. That is just on the last budget. It is only going to get worse if this government continues on that trajectory.

It means that future Tasmanians will not have the same capacity to pay for health and education services they deserve because this government could not manage the budget. The leader of government business, in his inaugural speech in this place called an intergenerational theft. That is what it is. The Budget is so out of control that this government is stealing from future generations. If you do not manage the budget well, you cannot invest in all the things you keep saying you are investing in, like health, education, police, housing and the things Tasmanians care about because there will be less capacity. You have structurally wrecked the budget, and it cannot go on.

The Premier, in response to a bill I tabled in this place last week, was railing against it. The threshold was so high for record deficits. He wants to keep racking up record deficits completely unchecked but I say no, if you are in this place, government members, we are going to put some checks on you. We are going to make you own up to the problem every time you come back here for more appropriation bills. We are going to make your report on it, and we are going to make you report on it in real time. We are going to get the Auditor-General to audit your dodgy forecasting because we know you are not owning up to the problem or being truthful about it.

These members over here have been in and out of the Chamber quite a lot this afternoon. I admit I listened to the FontCast this morning. It is always good to know what people connected to that side are up to and what they are thinking. Veteran Liberal strategist Brad Stansfield talked about their predicament. He said that this Premier was in real strife and if he sends them to an election - and that is not the Premier's choice, especially if this motion passes,

because he will no longer be the adviser to the Governor. It will be the Governor's choice on whether they allow an election. It is not the Premier's choice, but according to veteran Liberal strategist Brad Stansfield, if he sends them to an election, he is sending him off the cliff. He called the rest of them lemmings and he said that someone like Mr Abetz might have the ticker to assess the situation and replace the leader.

They have been in and out of the Chamber all day. I wonder if it is going to be Felix Ellis, Mr Abetz or the minister responsible for the ferry fiasco, Michael Ferguson. It is definitely not going to be the Treasurer because he has just delivered the worst budget in the state's history, so he is out of the race. We cannot have confidence in this Premier any longer and it is not up to him what happens next.

Time expired.

[5.03 p.m.]

Ms BURNET (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, I note the sombre tone in this Chamber today and it is for good reason. This is not a motion that should be considered with anything but seriousness. To move a no-confidence motion in a premier, and not the Treasurer at the handing down of a budget, is an extraordinary step by the Leader of the Opposition.

If we think about political history, and we were all probably students of political history, if you look at the federal level, there has been a revolving door of leaders. In 1996, we had prime minister Howard, then Rudd, then Gillard, then Rudd, then Abbott, then Turnbull, then Morrison and now Albanese. The federal parliament is remembered for those turbulent years as leadership challenges. However, it has been bookended by relatively stable leadership of Howard and Albanese.

Tasmanian politics has had relative stability in leadership over that same period. From 1996, we had premiers Rundle, Bacon, Lennon, Bartlett, Giddings, Hodgman, Gutwein, then Premier Rockliff from April 2022. It has also been a relatively smooth transition of premiers in this state in recent history, compared to the federal spin cycle. It has been at a time of their choosing or, I might say, the people's choosing.

We know that premier Jim Bacon had ill health which forced him to retire, with his death a couple of months after that and we know that Mr Gutwein, after steering the state through COVID, left of his own choosing early because of the strains of COVID and a long period in parliament. We have seen the number of parliamentarians over that time cut in July 1998 from 35 to 25, ostensibly to remove the Greens from Tasmania's political story. Recently, with the 2020 bill expanding back to 35 members, the Premier and former parliament were responsible for this. Seeing that the size of the House had reduced its capacity, it needed to be restored back. Meg Webb, member for Nelson, wrote a paper regarding this. I am quoting from her paper 'Restoring House of Assembly Numbers'. She quotes the former solicitor-general Bill Bale when he spoke to the ABC upon his retirement in 2008. He said:

I think the reduction in the size of the parliament, and that is, of the House of Assembly from 35 to 25, was a retrograde step. I don't believe that 25 people generally elected on a two-party basis, in Tasmania, there may be a third party, certainly a third grouping. I don't believe that leaves the governing party with enough people on its benches to provide a strong ministry, particularly if two or three ministers, as has happened fairly recently in this

state, for one reason or another, find that they've got to resign, there's very, very little on the reserve bench. And I simply don't believe that leads to good decision making.

Hare-Clark is, I think, the best form of democracy around. I think it is the best fit for Tasmania as well. We have a small population. Our population knows, and takes responsibility in the performance of those elected to parliament, and not least of all in the Premier's role. We have a responsibility to make this parliament work, but unfortunately we are not seeing it working to its fullest effect under the current Premier.

I argue that Tasmania's parliaments have been important experiments in democracy. They are sometimes threatened by lousy government bills, and we have seen quite a stack of those coming through of late. However, it has also tried to reflect the wishes of the Tasmanian people, as we have seen various parliaments, up to and including this 51st Parliament of Tasmania.

We have gone through those things, and I think the Premier might even have talked about those things that have happened in this minority government, this power-sharing government, with bills coming from the Greens, from Labor, from Kristie Johnston, member for Clark.

Ms Johnston - Thank you very much.

Ms BURNET - Those things make the parliament work. I might say, certainly with the May Day celebrations with Unions Tasmania, the Saputo workers were very pleased that we backed them as a united parliament. I think that was something that was very important to those workers on strike for so many weeks.

We have seen minority governments during the history of the parliament and a reluctance to embrace the concept of power-sharing because we are too cosy, often, in having all the power held in majority governments over the years. I think there is a real problem with that.

I think the Premier has tried his utmost to work with the crossbench. I do not know, I was not privy to those deals that might have occurred with the crossbench. However, what we are seeing is that that experiment is not necessarily working. We need to reach a maturity in our precious democracy at the bottom of the world. I do not think that we have reached that point of maturity, and so this matter of no-confidence in the Premier is before us.

That might be a reflection on Labor as well. We know that Labor is desperate to rule in majority. However, we are not at that stage yet. We are talking about no-confidence in the Premier. As a Greens, I have a long list of points of concern about this government and ultimately this Premier. It is a long, long list. We have heard from other members of the Greens talking about the concerns that we have, but I want to raise some of the concerns that I specifically have with what the Premier is leading us into.

We talked at length about the stadium during the debate on Dr Woodruff's amendment. The stadium is problematic because of the huge debt that this government and future governments and future taxpayers will have. It will be an intergenerational debt. I will not prosecute that argument again. We have heard about the ferries debacle and the mismanagement of our state-owned companies and government business enterprises. It is as if the government has had to be dragged kicking and screaming to improve the governance of those important state-owned companies and GBEs.

We have seen a chronic underspend on infrastructure projects across the board. The guaranteed spend that we were to have in the 2024-25 Budget has not been recognised in virtually all areas, including health, public infrastructure works and so forth. I have mentioned before that Montello Primary School is desperate for a rebuild. When I went there as a member of the Public Works Committee, we went through classrooms to get to other classrooms - hallways were part of the classroom. There was no privacy. If a kid wanted to go off to the toilet, they had to go through classrooms to get to that. Those things should be a priority.

Reprioritising infrastructure is so important, and we do not see any reprioritisation of infrastructure projects. There are infrastructure projects that are coming up - if we look at the Tasman Bridge, for argument's sake, that is a pretty significant piece of failing infrastructure, and it is nowhere to be seen in the budget papers. In fact, it is a tiny amount compared to what is required to either remedy that bridge for us as best as it could, and we know that it needs to be done sooner rather than later, or to reconsider what we do with the Tasman Bridge.

We have just seen the opening of the Bridgewater Bridge and the finalisation of that project - almost. There are a few things that still need to be done, but those things are priorities that we should be considering, or a government should be reconsidering as to how to go about that. Dr Woodruff talked earlier about the renal dialysis beds in Bass. It is a \$10-million federally funded project from 2019. It still has not been built and there is no money for that in the state budget, which is appalling. Having two more beds is really short-changing those people with chronic health needs in the seat of Bass.

There has been an inability to review those infrastructure projects, as I said, to deliver on the most pressing, or to abandon those we cannot afford - and I go back to the stadium. There is an inability to undertake strategic planning. We have seen time and time again over the course of this 12 months of parliament that minister Ellis is out of control in relation to what he brings for this parliament to consider, backed in by Labor, I might add. We have had the development assessment panels thrown out in the upper House. They will be back again. We have seen the youth justice facility bill, which ostensibly, in my opinion, undermines planning and how planning is done and the rights of people to appeal. Mr Bayley talked earlier of the stadium bill, or the Macquarie Point bill, which is currently out for consultation, but it was tabled the other day. There are huge concerns about how that undermines the rule of law and I hope that, should it be passed - and I hope that it is not passed - it is challenged in the High Court.

We should not be responsible for lousy legislation, but unfortunately this is what we have under Premier Rockliff's watch. There has been an erosion of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act*. It is appalling. Councils are angry; every council across Tasmania is angry, minister Ellis. They are angry and they know what you are doing. They know that you are undermining their responsibility of landing development, and I might add that we have this continued irresponsibility by minister Ellis in relation to strategic planning. The land use strategies - I saw a line in the wrap-up of the Budget about land use planning. I do not think this government has a clue about how to do planning properly and strategic planning, and it is embarrassing. It is absolutely embarrassing for this state.

We have seen, also, the withering of the public transport system. Public transport is one of the most important principles of how cities and places function. We are seeing a lack of investment and a total undermining of public transport by this government, and it is a sad

indictment because intelligent cities have good public transport systems. Cities should be able to get people to and from work. Everybody should have the right to good public transport.

We know that there has been very little investment in greenhouse gas emission reduction through transport, one of the largest emitters in our state. The introduction of electric buses is a joke and we have, I believe, the country's oldest fleet of public transport buses. I expect the Minister for Transport is rubbing his hands together in glee at the disarray that we see in our public transport sector.

We are effectively locking in transport poverty for those Tasmanians who cannot rely on a broken bus service and instead have to drive a costly commute. They can thank minister Abetz for increased congestion and longer peak hour traffic. We see the starving of the community sector, which is there to deliver to the most vulnerable Tasmanians. How is it that the minister has not argued for more funding to deliver programs to help the most vulnerable in our state?

There is an inability to undertake due process. The Project of State Significance process was chosen for the stadium, then abandoned, then legislation introduced to fast-track a permit process that disallows the right of appeal. There are so many things that are broken. It is absolutely appalling. There are also delays in delivery when we look at the environment. The container deposit scheme has arrived and minister Ogilvie is crowing about that. It is a good thing, but it has been a very slow process. The waste levy has been a slow process.

Greater powers for organisations such as the EPA to address the issues of pollution, of protecting our environment from the ravages of antibiotics and self-regulating industries, such as salmon, which is impacting both our coastlines, as we saw with millions of fish deaths over summer, and even outfall from salmon hatcheries in rivers, such as the Florentine, and from poorly managed handling of the waste of dead salmon and biosolids.

The State of the Environment Report fail is unforgivable. Delays in release - then under the cover of Christmas holidays. The concerns are many. However, I want to highlight the impact of development on city fringes across Tasmania which threatens flora and fauna species, and impacts soil and biodiversity. It is a blundering, heavy-footed and expensive approach in more ways than one. Is this the government you want to lead, Premier? If so, this is of great concern because I do not think you want to lead a government that operates like this.

I have been disappointed in opportunities for this parliament, with the level of discussion and debate both inside and outside the Chamber, in the interests of the Tasmanian community. For some reason, I expected more and agree with some of the sentiments of the member for Franklin, Mr O'Byrne. Collaboration and good will should extend to everyone. It is unfortunate that this Premier has not facilitated that as much as I would have expected. What do we have before us? Do we have a premier in charge of a Cabinet that is arrogant, fiscally irresponsible and does not really care about intergenerational debt? I believe we have that dilemma before us. The buck ultimately stops with the Premier.

