



**PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA**

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**REPORT OF DEBATES**

**Thursday 29 September 2022**

**REVISED EDITION**



# Contents

<b>TABLED PAPERS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS ANNUAL REPORT 2021-22.....	1
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE - REVIEW OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT .....	1
<b>HOMES TASMANIA BILL 2022 (NO. 35).....</b>	<b>1</b>
CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS MADE IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL .....	1
<b>HOMES TASMANIA BILL 2022 (NO. 35).....</b>	<b>2</b>
THIRD READING .....	2
<b>HOMES TASMANIA (CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS) BILL 2022 (NO. 36) .....</b>	<b>3</b>
THIRD READING .....	3
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (NO. 63) .....</b>	<b>3</b>
SECOND READING .....	3
<b>SUSPENSION OF SITTING .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>21</b>
PHARMACISTS - VACCINATION PROGRAMS .....	21
TASMANIA POLICE - RISDON PRISON SURVEILLANCE OPERATION .....	23
LOCAL GOVERNMENT - INTRODUCTION OF COMPULSORY VOTING .....	24
COVID-19 - REVIEW OF RESTRICTIONS FOR SCHOOLS .....	25
CAT MANAGEMENT- REGISTRATION .....	26
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (NO. 63) .....</b>	<b>27</b>
SECOND READING .....	27
<b>JUSTICE MISCELLANEOUS (ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES) BILL 2022 (NO. 41) .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>LAND USE PLANNING AND APPROVALS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (NO. 29) .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>ROADS AND JETTIES AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (NO. 12) .....</b>	<b>71</b>
FIRST READING .....	71
<b>MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY .....</b>	<b>72</b>
HOMES TASMANIA BILL 2022 (No. 35).....	72
<b>ADJOURNMENT.....</b>	<b>72</b>



**Thursday 29 September 2022**

The President, **Mr Farrell**, took the Chair at 11.a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People and read Prayers.

## **TABLED PAPERS**

### **Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts Annual Report 2021-22**

[11.02 a.m.]

**Ms FORREST** (Murchison) - Mr President, I have the honour to present the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts Annual Report 2021-22. I move -

That the report be received and printed.

**Report received and printed.**

### **Public Accounts Committee - Review of Public Works Committee Report**

**Ms FORREST** (Murchison) - Mr President, I have the honour to present the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts No. 27 of 2022, Review of selected Public Works Committee reports - No. 41 of 2020: Sorell Emergency Services Hub; and No. 15 of 2020: Major Redevelopment of Sorell School. I move -

That the report be received and printed.

**Report received and printed.**

**Ms FORREST** (Murchison) - Mr President, I move -

That consideration of the report and its noting be made an order of the day.

**Motion agreed to.**

## **HOMES TASMANIA BILL 2022 (No. 35)**

### **Consideration of Amendments made in the Committee of the Whole Council**

[11.03 a.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - Mr President, I move -

That the bill as amended in Committee be now taken into consideration.

**Motion agreed to.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the amendments be read for the first time.

**Amendments read the first time.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the amendments be read for the second time.

**Amendments read the second time.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the amendments be agreed to.

**Amendments agreed to.**

## **HOMES TASMANIA BILL 2022 (No. 35)**

### **Third Reading**

[11.10 a.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the bill be now read the third time.

**Mr PRESIDENT** - The Chair of Committees, having certified that the bill as printed and amended in writing, is in accordance with the bill as reported. The question is that the bill be now read the third time.

**The Committee divided -**

#### **AYES 8**

Ms Armitage  
Mr Duigan  
Ms Forrest  
Mr Gaffney (Teller)  
Mr Harriss  
Mrs Hiscutt  
Ms Howlett  
Ms Palmer

#### **NOES 6**

Mr Edmunds  
Ms Lovell  
Ms Rattray (Teller)  
Mr Valentine  
Ms Webb  
Mr Willie

**Motion agreed to.**

**Bill read the third time.**

## **HOMES TASMANIA (CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS) BILL 2022 (No. 36)**

### **Third Reading**

[11.14 a.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - Mr President, I move -

That the bill be now read the third time.

**Bill read the third time.**

## **CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (No. 63)**

### **Second Reading**

[11.15 a.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - Mr President, Tasmania is a leader in addressing climate change, having recorded net zero emissions for the last seven years. From 1990 to 2020, our net emissions reduced by 120.9 per cent while our economy has nearly doubled in size and more than 50 000 jobs have been created.

This globally significant achievement is due to a combination of our long-term renewable energy investments and our managed forest estate, along with ongoing emissions reduction in our waste sector. In addition, since November 2020, Tasmania now has capacity to generate 100 per cent of its electricity needs from renewable sources.

However, modelling shows that as our economy and population grow, and the risk of severe bushfires increases, we will need to do more to reduce emissions across all sectors to maintain our net zero emissions status.