This is a moment in time where the House decides the fate of a premier. It is not his own party with long knives, which is the scenario we have been used to seeing in the federal arena, where everyone climbed over others' still warm corpses to seize leadership. This decision today will be remembered, as the Premier said earlier, for the Leader of the Opposition's actions. I expect that the Leader of the Opposition has, sadly, not thought through all of the

consequences of his actions, The 'what if' scenarios and the discussions with important players in the lead-up to the events of the day.

The Greens support this motion of no-confidence. We recognise the important contribution Jeremy Rockliff has made over the years, but we see the shortcomings in this 51st Parliament with all that has been mentioned, and this must be the circuit breaker we need right now.

[5.23 p.m.]

Mr ELLIS (Braddon - Minister for Housing, Planning and Consumer Affairs) - Honourable Speaker, rarely in recent decades has so much been put at risk for so many in our community by a single act of political selfishness. This is an act that will be carried out in the dead of night, perpetrated by a party that does not even know if it wants to govern, that made a deliberate decision not to govern after the last election, and that stands here today having failed to deliver an alternative budget, having failed to deliver an alternative case for government itself.

The opposition is asking this House and, more broadly, the Tasmanian community to get rid of a man who has been trusted by people from every walk of life for decades of service in this place and outside for the selfish ambitions of a man who cannot even tell you what he thinks from day to day, who is happy to speak out of both sides of his mouth and comes up with different positions depending on who he is speaking to, depending on the pressures of the day. Compare that to the man of great courage and conviction who leads our state now. He leads our party absolutely. He leads this parliament but, more than that, he leads this state. He has done so through some of the most challenging moments our state has ever faced. He has done that with grace, strength and humility. The fact that the Leader of the Opposition displays none of those characteristics - not just tonight, but over the course of his career, should give all of us pause for thought in the hours, days and weeks ahead.

I rise to speak in support of our Premier, Jeremy Rockliff. He is a man who has built this state over the last 20 years. In an extraordinarily candid moment, the deputy leader of the opposition asked: Is Tasmania better than when Jeremy Rockliff came to this parliament 20 years ago? Is there a single person in Tasmania who thinks that it is not? It is quite clearly a better place, and not just that: it is a better place from when we took government in 2014, when Tasmania's best export was our young people.

Ms Haddad - Now they are leaving in droves.

Mr ELLIS - Look at the transformation that has been achieved under this Liberal government, under the deputy leadership of Jeremy Rockliff, under the premiership of Jeremy Rockliff. This is a man who is invested in our community because he is a state builder. He does that with the hard infrastructure that helps people to get around our state. This is a debate that is happening, only days after one of the great triumphs of Tasmanian ingenuity and Tasmanian purpose in the Bridgewater Bridge. This is our largest ever transport infrastructure, a piece of infrastructure that has helped to inspire a generation of young people to pick up their tools and be part of building something big and being part of building something for Tasmania. This is a moment that should make us all proud, a moment that should help us reflect on the decades where people have said that Tasmania is not good enough, that we cannot do these things, that we cannot have big dreams and big goals, and strive for higher purposes.

We have been able to do that in the form of a bridge and also in the form of so many more things, such as the Royal Hobart Hospital. When we came to government, the previous Labor-Greens government had not laid a brick. It has seen massive, transformational investment. The Mersey Hospital, which was on the chopping block to be sold under the previous Labor government, has had its first major investment and refurbishments in decades, tens of millions of dollars, under this government. We have seen investments in schools, police station and emergency services hubs around our state. The reason we invest in those things is because we believe in the power of human potential in Tasmania.

Too much of the debt that has been wrapped up in this state over years has not necessarily been worn on the balance sheet of our Treasury. It has been worn in the reduced life chances of our people, of people who have not had opportunities in their homes in generations, who have seen high unemployment and reduced opportunities in schools and hospitals. People who have struggled to make ends meet because the economy does not work for them will now speak. We have an unemployment rate that is the lowest in the country and the lowest in our history. That has been done because we have leveraged the balance sheet of this state to help build something big. It helped keep people employed during the pandemic and, even more than that, to provide them the long-term certainty that comes from real jobs with real investments backing real skills.

An apprenticeship takes four years. It does not just take the length of the pandemic. We have seen continued investment from a state government that has the confidence in the people of Tasmania; that if we can invest in them and change their life chances and change the life chances of young people, then we will be able to repay that because those people will have decades of opportunity that comes from breaking the cycle - a cycle that has plagued Tasmania for far too many years. We have the highest confidence in the country in this state. It is time that this parliament had the same confidence in the Tasmanian people that they have in themselves. This government has confidence in the people of Tasmania. That is why we have confidence in the Premier of our state, Jeremy Rockliff.

He is also a man of compassion. I have seen the Premier, in our shared responsibilities when it comes to disaster response and recovery, going through communities after devastating floods or fires. When the waters recede or the fires stop burning, he is the man who wants to invest and rebuild. He is the man who will reach out with compassion to operators like Wing's Wildlife Park, whose owners did not just have their business destroyed but had parts of their home destroyed and parts of their community destroyed. The Premier reached out to them with compassion and said, 'We need to make these investments.' Sure, it is going to be an addition to the bottom line for the state government, but we know what happens when you invest in the Tasmanian people, rather than leave the debt to them on their own personal balance sheets. That business is up and running again, it is supporting people, it is helping to grow jobs. There are stories like that right around our state.

We have seen devastating natural disasters in this state over recent years. We had the October 2022 floods, the major storm and flooding events last year and a bushfire on the west coast this year that burnt 100,000 hectares. Because of the investments we make in protecting our community and helping them rebuild, we are able to support those people. It has been the Premier, in his role in recovery, who has helped to lead the way and to set the standard for our team, and to say that if we can help people, if we can do more, then we absolutely should.

That is the kind of man that our Premier is. That is the kind of investment that he makes. We have seen in the discussion today the broadly felt acknowledgement of the compassion of our Premier, the man who has led this state through the difficult days of the commission of inquiry and the apology that needed to happen - even more than that, the investments to right wrongs and to ensure that they do not happen to future generations, because that trauma that was felt by those young people in those decades past is not a trauma that we want to see.

That debt that is held on the balance sheets of people needs to be changed, it needs to be righted. That is why we have seen once in a generation - once in the lifetime of our entire parliament - we have never seen investments in child safety and justice and supporting our young people to recover from trauma like we have seen under this Premier. It comes from his experience as a Lifeline counsellor in the cold nights in the middle of winter, speaking to someone who is struggling with their identity or their place in life and just being there for them, being that listening ear.

He has been that listening ear for our community for the last 20 years, and has made those commitments to people to try and help make our community a better place. When we have seen uncertainty, more broadly speaking, he has been one of the people who has stepped up. He has taken on the challenges of massive service delivery during COVID, the once-in-a-generation pandemic. We have seen the steady hand, and while other people were carping from the sidelines or complaining that we should spend more or we should spend less, we should take that action or we should stay as we are, he had to make the tough calls. Not everyone is going to agree with him, but I think the Tasmanian community has seen the measure of this man and he has stood up time and time again when it matters most.

We are entering and have entered another period of global uncertainty, particularly economic uncertainty, that has put businesses and livelihoods and opportunities for people who work in those facilities at risk. You compare the difference between an opposition who would boycott an island community of this state and the products that they make and a Premier who never gave up on them. He said, 'I will do what it takes to ensure that there are opportunities for people to be able to earn a living on this island, just as we should be able to do right across Tasmania.'

He stepped up, and it is so telling that it was the shadow treasurer who called for a boycott of King Island Dairy. It is the opposition leader who would put at risk the mine that provides 95 jobs for families on that island and the most critical mineral in the world, a key part of our sovereign manufacturing supply chain that will help defend this country in whatever conflict happens in the future. This is a man who has stepped up in uncertain times in the past and he is doing that right now.

Compare that, and compare this team that has weathered storms and made sacrifices and made the hard calls and a whole range of things, with an opposition and an entire shadow cabinet who has not spent a single day in a minister's role. Out of every single person who sits in the shadow cabinet, not one has spent a minute as a minister - neither the opposition leader nor the rest of his team. When you compare some of these people with this team, who have made the hard calls, who have been there for the difficult decisions, who have helped guide our community through a global pandemic and are reinvesting in our communities so that they can be kept safe, well and in work, it is clear that this House should have confidence in our Premier, Jeremy Rockliff. It is in stark contrast to an opposition who is putting so much at risk for so many Tasmanians.

Worse, they have proposed, in this act of political selfishness carried out in the dead of night, a deal with the Greens so that they can seize power in Tasmania.

Mr Bayley - It was at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Ms Haddad - That is the dead of night for you?

Mr ELLIS - That is the consequence of what is being proposed here on this day. It has been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition that when he receives the support of the crossbench and the Greens, he will seek to overthrow a Premier.

Ms Haddad - Have you looked at the Budget?

Mr ELLIS - This man over here, the opposition leader, has proposed to seize power in the dead of night in a deal with the Greens to throw out of office one of the most admired men in Tasmania.

Even worse, we know that there are other deals going on. There is a deal with Paul Lennon, the political puppet master who sits behind this Leader of the Opposition who seeks this act of political selfishness. We know that there are deals that have been done.

Ms Haddad - What a great work of fiction. You should turn your hand to writing. What a great novel.

Mr ELLIS - We know that Mr Winter deliberately never speaks of his support for the stadium that is proposed by this Premier. He only speaks of his support of 'a stadium'. Which stadium could that be? I know that his political puppet master, the man behind the scenes who pulls the strings for this Leader of the Opposition, has proposed another stadium, the Mac Point 2.0 stadium, Stadium 2.0. That is the dirty, grubby deal that goes on top of the deal with the Greens

Members interjecting.

Mr ELLIS - We want to know what has been promised. We want to know what has been proposed. We want to know if there has been a conversation between Mr Winter and his puppet master Mr Lennon in recent days. Did it contain any information about Stadium 2.0? What has been specifically said, promised and committed to? The Tasmanian people have a right to know. This parliament has a right to know, particularly with the commitments that we have seen from this side of the House and the demands from across the Chamber for transparency and honesty in government. That applies absolutely to the stadium and to Mr Lennon's Stadium 2.0.

This is an opposition that cannot even govern themselves. Just prior to the last election, they went to the people and said, 'We are no longer in administration. Nick and Dougie no longer run the Tasmanian Labor Party' -

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Thank you, minister, you have been asked to call them by their proper names in this place.

Mr ELLIS - The honourable Mr Sherry and the honourable Mr - what is Dougie's last name again?

A member - Cameron.

Mr ELLIS - Cameron, they run the Labor Party

A member - He is an ex-senator.

Mr ELLIS - 'We are no longer in administration' - that is what they said to the Tasmanian people, and guess what? They lost and they went back into administration.

In the interests of transparency, they did not tell anybody. It has only been with recent events where there is a Senator in the Federal Parliament from Tasmania who the opposition leader could not even pronounce his last name. That is how much authority that man, the Leader of the Opposition, has over his party these days. It is run by Canberra. It is controlled by faceless men. It is the Leader of the Opposition who is controlled by Mr Lennon. He is his only link and only saviour when it comes to this party that is in administration. If you were in care and maintenance, you cannot run this state.

The people in this place need to need to grasp and need to wrestle with the question of who the right person is to lead this state. There is one man in here who leads his party, and there is an opposition leader who is in control of nothing but spin and selfishness.

It is quite clear, I have to say, for an opposition to complain about spending to break the cycle of disadvantage in Tasmania once and for all for generations to come, but at the last election proposed \$4 billion worth of spending, nearly three times the dollar value that was proposed by this government. How can you say that debt and deficit are the challenge that you will use to bring down this Premier when the last time you proposed an alternative, that is exactly what you proposed. You proposed far more spending than we have ever seen from this government, and it was on rubbish. It was a policy mix that was so bad it had to be corrected 11 times and then deleted from the website so that no one could ever get access to it again.

This is an opposition leader who recklessly puts himself ahead of the interests of the Tasmanian people - people who want to get through a four-year apprenticeship and who need the certainty of the pipeline of work ahead, people who want to make a difference in this state working in our public service, and who want to help the Tasmanian community.

This is a government in stark contrast that is delivering and has a pathway of more to do. We have seen the work that this government has done in response to natural disasters, and I spoke about that before. We are making investments in stations and brigades right around this state, doing what it takes to keep Tasmania safe in their homes, on their roads and in their communities.

This is a government that backed in Reid's Law, which has delivered a full-time special operations group, that in the Budget has proposed additional funding so that we can secure the roll out of Arch centres for victim/survivors in alignment with what was proposed in the commission of inquiry. There is Daniel's Law, and record police graduates going through our academy. When I see those fine young people, I am motivated to pass the Budget so that they

can get paid, and so that they can serve in Australia's most trusted police force. We back them in, and we will do that as part of this Budget.

I have followed on from the Premier in his role as minister for Education, delivering skills and training. We have transformed TasTAFE and the opportunities for young people to get a vocational education in this state. The only letter that I have ever written to a politician prior to going into parliament was a letter to the Premier, when I was a plumber down the west coast. I said, 'I'd really like to get into a course at TAFE but I'm struggling to get there because those courses are not offered'.

My first job in this role in the Cabinet was as Minister for Skills and Training. I was empowered to deliver the kind of facilities and opportunities that young people like I was, who are seeking opportunities to do better and to get more education. We have the Water and Energy Trades Centre of Excellence, which is the best in the country. We have the Freer Farm Agricultural Centre of Excellence, which was saved by the Premier when he was in this role, when it was on the chopping block under Labor. Massive investments in the high-vis army that is transforming our state and helping young people build something big.

There are huge rollouts across housing, but more importantly than that, we are cutting red tape so that we can deliver increased housing supply and affordability.

We have a Premier who believes in Tasmania and the potential of Tasmanians above all else. We have an opposition leader who believes in nothing but himself, and we oppose this motion.

Time expired.

[5.43 p.m.]

Mrs BESWICK (Braddon) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, this House understands my position when it comes to no-confidence motions and the political gains and point-scoring in this place. We waste too much of parliament's time on frivolous no-confidence motions. Tasmanians do not vote for us to spend our days pointing fingers and blowing up the place. They expect us to work together and get the job done.

Due to this I rarely get up and say much in these debates - this is why I have not contributed to the Greens' amendment - but today I want to make a few points. This motion is far too important to stay silent on. From my position, political ambitions are being put ahead of the public interest.

Today we are meant to be talking about the Budget. It is a Budget that poses serious challenges for our state's future. It deserves our full attention, but Labor seems intent on blowing the House up for its own political purposes. We have a Labor Party running on a high from the recent federal election, somehow thinking they might get more seats in the next election.

It is not just the parliament they might blow up; a political crisis could have dire consequences for our economy. Labor's impatience is not in the best interests of our state. I share many of the same concerns as others on the crossbench. The Budget makes me worried for our future generations. The stadium debate has divided our community. The *Spirits* saga has badly let down my part of the state.

However, dumping a premier and sending Tasmania back to an election is not the answer. This is the parliament Tasmanians voted for. They expect us to make it work. We all have a vote in the place. It is a massive privilege. We represent the people who put their faith in us. The decision we are facing today has enormous ramifications for our state. We need to think very carefully about what is in the best interest of Tasmania as a whole, not just the people who we are politically aligned to.

No one can predict with any confidence what the consequences of this vote will be. The opposition leader has kicked a hornet's nest. He is catastrophising over the state of the budget but playing down what his behaviour will mean for the passage of supply. Labor says they will not block it, but who knows what happens next. We are on the verge of uncertain times. If the Labor leader wants to become the premier, he should make his case to the people, not join forces with his political opponents to turn the parliament and the state on its head.

How can Labor campaign so strongly on the stadium in the recent Legislative Council elections and now trigger a series of events that seriously puts that team at risk? I am no fan of the stadium, but at least I am consistent. I can imagine how let down the leadership of the Devils are today. Labor did not want a referendum on the stadium, but now seems determined to trigger an election that would be exactly that. It will be divisive at a time when we should be working to address the state's big challenges, not participating in a popularity contest.

How would the business community be feeling? The opposition leader has tried to make a virtue of being pro-jobs and pro-business. This behaviour runs counter to that. A lot of community members who have supported the opposition leader are completely baffled as to why he would do this. I have had words like 'selfish', 'arrogant' and 'reckless' shared with me. Comments on the ABC reporting of today say, 'This is absolutely disgusting. Two elections in two years'.

Are Labor and the Greens considering what happens if Rockliff resigns as Premier and the Liberals put an even more conservative leader in his place? Is Rockliff not the least bad option? Jane has stated what I am in agreement with:

I am dismayed at this motion and the damage this will do to Tasmania. We need to be moving forward in our state. The construction industry needs a major boost, which in turn leads to economic and social growth. I don't want my family to have to move interstate for opportunities that are being denied them by those who lack vision and understanding of the big picture.

The Labor leader has criticised the government for failing to manage confidence and supply agreements, and no doubt there are lessons to be learned when it comes to maintaining relationships with people from outside of our parties, but it is a bit rich coming from the Leader of the Opposition, who has pulled together an alliance today that would not be able to agree on anything. The only thing they all have in common is a desire to see the back of this government.

This follows Labor showing absolutely no interest in trying to make a minority government work at the last election. At least the Premier stepped up and tried to find a way to make a difficult situation work. The state is likely to find itself in a similar situation next time around, and Labor has given no indication it would be any different. It is their way or the highway. The opposition leader may well become Tasmania's premier one day, but he should do it the right way. Provide proper scrutiny to the government, present a real alternative and

take it to the people, because the opposition has so many questions to answer before the public can make an informed decision.

The shadow treasurer has pointed out what is wrong with the Budget, but is well short of a plan for repair. We have heard a few token suggestions on how to save money, but that will barely make a dent in the problem. Labor contradicts itself, because it claims to be worried about the budget bottom line but is happy to sign a blank cheque on the stadium. Labor rails against privatising assets but has absolutely no ideas for raising revenue in our state. The opposition's only engagement with me has been over the committee to explore GBE reform, which I appreciated, but I was disappointed that just days after the parliament voted to establish the committee, Labor was back to playing wedge politics with a motion pre-empting the committee's work.

The opposition is trying to walk both sides of the street, and Tasmanians are far from convinced. The latest polls have Labor nowhere near a position of forming majority government, but the opposition leader is acting like he is the chosen one. A 32 per cent preferred premier rating does not mean it is time to saddle up and jump on the horse. Labor has not shown it is able to collaborate, and this motion shows a complete disrespect for the vote of the people and the various views of the House.

If the opposition leader thinks he is going to follow his federal colleagues into majority government, he might be in for a rude shock. After all, Anthony Albanese had a base of 77 seats in a 150-seat parliament. Dean Winter has 10 in 35.

This morning we heard Mr Winter espouse the issues with the Budget after yesterday promising to fix it. Some of the ideas have merit. After all, we need responsible budget management across our public service. How can you impose a hard cap and state the spend is non-negotiable while promising to protect all roles? It sounds too good to be true.

I have not spoken a lot about my working life prior to coming to this place, but Labor calling for the abolishment of the Waste and Resource Recovery (WWR) Board got my attention. Waste management is not sexy, but it underpins every aspect of our state - every business, every home, every service provision. Without good waste management, we cannot do business, we cannot manage our environmental outcomes, we cannot treat our wastewater and we cannot keep Australia beautiful.

We need the right infrastructure to manage waste, and we need to invest to reduce inputs to our landfills. Abolishing the WRR Board and its staff will not have a material impact on this Budget. All it will do is take a group of well-respected waste experts away from the decision-making of projects that will underpin Tasmania's progress and cause unnecessary upheaval to the community. It is another example of Labor not thinking through the consequences of its thought bubbles, and the one we are dealing with today has the most serious consequences of all.

I am curious. Last year, when we were in campaign mode, Labor promised enormous funding to various organisations for all sorts of things. It got to the point that Tasmanians were laughing at them for its ridiculousness. They promised they were against the stadium before the election, before changing their minds. A previous commitment to poker machine reform has disappeared, while on issues like development assessment panels, they have bagged the government but supported the legislation anyway. This week, they started their pork-barrelling

all over again. I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition: what are you going to stand by? What promises from last year are you going to keep?

Going to an election now tells the world that Tasmania is not open for business. Do not invest, because who knows who will be in charge next week. They go to the polls every year. There is no stability there. This will make our state a laughing stock. We are all faced with a monumental decision here today. A vote of no-confidence will trigger a series of events that no one can really predict. Is that what Tasmanians really want? Do they want us to work hard together to find common ground, to collaborate and produce positive outcomes for the people who put us here? For me, supporting a vote of no-confidence feels extremely reckless, and I will be voting against it.

[5.53 p.m.]

Ms HADDAD (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, it is interesting that we were almost eight hours into this debate before we really heard any of the Premier's colleagues come in here and actually defend his record. It was a great audition from minister Ellis. I dare say he is the only one in here who understands what a no-confidence motion is about, because prior to minister Ellis, who gave a very full-throated defence of Jeremy Rockliff's record, we had not heard much. We had not heard many Liberals get to their feet in any of the stages of today's debate to back in their colleague and to back in this Budget, which is why we are here today.

We are not here today because of the stadium, because of an election, because of anything other than the state of this Budget - the worst that Tasmania has ever seen - and they were not jumping to their feet to come to his defence. I dare say if the roles were reversed, we would be jumping to the defence of our colleagues, because we understand what solidarity is about on this side of the Chamber. This is serious.

As others have said, this is not about Jeremy Rockliff as a human. People know Jeremy. He has been in this parliament a long time. People know him and like him, and for good reason. This is about the state of this Budget, and it is extremely serious. We would not be taking our responsibility as an opposition seriously if we did not act now. How much respect could the Tasmanian people have for us if we stood by \$11 billion of net debt? We have to say something about that. We cannot keep seeing those debt levels rise and rise off into the future until we are basically a bankrupt state. What then? What are the options for a state that cannot meet the needs of the Tasmanian people? because that is what we see in this Budget.

Last year we were shocked at how bad the Budget was and the sweeping job cuts and the efficiency dividend, which is a fancy word for a cut, that was going to sweep across the public sector but this year it is even worse, and it is worse off the back of a year of austerity, vacancy control, recruitment freezes, and refusals for public sector departments to be able to fill essential roles. People are being told that if that job has not been filled for a year, we are wiping it off your list, and when they go back to those vacancy control boards and say that it is an essential role - that the reason it is not filled is because they cannot recruit to it because the government has mismanaged recruitment and retention for 11 years - they are told, 'Too bad. You cannot have that role anymore.'

In my responsibility area as shadow minister for health, what we see as a result of those decisions is an impact on patient care and impacts on staff retention, staff morale, people wanting to come and work and live in this place. I want us to be the best public sector and the best Health department that people rave about, that people want to come and work in, but that

is not what we have now. What we have now is a burnt out, exhausted workforce, always working with not enough people rostered onto shifts, nurses and other health professionals doing double shifts and being called back in when they are exhausted and burnt out, and people are leaving. People I speak to are leaving to work in the private sector. They are leaving to retrain and go into a totally different industry altogether. They are retiring early or they are reducing their hours. Those things have a material impact on our workforce.