The Tasmanian Government recognises that the climate changes already underway will affect our way of life, our industries and our environment, in our lifetimes. Climate projections, and the most recent findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, indicate that Tasmania is projected to experience increases in the severity and frequency of extreme weather events, including extreme heat and bushfires. Likewise, storm events will increase, and will result in heavier and more sustained rainfall, high winds and coastal flooding and erosion, which will be exacerbated by sea level rise.

That is why Tasmania must contribute to the global response to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and build our resilience to avoid the worst impacts of climate change.

The bill amends the act in response to the findings of its most recent independent review, detailed emissions and economic analysis, and extensive consultation with business, industry and the community. Over 200 Tasmanians and organisations participated in the independent review and more than 60 written submissions were received on the draft bill. In addition, over the course of five days debate in the House of Assembly, the Government carefully considered

all 59 amendments proposed, agreeing to 11 amendments to improve the bill. The minister thanks everyone who has contributed throughout this entire process.

The Bill proposes a number of key amendments, and I will go through them:

- legislating for a statewide emissions target for Tasmania of net zero emissions, or lower, from 2030;
- consolidating the existing 10 objects of the act around five key themes including explicit reference to a consultative partnership approach with business, industry and the broader community, including local government and consideration of the impacts of climate change on future generations;
- a requirement for the Tasmanian Government to prepare a Climate Change Action Plan at least every five years;
- a requirement for the Tasmanian Government to undertake a statewide Climate Change Risk Assessment at least every five years;
- a requirement for sector-based Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans to be prepared in partnership with industry, and updated at least every five years;
- a requirement for the minister to prepare annual climate change reports including an annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report and an annual Activity Statement; and
- a requirement for the minister to table all key climate change reports in parliament, including the Action Plan, Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans, statewide Climate Risk Assessment; Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report and annual activity statements, increasing the transparency and accountability and raising awareness and understanding of the government's action on climate change.

I will now turn to the new emissions reduction target and sector plans.

The bill legislates a statewide target of net zero emissions, or lower, from 2030. This will be the most ambitious legislated target in Australia, and one of the most ambitious in the world.

A whole-of-economy target provides a flexible approach that recognises different sectors have different opportunities to reduce their emissions, and some will require more time, support and technology than others to transition to a low emissions future.

The Tasmanian Government is confident that our target, while ambitious, is achievable. The Tasmanian Emissions Pathway Review identifies 16 economy-wide emissions reductions opportunities that, if implemented, are projected to not only achieve our target but improve our net zero emissions profile over time.

The identified actions include:

- increasing the uptake of electric vehicles;
- developing a renewable hydrogen industry;



- the use of innovative feeds supplements to reduce livestock emissions;

That is one I am particularly interested in, Mr President.

- fuel switching by replacing fossil fuel boilers with alternatives powered by renewable energy, including bioenergy technology;
- reducing agricultural soil emissions through precision agriculture;
- use of wood in construction in place of emissions-intensive building products;
- planting trees to improve agricultural productivity and on-island timber processing; and
- diverting organic waste from landfill.

Mr President, economic analysis demonstrates that these actions will not only reduce emissions, but can also improve productivity and increase demand for Tasmania's renewable energy and products, generating higher economic growth and employment. By 2050, our economy could be \$475 million larger, employing over 1200 more Tasmanians as a result of these actions.

Importantly, the Tasmanian Government is already working to reduce emissions across our economy through new investments in the waste transport, energy and agricultural sectors. Recent examples include:

- committing \$6 million in funding towards two industrial-scale organics composting facilities in northern and southern Tasmania, diverting organic waste materials from landfill and reducing associated emissions;
- transitioning the government fleet to electric vehicles (EVs) by 2030, reducing emissions associated with imported liquid fossil fuels and increasing the supply of used EVs in Tasmania;
- supporting Metro Tasmania to trial zero emissions buses, with over \$16 million in funding in northern and southern Tasmania. The outcomes of the trial will inform future emissions reductions across the Metro Tasmania bus fleet;
- supporting the wider adoption of EVs to reduce transport emissions with investments of \$1.4 million into a comprehensive statewide charging network;
- replacing fossil fuel burning boilers in government-owned facilities with renewable energy-powered alternatives, with an initial commitment of \$10 million over four years;
- installing solar panels in over 100 government schools, with an investment of \$5 million in the Renewable Energy Schools Program to reduce energy costs and associated emissions;
- supporting Norske Skog to consider alternative fuels for its new boiler, as part of a \$2 million state government commitment to ensure the sustainability of its operations. According to Norske Skog, this could reduce emissions up to an estimated 160 000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> per annum;

- supporting Sea Forest with an investment of over \$500 000 to further research the use of asparagopsis seaweed as a livestock feed supplement, which could not only increase productivity but also reduce methane emissions; and
- the Government and government businesses are also making significant investments to assist the state to reach 200 per cent self-sufficiency in renewable electricity by 2040 and achieve significant green hydrogen production by 2030, both of which could facilitate emissions reductions across Australia and globally.