This Budget is going to make it worse - 2500 more public sector jobs to go, more efficiency dividends. Like I said, that is a fancy word for a budget cut. More and more of that is going to be seen in this Budget. It would not be responsible for us to stand up for it and not act on it, not to do something to show the Tasmanian people how seriously bad this Budget is. Like I said yesterday, people might not think that what a government budget looks like matters to individual people in the community. People say that - that it is not the same as a household budget and we should not make those comparisons.

However, it does have a material impact on individual people in the community, because when the Budget is as bad as it is now - and do not forget, they had money in the bank when they came to government, \$208 million in cash and investments, money in the bank. We have gone from that to the worst net debt in history and rising. It has an impact on individual workers, families, households, because when budgets are this bad, what is the government looking at doing to try to repair some of that damage? They are looking at selling off our public assets, selling off things like our transport system.

What do you think is going to happen if they sell off our transport system, Metro, which every Tasmanian relies on? We will see higher bus fare prices, we will see less bus routes filled, we will see worse conditions for drivers, for maintenance crews and people who look after our public service bus fleet. That is what we will see when that is sold off to the highest bidder, who is going to be making decisions in the interests of profit and shareholders and not in the interests of the transport needs of Tasmanians.

Providing transport is a fundamental role of government. It is their job to do that. It is not providing a luxury; it is providing an absolute necessity for people to be able to get to work, to get to education and training, to participate in our community. Sell that off to the highest bidder and services are going to go down and prices are going to go up. The same with the others. They want to sell off TasNetworks, our power source. What are we going to see when that happens? Higher power prices, worse conditions for workers. We are going to see the same kind of thing happen there as well. Decisions will be made in the interests of shareholders and profit and not in the interests of Tasmanians.

You can sell those off. You will sell them for a lot of money and next year's budget might not look quite so dire, but it is a one-off sugar hit. It is a one-off sugar hit that you will have and what do you lose? Not only do you lose over \$600 million of revenue that they bring in every year, but you also lose control of those public services that belong in the public sector, delivered by government and on behalf of government for Tasmanian people who need those services.

The same goes for the not-for-profit sector. We have heard others speak about it in this place and I mentioned it yesterday. We know the demand on not-for-profit services has increased hugely, over COVID and since COVID. People who have never had to rely on community services before are relying on them for the first time. People who have never had

to try to navigate that system of food relief or financial assistance are having to do that for the very first time.

What do we hear from a Community Services minister who administers a big chunk of those grants? We heard him say to those organisations, 'You need to be able to do things faster, cheaper, better, and more efficiently. If your contract is set to expire, do not rely on it being renewed.' Not only does that treat that whole profession with disdain - that is a professional workforce - but it also completely disregards the needs of those tens of thousands of Tasmanians who are relying on those services.

Do not forget that those services are being provided on behalf of government. They are being provided instead of the government providing them. Many decades ago, government was the provider of those services that have now been outsourced to the community services sector. Whether you agree on that philosophically or not, the fact is that those services are actually government services that the government is now buying from the sector. If they fail to fund those organisations properly to be able to support the needs of their clients, then they had better get ready to start providing those services themselves. That is what that means, honourable Speaker.

Much has been said about the broken promises of this government, and many of them are impacted further by this Budget. They said when they came into government that they were working towards Tasmania being the healthiest state in the nation by 2025. Well, I have news for you: it is 2025 and we are not the healthiest state in the nation. We are far, far from it. In fact, on most health measures we are only a little peg above the Northern Territory. We have the highest rates of chronic disease, the highest rates of smoking, obesity, and other chronic illness. That is not only a bad thing for our population's health and wellbeing, but it is also a bad thing for our health system and our budget. The more people who need acute services, who are not getting access to services early through preventative health measures, the more impact there is on our acute health services down the track.

Let us have a look at some of those that we can see in this year's budget. We can see that for category 1 elective surgery patients, the percentage of those who have been seen on time - category 1 elective surgery, sometimes people think it means it is voluntary surgery, something that is not needed. They are actually vital operations. They are operations that are required. They are impacting really heavily on the people who need them. They are not voluntary operations. For category 1 patients last year, only 66 per cent were seen on time. The year before that it was 62 per cent, but the government is hoping that next year it will be 95 per cent. They are suddenly going to jump up more than 30 per cent, honourable Speaker. That is a hard ask from a workforce that is already under such extreme pressure.

Let us have a look at how long the average wait time was for those patients. Category 1 patients being seen beyond the recommended time - category 1 patients were waiting 67 days longer in 2022-23 and 43 days longer last year. Jump to category 2 patients - they are waiting 200 days longer than the recommended clinical timeframes. Category 3 patients are waiting 243 days longer than the clinically recommended wait times.

We have seen through other RTI data that has been released that some of the people on those long-term waitlists die before they receive their surgery, or they end up on the emergency surgery list because they waited so long for something that was elective that it became so acute

that they ended up on the emergency surgery waitlist. That is no way to manage a health waitlist.

Let us look at some of their other broken promises. They promised when they came to government that education results would be at the national average by 2022. We are years past that now and our education results are some of the worst.

They said they would keep Tasmania net debt free. Well, that is why we are here in this no-confidence motion. This Budget shows us plunging into the worst net debt in history, that is going to take a generation or more to repair. We are plunging our next generation and most likely parts of the one after it basically into recession. We are plunging the next generation into years and years of budget pain, and not getting any better.

Let us look at housing. They told us that that was a priority quite belatedly, because it is not in the DNA of the Liberal Party to care very much about people who are doing it tough. We have seen housing waitlists grow and grow and grow under this government, and housing delivery fall and fall and fall. When I was first elected in 2018, they started putting through fast-track housing land supply orders. That is a fancy piece of legislation that they put through this place that was meant to make it quicker and easier to deliver social and affordable housing. By last count, in seven years they had delivered six houses under that scheme.

There are people sleeping in their cars winter after winter after winter, freezing cold. I have spoken to health professionals who say when they are providing health services to a homeless cohort, they are seeing conditions in those people that they learnt about at nursing school or medical school and were told that these are things that you do not see anymore - these are illnesses that you do not see. You certainly do not see them in a developed country like Australia. Now, they are seeing them again. They are seeing those serious conditions because people are homeless for year on year on year.

A long time ago, when I was a government staffer, there was still real pressure in the housing system then, but if someone came into the office at 4.45 p.m. on a Friday afternoon and said, 'I have nowhere to sleep tonight', we could almost always find them somewhere to go. There would be room in a shelter, or we could call one of the not-for-profit providers and they had brokerage funding and they could get someone into a hotel. That is not the case anymore.

When I talk to constituents who call Housing Connect - and those workers are doing the absolute best they can - they are burning out too because they do not have a magic wand to be able to fix the situation, but they are the ones stuck there on the phone having to tell people there is nowhere to go. They call Housing Connect, 'There is nowhere for you to go', and they ask, 'Okay, who do I call next?' No one. There is no one else. This government has not prioritised housing. We have not seen them care about it. The ministers more recently who have tried to are playing catch-up off 11 years of neglect.

Not to mention some of the policy areas where they have let us down. I will mention a couple of them in the few minutes that I have remaining. They promised to implement the Cox review into the Integrity Commission. He did that review more than six years ago and there are only six recommendations that have been implemented. People are crying out for an Integrity Commission that can do its job. We have a government who, minister after minister,

says, 'It is a priority, we are working on it, it is a priority, it is a big priority for my department', and we see nothing.

What about a ban on conversion practices? What about that? All of us, on all sides of the Chamber, have met with victims of those abhorrent practices that tell gay, trans and lesbian people that they are broken, that there is something wrong with them. It is shameful that those practices still happen anywhere, let alone in Tasmania. The Premier had a consultation draft bill that went out, and the advice many of us got back was the bill was so bad, it would probably make it easier to provide conversion practices. However, we have not seen that bill or any better bill tabled in this place. I have to ask myself why that is. Is it because the Premier cannot get something through his caucus room because it is so stacked with members of the far right of the Liberals now that they do not want to act on something like that? They do not want to act on the rights of LGBTQI+ Tasmanians. They do not want to worry about the fact that conversion practices happen here. They should be worrying about that. This government has let Tasmanians down in so many areas of policy.

However, that is not the main reason we are here today having this debate. The reason we are having this debate is the budget is broken. This is the worst budget Tasmania has ever seen, and we cannot stand by responsibly and continue to support a government that is going to implement sweeping job cuts, sweeping budget cuts and plunge generations of future Tasmanians into dark days of debt and recession. We cannot stand for that. I will be supporting this motion. I hope people can see through some of the spin of those opposite and understand that this is a serious situation we are in. This is something that has been deeply thought through in the Labor caucus. We know the risks of doing something like this, but the risks are much, much higher for Tasmanians to see a government like this continue, and continue to plunge Tasmania into generations of debt.

Time expired.

[6.12 p.m.]

Ms JOHNSTON (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to make my contribution on the substantive motion. This is a very serious motion and I take very seriously my responsibilities in this place, representing the people of Clark, who put so much trust in me.

After the last state election, I wrote to the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Greens. I said, in an open and transparent way that has been well publicised, that I would consider each issue that was before me in this place on its merits. I would do that for bills, motions and particularly motions of no-confidence. I outlined three key principles that would guide my decision-making. The first was that I wanted to see transparent and accountable government; the second, a high degree of integrity within parliament and its processes; and, finally, that I wanted to make sure decisions that would promote the interests of Tasmania and improve the lives of Tasmanians would be put first.

This is the approach I have taken to this motion before us. The motion deals with three key issues. Unlike other motions about confidence or supply issues, there is no real rhetoric in this motion. It is a pretty straightforward, straight-bat motion. It deals with three key aspects: budget mismanagement, the sale of public assets and major project failures. I will consider each of those issues and apply my three key principles.

First, to budget mismanagement. It is pretty clear from commentary since the Budget was released on Thursday last week that many are gravely concerned about the direction this government is heading in when it comes to financial management. The commentary has been quite astounding. Perhaps the most amusing, but also perhaps the most apt commentary was a description by federal independent member for Clark, Andrew Wilkie, when he said:

To see this government's financial planning in action is like watching a possum on crack trying to load a dishwasher.

Humorous, but I believe it paints a serious picture about what this government is doing to the finances of Tasmania. I referenced economist Saul Eslake this morning in my contribution on the amendment. Mr Eslake, on ABC Radio last Friday morning described the Budget as a 'triumph of hope over experience.'

What we are witnessing is not economic strategy, it is economic fantasy. The government is steering Tasmania towards more than \$10 billion in general government sector debt by 2028-29, running a deficit this financial year of over \$1 billion, with no credible path back to balance, let alone surplus. No credible path - that has been said time and time again by many in the community and many experts. Add to this the debt of GBEs and state-owned companies, and the net debt is forecast to reach an eye-watering \$17.6 billion by 30 June 2028, with net interest payments of \$854 million by 2028-29. That \$854 million is another eye-watering figure. That is before any increasingly likely credit downgrade, which will make those costs even higher.

However, this same government wants to spend upwards of \$1 billion, and more likely closer to \$2 billion, on a stadium that most Tasmanians do not want, that we do not need, cannot afford and is unsuitable on a site that is too small for it.

There is no magic pudding. Spending directed to paying off a debt is spending not directed to essential services and support for Tasmanians. In the Budget, the government's so-called plan to fix the budget relies on four pillars in the forward Estimates. First, it relies on slashing the public service by 7 per cent, or about 2500 jobs, by 2032-33. The government says that will not be frontline services. However, they cannot tell us what frontline services or essential services are. There is this artificial distinction between frontline services and backline services. I have been inundated by people contacting me, concerned that they would be what this government would describe as backline services and pointing out just how essential their backline jobs are to providing frontline services to the community. It is an artificial delineation.

The government plans to restrict spending growth in operating expenses to just 0.3 per cent over four years to 2028-29, when the lowest in the last two decades has been 2.1 per cent. Again, Saul Eslake says this is a budget triumph of hope over experience. This is the government that, in September 2024, when it delivered its previous budget, told us it would expend a certain amount of money, blew that by the time the Revised Estimates Report came out in February and blew it again considerably by May this year. They expect us to believe that they will perform a miracle. What they have not been able to do in the last 10 budgets they are suddenly going to be able to do in the forward Estimates. It is simply a work of fiction, a fantasy from this government.

The third pillar is that they are going to sell off revenue-generating assets and public land. I will speak about this in greater detail further into my contribution.

Finally, the government has refused to raise revenue in fair and sensible ways. We have had a road map delivered to us by experts such as Saul Eslake of how it could do that in a fair and responsible way. The government have simply refused to do it. It has ignored expert advice and community concern. It continues on its splurging ways, spending money on capital expenditure like it is going out of fashion, slashing the public service delivering essential services to the community and living in fantasy land when it comes to its projections in 2028-29.

The so-called non-essential jobs it plans to cut are often the very roles that make this government work more efficiently; people like policy experts who can advise them on the most effective programs and services, and administrative workers who allow frontline workers to focus on delivering one-on-one services. It is not like the government has not been warned. The community has been pleading with them for some time now. The community services sector has been pleading with them. The situation is getting worse; it is getting worse for young people, for families, for older people. I keep telling the government that you need to do more, to focus on the right priorities. The government has not listened. Experts have been telling us. Again, Saul Eslake in August was explicit with what the trajectory was. The government ignored that. It said it could not do anything in time for its September budget but would consider it for the next budget. By the time the government responded in February, once the Revised Estimates Report came out, the situation was far worse. Fast-forward to last week, worse again.

We talk a lot about numbers in this place and, certainly, the numbers I read about net debt are eye-watering. However, I want to put the human face to what budget mismanagement means. It is not just the numbers in the Treasury books. It is about the human impact of that mismanagement. I have seen social media commentary and other media commentary, and mainlanders who are tuning in watching this debate unfold today. This should not be seen just through a football lens - a yes team and no team lens. I ask them to consider what budget mismanagement means for Tasmanians at a human level. It means that on this really cold winter night, when it is about 5°Celsius outside, we have people sleeping rough, people who have been on the public housing waiting list for over seven years. We have families who have been waiting desperately for a loved one to get urgent care in our hospitals, who have been suffering in pain waiting for hip replacements. We have cancer sufferers who are waiting for diagnosis and biopsy services to come back and report so that they know what the right treatment is going to be. We have children tonight who are at risk in homes because we do not have enough frontline services dealing with child safety.

That is what budget mismanagement means. It means we are not putting roofs over people's heads, we are not making people better and fixing their ills, we are not protecting children like we should be. That is the real cost of budget mismanagement. That is why it has to stop because it is impacting on the lives of Tasmanians.

I will turn to the issue of asset sales. The House has already spoken very clearly on this issue in previous motions, and the community understands the madness of proposing to sell revenue-generating assets. They get that once you sell them, they are gone forever, and they are worried about what the proceeds of any sales will be applied to. If it is to pay down debt, they have no confidence that this government will not rack it back up again, but the next time around, we will have nothing to sell. They are worried that we will sell assets to pay for a stadium that we do not need, cannot afford and do not want.

The third pillar of this motion is around major project failure. The motion references, in particular, the *Spirits* debacle. That has seen a \$400 million cost blowout. It took a hell of a lot of effort for this parliament - and I recognise the efforts of the opposition here - to get the truth out of the Premier on this major project failure. I am still not convinced that we have heard the whole story and got to the bottom of the story when it comes to the *Spirits*.

There are other examples of this government mishandling major projects. The high-performance centre is another classic example. I have been asking myself, and Tasmanians have been asking me, what this means for the biggest infrastructure project. This Premier wants to push through the biggest one, the stadium, without proper process. It is 50 per cent designed and there are already significant cost blowouts. If it follows the path that the berth has followed, a 400 per cent blowout, then it is going to be a \$4 billion stadium.

I heard the Leader of Government Business get up before and say that the \$90 million budget figure, initially for the berth, was a fanciful figure. Guess what was also a fanciful figure? A \$715 million stadium. Apply the kind of cost blowouts, the kind of risks that the Treasury documents and the budget documents outlined to the stadium, and we are looking at a multi-billion-dollar stadium. That is the cost of those Tasmanians who are cold tonight, who are at risk in their homes tonight, who are in pain tonight because they have not got essential healthcare and services and surgery that they need.

Then, of course, we have this Premier who has not listened to the community, the experts or the Tasmanian Planning Commission and the concerns that they are raising in their proper assessment of the stadium. He is trying to abandon the Project of State Significance process, yet we still have hearings about to commence on 25 June, right when we are supposed to be debating his enabling legislation. Yesterday, before the consultation even closed on the bill, he tabled the legislation. That is arrogance supreme.

I have consistently been on the public record raising these concerns. There are other concerns that I have with this Premier and they are on the record too. I note, as others have done, the Premier's massive backflip over mandatory pre-commitment cards for poker machines. I spoke at the time there was a no-confidence motion about my deep concern and my distrust of this particular Premier.

I know that there are other major projects and issues of concern and that there are multiple communities around Tasmania who are worried about this Premier. They are worried that he will not follow through with what he says he will do because time and time again we have seen him backflip.

I have not taken this decision lightly. I do it with a really heavy heart. The Premier, when he is backed against the wall, instead of listening and negotiating, sadly issues threats. We saw it most recently when he initiated a threat to the Legislative Council regarding his enabling legislation: 'Pass my enabling legislation or we have no team' - a clear threat. His back was up against the wall. He could tell the community was so deeply concerned about his stadium and that the TPC were raising legitimate concerns about his stadium, so he decided that the best path forward was to issue a threat to the Legislative Council.

Last night we saw the Premier with his back against the wall, following a clear indication from the crossbench and the opposition's no-confidence motion, issue another threat: 'No confidence in me means an election.' That is not his call to make, not his call at all. This is

a no-confidence motion in the Premier. There are other options available. There are clearly different ways that we could go about a change of direction, one that listens to the community and listens to experts.

I have never shied away from making hard decisions. My record has shown that I will not shy away from calling out bad decisions and injustices. I have applied my key principles that I talked about in my letter to the Premier, opposition leader, and the Leader of the Greens. They are those three key principles: transparency, accountability, and integrity in processes in the best interest of Tasmanians.

I cannot close my eyes to the problems with this Premier. I accept that stability is important, but not at any cost. I will not throw Tasmanians under the bus to protect a Premier who is not keeping his word. I will not rubberstamp bad decisions and bad leadership. Tasmanians want competent, responsible, transparent and accountable government and leadership the most. We cannot avoid calling out wrongdoing because it might end in an election. That smacks of political self-interest. Tasmanians want us to do our job, they want us to draw a line in the sand, and I think we have reached that line in the sand.

This is an opportunity not for an election, as a Premier suggests, but an opportunity for the government to reflect, for the Liberal Party to reflect and make changes that Tasmanians need and want; to listen; to avoid the foreseeable mistakes before it is too late; to put Tasmanians first; to do the right thing; to stop this Premier's actions, destroying the budget, destroying Tasmanians in their future and doing the right thing.

[6.31 p.m.]

Mrs PETRUSMA (Franklin - Minister for Health) - Honourable Speaker, I rise tonight to speak against this abhorrent motion. I absolutely join all of my Liberal Party colleagues here tonight in 100 per cent backing Premier Jeremy Rockliff to the hilt. I back him as a person of integrity who we absolutely 100 per cent support and trust to get on with the job and to deliver for Tasmania and Tasmanians.

I met the Premier back in 2009 when I first stood for the Liberal Party for the 2010 election and my admiration, appreciation and support of him has only grown over the years. I have seen him as Deputy Leader of the Opposition, then as Deputy Premier, now as Premier, and history will reflect kindly on this government and on him as Premier.

I can tell you now tonight, that it will not reflect kindly on the honourable Dean Winter and all who support this motion. Tasmanians are absolutely sick and tired of elections and Labor will find that out at the ballot box. They know that Labor is not focused on what matters. They are focused on themselves. They are not focused on Tasmania, but they are focused on being in power.

They will see tonight that Mr Winter is like a windscreen wiper. He is born here, he is born there, he is been born everywhere, man. He is for privatisation, he is against privatisation. He is against the stadium, he is for the stadium.

We have heard a lot spoken tonight about the Budget. There are a few of us still here who remember very well what it was like to be in opposition between 2010-2014, to actually experience what budgets were like under the Labor-Greens government.

I remember well the 2011-12 budget where \$877 million was cut where a nurse a day was sacked over nine months which made 270 nurses sacked. There were job losses everywhere and people leaving the state. Hospital wards were shut. Beds were locked up. Some 20 schools were at risk of closure. The unemployment rate was skyrocketing. In fact, our youth unemployment rate was way over 8 per cent.

Then they come in here and lecture us about budgeting. I thought I would go back and reflect on their alternative budgets because between 2010-2014, in opposition, we tabled an alternative budget every year. In 2014-2015, this was their alternative budget. We thought, 'This is a great budgeting skill.' This is the alternative budget in 2014-15. We thought, they have just come out of government, they have just gone into opposition. Maybe they have forgotten already how to do a budget, but we thought we would give them another year.

Then, in 2015-16, this again is their alternative budget. There are so many numbers on here.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - If you are reading from it, it is okay, but you cannot use it as a prop, minister.

Mrs PETRUSMA - I have written on here in tiny letters '2016-17 alternative budget'. Then we thought '2017-18, maybe this is the year,' 2017-18 alternative budget. We thought maybe 2018-19 might be the year.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - No using it as a prop, minister.

Mrs PETRUSMA - But then, okay, 2019-20, maybe there is an alternative budget, 2020-21 maybe there will be an alternative budget. Budget 2021-22. Was there an alternative budget?

Mr Ferguson - No.

Mrs PETRUSMA - No. 2023-24? 2024-25? It is now 2025-26 and they have come in here today and lectured us about a budget, but they cannot even show what an alternative budget is. Until they can actually demonstrate that they know what goes into a budget - for example, they came in here yesterday, and in the *Mercury* it is written up too, how apparently we had under-spent digital health transformation by \$7.2 million. They did not even bother to read page 113 or budget paper 2 volume 1 where it showed we had actually spent that \$7.2 million earlier in 2024-25.

We had actually pulled it forward and spent it because digital health transformation is very important to this government. They also talk about budgeting, and I remember well at the 2024 election, we were in the dying days of the election, that Labor came out and they promised more than \$3.6 billion, while announcing \$2 billion in cuts, including an estimated \$173 million in cuts to health services.

I came back at the 2024 election because I had stepped down in 2022. The reason I came back in 2024 was because I believe in the Premier. I believe in what he wants to do for this state. I believe in his vision because I know that he cares. He is a proud Tasmanian and I also know what he wants to achieve for this state.

Nobody can deny that Tasmania is a much better place under the Liberal government and under Premier Jeremy Rockliff. We have created thousands of jobs: over 47,000 more Tasmanians work compared to 2014 and the dying days of the Labor government. Our unemployment rate is now at a record low of 3.9 per cent, and these are not just numbers, these are real people able to earn a living because of the economic decisions that this Liberal government and under Premier Jeremy Rockliff have taken over the past 10 years.

Because our economy has been strong, because our economy has turned around from those dark days under Labor and the Greens - and that is where we will return to - we are able to emerge from the pandemic in a position of strength. The facts are, a new election just over 12 months after the last one is the last thing that Tasmania needs. Even Labor said this themselves just a few months ago. As Dr Shane Broad said just last month:

I do not believe that Tasmanians are ready for another state election. It would reflect poorly on all of us. This is a time when we know that things like business confidence are hanging on by a thread. This state needs stability for a period. The election was over a bit over a year ago. We do not need another one right now.

It is the only time I ever thought that Dr Broad was Nostradamus, but yes, he is correct, it does reflect poorly on all of us. It is clear in this, that Winter really does not care about Tasmanians; he only cares about himself and his own ambition to be premier.

I want to speak specifically about Health and where we were and how far we have come. As I said before, under Labor and the Greens, a nurse a day was sacked for nine months, 270 days. A single brick was failed to be laid on the Royal Hobart Hospital redevelopment. Our hospitals were run down.

Under Premier Jeremy Rockliff, both as minister for Health and as the Premier, we have turned that ship around. We are delivering more doctors, more nurses, more paramedics, more elective surgeries and more health surgeries than ever before. We are delivering more than 50,000 outpatient appointments on average every month, which is 10,000 more back in than back in 2014. We are delivering more elective surgeries than ever before and more than 22,190 surgeries in 2023-24, breaking the previous record of 21,364. That is almost 60 surgeries a day on average.

We have reduced the elective surgery waiting list from 12,271 in January 2021, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, to 9,114 in April 2025. Ambulances spending 21,504 less hours ramped from May 2024 to April this year, a 67 per cent reduction compared to the same period the year before. This is something that Labor said we would not fix; we are fixing ramping. This means that Tasmanian ambulances and paramedics have been able to spend 21,504 more hours out in the community with Tasmanians in need in one year. In the 2025-26 Budget, we are building on this momentum. We are investing a record \$14.5 billion into Health, a historic record - 34 per cent of the state budget. It is a 12 per cent increase or an extra \$1.6 billion from last year's \$12.9 billion. What are Labor saying that they are going to cut? They are coming here saying we have no budgeting skills. Well, what are they going to cut? We do not know because they have not put forward an alternative budget.

I can tell what we are doing with our money in Health. We are investing an additional \$880 million over the next four years specifically to meet demand on health services. We are

also spending \$70.2 million over the next four years on our new four-year elective surgery plan, 2025 to 2029, which follows our first four-year plan, which, as I have said, has seen a record number of elective surgeries delivered and the highest per capita admission rate for elective surgery of any state or territory. This target investment ensures we can continue this momentum so more Tasmanians can receive their procedure sooner.

We are also investing in more staff with more doctors, more nurses and more paramedics. We are delivering the biggest health hiring blitz in Tasmania's history. It is delivering and it is working. Since April 2024, in one year we have put on 3160 new staff, including 1080 nurses, 576 doctors, 77 paramedics and 282 allied health workers. In contrast, between 2010 to 2014, Labor sacked a nurse a day over nine months: 270 nurses. No one can deny we are recruiting and we are committed to recruiting as fast as possible and as soon as possible, as we have done across the past year.

We have also launched our GP Now Rapid Response team, with five GPs commenced and recruitment for another five underway. We are partnering with GPs already working in regional and rural Tasmania to strengthen and sustain their practices through flexible grant funding of up to \$250,000 per year. We have also invested in significant incentives to not only bring health workers here, but to keep them here, including \$4 million to deliver 40 new GPs to work in our rural and regional areas for five years.

In fact, we are currently spending around \$50 million to support primary care initiatives in Tasmania, which is the federal government's responsibility. That \$50 million could otherwise have been spent on our public hospitals, but as the Premier outlined today, it is because this government has a heart and we care. That is why we are doing this, even though it is a federal government responsibility.

For nurses we are continuing to deliver our \$10-million incentive package as committed to in the 2024-25 Budget to provide a relocation allowance of up to \$15,000 for nurses and midwives who move to Tasmania, and \$10,000 for new Tasmanian graduate nurses who work full time in the Tasmanian Health Service (THS) for three years. That has been working, because nurses are wanting to move to Tasmania. In fact, we have nurses and doctors and allied health professionals moving from all around the world to come and live in Tasmania because of the achievements of this government under Premier Rockliff.

As part of the \$14.5 billion, the 2025-26 Budget also locks in \$805.42 million in the capital investment program, including \$663.5 million across the forward Estimates for hospital and health infrastructure, \$112.8 million for digital health transformation, \$24 million for medical equipment, \$4.7 million for a new state-of-the-art surgical robot at the Launceston General Hospital for improved clinical outcomes for prostate and kidney cancers and gynaecological surgery, and \$423,000 for aeromedical support.

This \$805.42-million investment shows we are continuing to rebuild Tasmania's major hospitals and health facilities, because when we inherited them they were run down. We are doing this to ensure staff and patients have access to world-class facilities and technology alongside a boosted workforce. Over the past 11 years, because of what we inherited when we came to government in 2014, we have invested more than \$1 billion in new hospitals and health infrastructure, and we will spend \$1 billion more over the next decade to keep building a better health system for Tasmanians now and for the future.

We have locked in upgrades at all our major hospitals; we have also funded, and are still funding, the delivery of 16 new and upgraded ambulance stations as well as new vehicles across the state, with \$16 million in the Budget towards new ambulance stations, including at Cygnet, Snug, King Island and Legana.

We are investing \$14 million for the new Diagnostic Breast Imaging clinic in Hobart, along with \$110.5 million to progress the St John's Park Health and Wellbeing Precinct, including \$70 million for an older person's mental health facility. There is \$33.7 million for a child and adolescent mental health inpatient unit and day facility and \$6.45 million for a dedicated eating disorders treatment centre.

Because of the Premier's outstanding efforts, there is also \$88 million for the new Northern Heart Centre and \$24 million for the Kingston Health Centre stage 2 to provide increased community health facilities for this growing region, with construction scheduled to be completed in early 2027. There is also \$3.27 million to deliver stage two of the Midlands Multipurpose Health Centre upgrade in Oatlands, the heart of Tasmania.

These investments are all designed to give Tasmanians the healthcare system they expect and that they deserve. It stands in stark contrast to Labor, which, as I said before, failed to lay a single brick on the Royal Hobart Hospital redevelopment and went to the 2024 election promising zero infrastructure investment into Tasmanian's major hospitals.

Only the Liberal government has a strong plan and the Budget to back it up to invest in health care in our major hospitals.

We invested, as I said, more than \$1 billion in new hospitals and health infrastructure to deliver a better health system for all Tasmania, and the Premier as the former minister for health has overseen many of these. For example, in January 2023, the first stage of the Royal Hobart Hospital Emergency Department expansion was opened, providing an additional 28 beds. We also completed the first stage of the Endoscopy Short Stay Suite in December, and the second stage in July last year. In March 2023, the Premier was there to announce the completion of the Royal Hobart Hospital Cardiology Unit redevelopment, providing contemporary space for patients and also allowing for the establishment of a dedicated sleep centre.

We have also delivered 12 new Intensive Care Unit beds following the completed construction of the Intensive Care Unit expansion, and new outpatient and pre-admission clinics commenced services at the Royal Hobart Hospital on 9 May 2023.

At Oatlands, at the Midlands Multi-purpose Health Centre, construction of the new residential care wing was completed last year, with patients now moved into their new and improved facilities. At the Launceston General Hospital, a number of key milestones were met, including the new dedicated Women's and Children's Precinct, which opened last year. The new administration and learning building, which incorporates the Anne O'Byrne Education Centre, opened in November 2022.

Because of the Premier's efforts, we delivered the \$5.8 million Antenatal Clinic at the North West Regional Hospital in August 2022. This has brought together a range of antenatal services from across the hospital into one location so that a woman's outpatient journey for maternity is delivered at the same place. We have also delivered a range of critical upgrades at

the Mersey Community Hospital. In terms of ambulance infrastructure, we have delivered for the community there as well.

Late last year I had the pleasure and honour of being alongside the Premier at Burnie where we opened the new Burnie Ambulance Superstation. We invested \$12.4 million into that facility, and anyone who sees it will know how well it will serve that community for years to come, with a large garage, dedicated staff training areas to support continued professional development, staff meeting rooms and improved secure access for staff and visitors.

This is real infrastructure, built from the ground up and delivered under this Premier and under this government, and it will directly benefit the people in the north-west. These are the things that really matter.

Under the Premier, we have also established master plans for the development of all major hospitals: the North West Regional Hospital, the Mersey Community Hospital, the Launceston General Hospital and the Royal Hobart Hospital.

We have cut red tape by expanding the list of eligible vaccines that could be administered by pharmacists, and the recent Budget expanded on that further.

We have developed the Long-term Plan for Healthcare in Tasmania 2040, our vision for the future of healthcare in Tasmania, and we have provided community-based paediatric services by delivering new kids' care clinics under the state - all of this under Premier Jeremy Rockliff.

Yet this motion claims the Premier has apparently been doing long-term damage to Tasmania. Out of all that that I have read out tonight, what exactly are they saying has caused any long-term damage? This is all about making sure Tasmanians have the right health care in the right place at the right time, because we are delivering real outcomes for Tasmanians with new and upgraded infrastructure.

It is a joke, and Labor should be ashamed of bringing this motion on. The Greens should also hang their heads in shame for supporting this motion. This government has been delivering. This Premier has been delivering. This motion does nothing for the Tasmanian people. Mr Winter talks about the budget, but he showed us yesterday that he cannot even deliver an alternative budget.

Mr Winter calls integrity into question. Do you think that he can lead this state if he cannot even own up to his mistakes, if he cannot even own up to where he lives, if he cannot even correct the record on where he was born? He has no credibility, he has misled the people of Tasmania, he has misled the parliament and he has the gall to think he can lead this state. He also has the gall to think he can even deliver a budget when he cannot even deliver an alternative budget. I oppose this motion.

[6.51 p.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, nobody in their career in this place wants to find themselves in the circumstances that we find ourselves in today. In this place I have no doubt that each and every one of us wakes up every day and believes in our abilities to do the best for Tasmania. We have a desire to see the best for our people, the best for our

communities, the best for our businesses and industry. We continue to ensure that we give the greatest support to this island to grow our national and international reputation.

When we find ourselves in a situation where, as a state, there are things that continue to hold us back, there are things that continue to undermine our reputation, there are actions that are unbelievable that would occur and are holding us back, something needs to happen. The nature of the motion today is a no-confidence motion in the Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, and it moves that the House agrees that the Premier, the honourable Jeremy Rockliff's budget mismanagement is doing significant long-term damage to Tasmania. It moves that the House does not support the Premier's plan to privatise public assets, that the House has no faith in the Premier's ability to deliver major projects following the *Spirits of Tasmania* fiasco, and that the House has no confidence in the Premier, Jeremy Rockliff.

There has been much said today from both sides of the House and from the crossbench about Jeremy as a person. There is no doubt that his care for, his passion and his commitment to Tasmania is deep and is strong. There is no doubt, as many other members have mentioned, and I reflect on the contribution from our shadow treasurer, Josh Willie, when he was opposite the Premier as Education minister, that he has given much and served much in our state and made contributions that have had an impact positively, particularly in the area of education. I think today it is important to put those matters on the record. There is no doubt that as a deputy leader, Jeremy Rockliff was strong, determined and loyal always to the many people that he served with. In that role he was perfect for Tasmania.

It serves as no pleasure for anyone to have to stand in this place and speak to a no-confidence motion about a fellow parliamentarian, but the reality is that we are called upon to do what is hard, not always what is easy. When we find ourselves in these circumstances, we need to call it out. As much regard and respect I have for the Premier, stepping into leadership is not for everybody. It is equally not for everybody when you step into leadership in difficult circumstances and with a difficult environment around you. There is no doubt that calling on colleagues, ministers to deliver for Tasmania, to ensure that they support Tasmania in their homes, in their businesses, support people that are choosing to invest and come to Tasmania or to understand why people are choosing to leave Tasmania - that is not an easy task and it is not for everybody.

Tasmania, this place, has lost confidence in this Premier. As I move around the state and particularly in my electorate I repeatedly hear warm words spoken about the Premier but concern about his ability to lead Tasmania in these times. Tasmanian Labor, I know, in the many caucus conversations that we had leading up to this time, worried about the moment where the Premier would not take hold of what was required in Tasmania and take control of the finances, take control of the ministerial positions that were being presented to Tasmania and the failures across his team and his failure to direct and expect certain outcomes from his ministers.

In my own electorate of Bass, there are many examples where people are being let down. I think it is important that we step back today from the internal parliamentary narrative in the Chamber about budgets and no-confidence motions and motions and the things that occur in the processes that happen in the parliament and look up to what actually happens as a result of the things in this parliament that have impact in our community.

One of the things that has been talked about with the Budget is honesty. One of the greatest failings, I think, of this government and this Premier is the lack of courage to be open with our community in a timely manner as things occur and they get bad. I think the true measure of a great leader is being able to openly express difficult moments, mistakes, failures, or areas of learning as they happen in order to face them and correct them. We know there are many examples on the record, particularly around the *Spirits*, where that just did not happen and members of our Tasmanian community were materially and financially harmed.

I know, in my own community and in my old stakeholder areas, that there were people investing in and preparing for the extra capacity for our ships, not only in tourism but in our primary industries. They were financially harmed by not having early information about the lack of progress and the lack of clarity around what was happening not only with the *Spirits*, but also with the berths, and across a whole range of areas in primary industries.

We know that the late advisory to the tourism industry right across Tasmania, but more importantly on the north-west coast and in the north of Tasmania, tourism and hospitality businesses were investing to prepare for that extra capacity. Some people were borrowing on borrowings to actually invest in that because they knew it would be a pathway forward for them. The pressure that those people have been put under in themselves and their families and then as a result by the unexpected increase occurring for their team members and workers has an ongoing ripple effect right across our community.

I know that, more locally in Launceston, the lack of honesty around decisions and timing on impacts just is not on the big commercial areas that Tasmanian Labor often focus on, but in the smaller but absolutely critical issues that work to the deepest emotions of individuals and families. Something that is close to my heart is the hospice in northern Tasmania. There was some reporting over the last couple of weeks about differences about this budget and whether it actually meant that the delivery of the hospice was delayed.

There were commitments by the government that that was not the case. I know that there was a sigh of relief in that community in northern Tasmania. I am also aware that there were statements made on the record that the Allambi Building would be decanted by the end of June in order to progress that project. There are people, workers in that building who are not going to be out of that building. They know that will not happen. Not being honest and clear around timings and positions with the community impacts existing workers. It impacts people who are going to come in there, and future workers. It impacts families that, right now, are experiencing a loved one who is close to the end of their life and might miss out now on the experience and support of a hospice, but might be hopeful that in the future, not too far down the path, that somebody can be supported by that hospice.

There are the *Spirits of Tasmania*. There is the northern hospice. There are the hundreds of workers at Bell Bay with Liberty, where this government is saying they are in regular contact, they understand the issues, they know what is going on - but we actually know that that is not correct. We know that, if this government had ministers where this business is in their own electorate, been in regular contact and been onsite talking with workers and with leadership, they would have been more across those issues and therefore not have put those hundreds of workers at risk as far as they are in Tasmania.

There are big issues with this government, and I am a big believer that what happens at one level happens at another level. There are tiny issues that are a problem with this

government. This government have repeatedly, since I have been in this place, and when I was the shadow for small business, talked about the reduction of red tape. Again, needing to be honest with. If there are any people in our community who are under pressure, individuals in households, but also people who actually own and operate real small businesses are under so much pressure; if they do have an employee, they are not only trying to look after their own household budgets and their business budgets, they also feel a responsibility for their workers' household and home budgets and financial positions.

I have had, curiously, over the last month or so, four or five individual members of our community who would like to, under pressure where you cannot buy eggs at the moment, have some chickens in their backyard and start selling eggs at local markets and in local supermarkets. The ridiculousness of the level of red tape required for someone to put up a 3x3 shed that does not have to do anything to the eggs except they are collected, they are packaged and then they are delivered in the same day.

The cost, tens of thousands of dollars and months of delay for people to be able to deliver something simple to the community. How can this Premier sit across the governance, a Premier who understands primary industries, sit across and allow people in their community, maybe in their retirement, maybe in adding an extra string of income to their household, make something so simple so complicated.

This government, under the leadership of this Premier, have lost control. They have lost clarity. I often use interchangeable language about whether they have either lost the capacity to care or the capacity to deliver, because so often the decisions that come out of this government led by this Premier make no sense

We have businesses in northern Tasmania: construction, civil construction, many in Tasmania that are in the ecosystem of our civil works; businesses that rely on that rely on a smooth and understood, well-advanced pipeline of works for them to continue to deliver for the infrastructure of Tasmania and also for their workers. We have numerous businesses that are in contact with us regularly who are having to lay off tens of staff from week to week under their business because where they had a commitment made for a project that is then withdrawn. We have businesses that have put tens of thousands of dollars into tenders then the tenders are cancelled, then they are asked to retender, to reinvest that money to go again, only to have it then directly appointed to somebody else.

Under this Premier's leadership, although some of these issues might be by other ministers, it is the responsibility of the leader to actually set the tone for the ministers and the tone for the outcomes in this place to ensure that, in Tasmania, things are not made harder, things are not made more complex, that the ministers understand the material impact, the financial impact they have on individuals and businesses by the lack of decisions or the crazy overwhelming decisions that they make because a lack of decision is as bad as a poor decision - and, in fact, I can remember when I first came into my primary industry space, some of my farmers said to me,

We almost do not care the decision the government made. We know they are not actually necessarily going to make a great decision. We just need them to make a decision because we can deal with what happens if we know what it is, but we cannot deal with it if they just do not make a decision.

Recently, there was an announcement, and we welcomed this announcement with Abel Energy at Bell Bay. It has taken years. There is not much more patient capital than the capital behind the Abel Energy project in Tasmania, who have been here since the very beginning with so many other businesses that were attracted in with the promise of this government of an opportunity at Bell Bay. They were promised there was infrastructure, water and energy; they come in and they spend their money in this community and our reputation is ruined because the government cannot deliver. Finally, Abel Energy have been announced as a lead proponent of the hydrogen hub in Bell Bay, but just an announcement does not make an outcome.

We know that, in order for that project to go ahead, it does need water, it does need power and it needs other support in that area. The water to be delivered to Bell Bay is required to go through the farming precinct of the Tamar Valley and to actually bring forward the Tamar Valley Irrigation Scheme but the farmers are not aware of the advancement of the water for the Bell Bay scheme. The Bell Bay people say that they have got it assured, but actually this government cannot put together simple pieces of a project that will create an outcome for Tasmania.

We have farmers in the Tamar Valley who had to pay a bond for their expression of interest for their water. Many farmers had been investing in their property, so they borrowed the money to pay the bond and are paying interest on the borrowings, while this government cannot make a decision, cannot advance an outcome. For me personally, I see that the leadership of this Premier, the inability to bring together a series of ministers to deliver good outcomes for Tasmanians is letting Tasmanians down.

We know that under this Premier's leadership, the Treasurer has been allowed to bring forward a budget that does not seek to correct the poor financial performances of Tasmania and does not seek to correct the poor trajectory of the financial position of Tasmania. We know that and the government have been on notice for so long that Tasmania cannot continue to carry the burden of significant deficits and the debt that is spiralling out of control.

We know, over the last three years that the Premier has been the leader of Tasmania, Tasmania has recorded the three worst financial outcomes in our history. We know that there is no commitment within this budget to actually retard that increase in the debt, there is no commitment to bring that back and it will escalate to \$11 billion by the end of the budget period.

The lack of willingness for this government to do the right thing and act with financial responsibility means that future generations of Tasmanians will carry that burden. We know that already. This government talks about confidence and stability, but we know that that does not exist in Tasmania because plane loads of young people are leaving Tasmania now like they did in the 90s, looking for other opportunities. They are not confident about the future of Tasmania; they are concerned about the burden that is being placed on them.

When we talk in this place about billions of dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars, that does not necessarily always mean something to the individuals in Tasmania, but to know that the tens of thousands of dollars per every Tasmanian that are being carried by the poor financial outcomes of this government, that matters and that means something to Tasmanians.

We call on this place. This government, this Premier, had the opportunity through this budget to correct the pressure being placed on Tasmanians. This government, this Premier, had

the opportunity with this budget to stop the wrecking and stop breaking Tasmania financially, but they chose not to do it. I am on the record yesterday saying in this place, that I believe - and I think it is atrocious - that the government is actually intentionally not seeking to correct the financial positions of this state because it wants to make it harder for a future government to correct, knowing how they are not being able to correct that. Really, in this place, we are all in this together.

People talk today in their contributions about having to work together and be positive for Tasmania and this is just a negative thing happening right now, but that is not what this Premier is delivering. This Premier is not delivering strong outcomes for Tasmania. This Premier, through his leadership, is undermining the capacity of many in this state to do what they do well. Many of the conversations that I have as I go around, whether it be in my energy portfolio or whether it be in my primary industries portfolio, is sometimes the best thing a government can do is get out of the way.

We talk about the reduction of red tape, not applying more pressure, not applying more overwhelming red tape to businesses. This government has to figure out when it is going to stand up and be honest. It has to figure out when it is actually going to reduce the burdens on Tasmania. This Premier has been responsible over the last three years for getting us to this point. The Premier has served over the worst three financial records in Tasmania's history. The Premier has allowed the Treasurer to deliver another budget that puts Tasmania in a worse financial outcome. The Premier has stood on stage with this treasurer at the Budget Roadshow in the last week and been proud of and supported the Treasurer for what is a diabolical budget for Tasmania's future.

Tasmanian Labor can no longer support this Premier. We are calling on the House to indicate it has no confidence in the Premier. We are calling on this place to demonstrate the no-confidence that this government and this Premier have so astoundingly delivered in terms of the horrific processes with the *Spirits of Tasmania* and with the birds. We know there are so many other projects like that that have not been delivered, that have been poorly thought through, that have not had great governance to them, and Tasmanian Labor say, today is the day where we have to draw the line.

We know that the Premier has given up. We know that the government has given up. We know that the Premier not only cannot manage major projects, but cannot manage the budget. I was on record yesterday saying that when we ask simple questions of the Premier, that he could not answer, he potentially also does not understand the budget. We know that Tasmanians can no longer trust this Premier.

Tasmanian Labor have not come to this position lightly. It is not a day that anyone wanted to have, moving a no-confidence motion in an individual of this place. On record, during the period of time that Jeremy Rockliff has been in this place and served Tasmania, I know he has done it with the best of intentions, with his heart and is respected by many but the step up to be the leader of Tasmania, to be the Premier of Tasmania, has not worked. It is hurting Tasmanians, and we call on the parliament today to support the no-confidence motion in Jeremy Rockliff.

[7.10 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Finance) - Honourable Deputy Speaker, Dean Winter has today moved to overturn the will of the Tasmanian people, to overturn the

government they chose just one year ago for the worst possible reason - just because he can. There is no mandate for this motion. It shows Mr Winter's contempt for the Tasmanian people and his disregard for their best interests in favour of his own.

At the election just 14 months ago, Tasmanians voted for a Liberal government led by Jeremy Rockliff, governing in minority in a larger parliament, for four years. Today, Mr Winter said, 'I do not believe I can in good conscience allow this Premier to continue.' Well, Mr Winter, that is the Tasmanian people's decision to make, not yours. They did not vote for another dysfunctional Labor-Greens government, which is what they might get if this motion is supported today. If you rely on the votes, you, Mr Winter, may have, for this motion, to form government. They did not vote for the uncertainty of a desperate, unplanned coalition that will start life at war with itself on issues like salmon, forestry and the stadium, which is what we might get today. How can this be good for Tasmania? I do not think anyone has thought this through. I do not think any Tasmanian has asked for this and no Tasmanian will benefit from it.

Tasmanians voted twice for the government that steered them through COVID and kept people and families and their jobs and businesses safe. They voted for the government and the Premier who initiated and responded with compassion and conviction to the commission of inquiry to investigate the failings of successive governments to keep children safe. They voted for a premier and a government that has the experience and maturity to lead our state through not only the unprecedented challenges and heartbreak of these issues themselves, but also the immediate and longer term consequences for the state's finances of dealing with these issues, which have a long tail.

Mr Winter never opposed the decisions and the actions taken by this government to meet these unprecedented challenges back then, because it was the right thing to do. He did so in full knowledge that they came at the cost of billions of dollars of unplanned but essential public funding, which would take years to pay for and would have a massive impact on the state's finances in the future - until now. Now he is talking as if all that never happened, as if the last five years has been business as usual and those billions were never spent. Mr Winter supported the spending at the time, but now wants to frame its consequences as budget mismanagement.

We have to rebuild the financial capacity that was depleted by the cost of COVID and the commission of inquiry, just as we need to fill the budget black hole Labor created by spending the public service superannuation provision. We have to do that in a way that does not affect spending on essential services and infrastructure, that will drive continuing investment, jobs and revenue for the state so we can continue to pay for those services. We need to avoid shocks to the economy and public service that affect people's lives and livelihoods and their confidence to invest in their homes and businesses and communities. That is what our Budget actually does. It is not a pretty picture, but it is an honest picture of where we are and what we are doing to take the state's finances back to surplus over time.

Again, Mr Winter criticises the Budget but does not present any alternative. His Budget reply failed to lay out any significant departures from the government's own spending policies and fiscal strategies. He has condemned every single savings and efficiency measure the government has proposed or even considered, while at the same time saying we are doing nothing to improve the state's financial position and that we should be spending more on health, education, and other services.

It is a weak, cheap, lazy, and irresponsible approach to opposition, which is very different from offering alternatives, let alone an alternative government. To be clear, Mr Winter has framed this motion in terms of his dissatisfaction with the state's Budget before it has been scrutinised through a whole week of budget Estimates committees in both Houses, but he has offered no alternative budget and no alternative budget strategy.

Furthermore, as Mr O'Byrne pointed out today, he has not aimed his grievance at the Treasurer, who presented the budget, or the Cabinet that approved it, but specifically the Premier. Again, the state budget is not the trigger for Mr Winter's motion - it is the cover story. He wants to bring down the Liberal government Tasmanians voted for a year ago and replace it with a Labor-Greens government just because he can. He did not win the election, so instead he wants to steal it.

As others have noted already, I do not think Mr Winter knew this was coming. He baited the hook yesterday, tabling a motion that he was prepared to leave on the table until he was confident that he had the numbers for it to succeed. Note that he did not bring it on as an urgent matter, which he would have done if he were actually about intervening in the budget process - if there was an emergency or if he thought he already had the numbers.

He just wanted to have something hanging over the government's head while the Budget goes through its normal scrutiny and debate. Just a threat. Another stunt. To his surprise, though, enough crossbenchers took the bait, so he was forced to bring on the motion. I do not think that was ever part of his plan.

As Mr Abetz described earlier, Mr Winter is like the dog who caught the school bus. He has always loved the chase, but now he has the bumper bar in his teeth, what is he going to do with it? He has brought about a situation that has the potential to fundamentally destabilise government operations in Tasmania. It has the potential to disrupt the 2025-26 Budget process at a critical stage and the flow of funds to essential projects and services; to shatter business confidence and perceptions of Tasmania's political stability, which underpins investment and our state's reputation; to lose us and generations to come the opportunity of the Macquarie Point stadium and all the investment and economic and social benefits that can bring - something that younger Tasmanians in particular will be devastated to have stolen away from them. He will lose Tasmania's AFL and AFLW team licences, which Tasmanians have only just secured after generations of passionate lobbying by generations of passionate Tasmanians.

Do not take my words for it. Kath McCann from the Tasmanian Football Club today said:

One thing I'd like to remind everyone of is the optics of this, nationally and internationally, is really negative for Tasmania. What this looks like is uncertainty. What it looks like is a risk to invest. What it looks like is a state that's not unified, and I think we're better than that and I think our leaders need to think about the consequences of their actions.

Anthony Haneveer in *The Advocate* said:

Tasmania is in turmoil as politicians put their own interests first. As the rest of the country looks on bewildered, the uncertainty will undermine business confidence, potentially costing jobs, and there are real fears that our AFL dreams could be shattered.

In an email that all members of parliament will have received, one of many emails:

At the last state election, Tasmanian voters mandated the current government arrangements in the House of Assembly at the time of the election and now so much is hanging off a stable, connected, joined-up and focused government. The future of AFL in our state and the stadium proposal hangs in the balance. Now is not the time for the government to create this gross instability in the state. We need the stadium and we need the AFL team. I've always been a swinging voter. However, if the no-confidence motion creates an environment that in any way subverts the viability of the stadium or the future of an AFL team for Tasmania, I will never vote for another Labor Party or independent member of parliament in Tasmania ever again.

Mr Abetz - Very wise.

Mr JAENSCH - Mr Winter needs to explain how this extraordinary situation, which has fallen in his lap by chance, not design, is going to play out. He needs to explain to Tasmanians and anyone else watching, holding their breath and their investment decisions, how these risks are going to be managed because he created them.

That is a reckless act from someone who should always be thinking about what is best for Tasmania and not what is best for his own politics. This says so much about the person who could be premier as a result of these machinations. It came out in his Budget reply speech yesterday, which contained so many sentences starting with 'I', 'me' and 'my'. They say there is no I in 'team', but there is one in 'Winter.'

Members interjecting.

Mr JAENSCH - He has not laid out a plan to address the issues he says need fixing. In fact, he refuses to. He has clearly not socialised his plan with any of the people he normally holds up as his barometer of the best interests of what is good for Tasmania, the industry leaders whose businesses and workforces it will affect who are calling us and calling him and the media to express their alarm at what he has done. He has not targeted the Treasurer or the government as a whole, who are collectively responsible for the budget he objects to, just the leader, our Premier, who is more popular than Mr Winter will ever be and his biggest obstacle to taking power - and it is about taking power. That is what he or those who control him are clearly aiming to do. They believe they have to take power because the people of Tasmania did not give it to them at last year's election. Mr Winter believes the people of Tasmania got it wrong.

On this side of the House, we know that only the people of Tasmania get to choose who forms government and only the Liberal Party can choose its leader. We respect the people of Tasmania. They always get it right. Mr Winter is not doing this because he has a different plan for Tasmania and is prepared to take on the deep challenges and heavy responsibilities of true leadership in the best interests of the Tasmanian people. No, he is doing it just because he can, because by pure dumb luck the numbers fell his way. How sad for Tasmania and how small, selfish, reckless and immature a leader is Mr Winter for taking this cheap stunt just because he can.

This is on comparison to Jeremy Rockliff, the man he would replace, a statesman leader, perhaps Tasmania's best ever, and the clear choice of Tasmanians as their preferred premier

again and again. Despite this choice being measured again, most recently in the last two weeks, Mr Winter is prepared to ignore and override the will of Tasmanians again for no other reason than because he can.

I have known Jeremy Rockliff for over 20 years. He is a man of extraordinary integrity. When I met him and first knew him, I had no interest in politics. I was like most other normal Tasmanians and Australians, who are deeply suspicious of politics and politicians. I met Jeremy in the early days of his political career and I watched him closely over about a decade. I saw that he was consistently a person of huge integrity: a respectful, gentle, mature person, well regarded by all who met him, whether they shared his political beliefs or not. He is the reason I entered politics. He was evidence to me that you could do this thing without losing your soul.

I watched him as deputy premier: loyal, stable and strong, caring for a team of people around a leader. The leaders tend to be a bit hot sometimes. You need someone who has an eye on the balance of the team and the individuals in it to have a good team. Jeremy Rockliff provided that for the two premiers I first served under.

He brought innovation, passion and compassion to his roles in parliament right from the beginning. He came up with and delivered an outstandingly simple and obvious policy platform of extending our schools in Tasmania to year 11 and 12 so that school did not end and education did not end for Tasmanians when the school in their town ran out of year levels for them to participate in. He elevated Mental Health and Wellbeing to a portfolio for the very first time, which led to a massive increase in the budget and staffing, and the sophistication of our mental health system in Tasmania. That is something I now have the privilege and a responsibility for delivering on, with an additional \$44 million in services over the next four years and a capital program of around \$280 million right across the state.

As Premier, Jeremy Rockliff enabled this parliament and my party to have conscience votes on same-sex marriage and voluntary assisted dying. He restored the House of Assembly to 35. He carried on the difficult part of COVID, the coming out and recovering from as an economy, a phase we are still in. That requires a different sort of leader, not working under emergency provisions but explaining what he is doing, bringing people with him, ensuring that we followed through on everything that we were told and learnt that Tasmanians need to stay safe. The same goes for the commission of inquiry - a tragic body of evidence covering decades of successive governments, that this government initiated and this Premier has led us through with enormous integrity and heart, and with a commitment to keep investing in the changes we were told were needed after the commission of inquiry itself was stood down and it is not in the papers every day.

That is why our budgets are difficult. That is why we have had to take on debt: to follow through and fix these things properly once they are not in the headlines every day. This is what we need in our leaders: not people who reach for the headlines and the stunts, and their own fortunes, in a six- or 24-hour cycle, but people who, with the heart of a parent, are prepared to do long, hard work to their own detriment, sometimes unpopular, sometimes difficult, to fix things for our state and the people in it in the long-term. That requires a different sort of maturity than we have seen on display today from the absent Mr Winter, who has grabbed an opportunity to take a moment of lucky numbers to advance his interests at the expense of this parliament, this government and this state.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER (Ms O'Byrne) - The time being 7.30 p.m., the question is -

That the House do now adjourn.

The House divided -

AYES 18

Mr Abetz
Mr Barnett
Mr Behrakis
Mrs Beswick
Mr Ellis
Mr Fairs
Mr Ferguson (Teller)
Ms Howlett
Mr Jaensch
Mr Jenner
Mr O'Byrne
Ms Ogilvie
Mrs Pentland
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Wood

NOES 16

Ms Badger
Mr Bayley
Dr Broad
Ms Brown
Ms Burnet
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Mr Farrell
Ms Finlay (Teller)
Mr Garland
Ms Haddad
Ms Johnston
Ms Rosol
Mr Willie
Mr Winter
Dr Woodruff

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 7.35 p.m.