Mr President, many of Tasmania's major companies and industries already have well established emissions reductions targets and goals, on the public record. For example, the Liberty Steel Group (TEMCO), and the Australian red meat and livestock industry are aiming to become carbon neutral by 2030. Rio Tinto Bell Bay is seeking to reduce emissions by 50 per cent by 2030. Norske Skog, Tassal, Fonterra Australia and the Cement Concrete and Aggregates Australia Industry Association have a target of net zero emissions by 2050.

Given the substantial work underway across industries and sectors, the Government will not legislate additional sector-based targets, but will instead legislate the requirements of sector-based Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans. The Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans will be developed by the minister in consultation with relevant portfolio ministers, and in partnership with industry and sector stakeholders. The plans will incorporate and support existing targets and opportunities to reduce sector emissions, aligning our efforts with those directly involved in managing emissions, identify further actions to reduce emissions and accelerate the required investment while increasing each sector's resilience to climate change and supporting productivity and economic growth.

Recognising the urgency to reduce emissions, the Government agreed to amend the bill in the House of Assembly to legislate time frames for the first plans to be completed. The bill now includes provisions for the first plans to be developed within two years of the commencement of the act and the first plan for the transport sector to be developed within 12 months. Furthermore, the plans will consider both the target and the objects of the act and, responding to consultation feedback, will be tabled in parliament, ensuring accountability and transparency in the Government's response to climate change.

The Government will also continue to lead by example, through the development of an emissions reduction and resilience plan for government operations. The plan will include the various actions the Government is taking to reduce emissions, including our commitment to transition the government vehicle fleet to 100 per cent electric vehicles by 2030. It will also include actions for the government to adapt its operations, and increase their resilience to climate change.

Mr President, I now turn my attention to the objects of the bill. In its current form the act has 10 objects which establish the purpose of the act. The independent review found that the current objects of the act are not explicit, that they overlap and are poor at guiding effective climate action. Consolidating the objects will clarify the purpose of the act, ensuring a more robust legislative framework for evaluating climate change and the act's effectiveness, consistent with contemporary best practice.

Responding to feedback on the draft bill, the bill's objects now explicitly reference the important role of local government in responding to climate change, and the impact of climate change on future generations. In addition, since the tabling of the bill, the Government received further advice and feedback on the impact of climate change on human health and wellbeing, which is projected to increase over time. The Government has listened and moved an amendment to the bill in the other place to explicitly include the consideration of these impacts, in addition to the impacts on future generations, in both the objects and the statewide climate change risk assessment, as I will now detail.

Mr President, the bill legislates the requirements for the minister to prepare a Climate Change Action Plan at least every five years. This will ensure that the Tasmanian Government will continue to take action to grow a climate-ready economy, reduce emissions, build resilience and adapt to climate change. The Climate Change Action Plan will provide clear direction and accountability for the Government's short- to medium-term climate change priorities and provide opportunities for industry and community input over time.

The bill requires that the Climate Change Action Plan is produced in formats that allow a broad range of the Tasmanian community to stay informed and participate in consultation on our climate change initiatives, including children and young people. Following further advice and feedback regarding the importance of children and young people being involved in decision-making that will affect their future lives, the Government moved a further amendment to require that they are consulted with as a distinct interest group of Tasmania's Climate Change Action Plan and in other relevant aspects, which is now reflected in the bill.

The bill now requires the first Climate Change Action Plan be prepared within 12 months of the commencement of the act, reflecting the need to begin implementing the bill's legislated requirements as soon as possible. The Government has committed to preparing the first action plan within six months. The first action plan will include, as key actions, the development of Tasmania's first Statewide Climate Change Risk Assessment and commencement of the first Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans.

I now turn my mind to the Statewide Climate Change Risk Assessment. Responding to climate change also involves building the resilience of our community and environment and adapting to projected impacts of unavoidable climate change. Accordingly, the bill legislates a requirement for the minister to complete a Statewide Climate Change Risk Assessment every five years, with the Government agreeing to amend the bill to require the first risk assessment within two years of the commencement of the act.

The risk assessment will inform the development of the Climate Change Action Plans and the Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans, which will include actions to build resilience and adapt to climate change, as well as providing detailed information that the broader community can use to build its own resilience and adapt to climate change.

The key principle in the assessment of climate risk will be the consideration of its impact on future generations and as noted earlier, its impacts on the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians.

I turn now to the increased accountability and reporting. Responding to consultation and feedback, the bill includes a number of requirements to increase the transparency and accountability in the reporting of Tasmania's actions and progress towards our 2030 target.

This includes a requirement for the minister to produce additional annual reports and sectoral details, including an annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report and an annual climate change activity statement. The minister is to table all key climate change reports in parliament, including the Climate Change Action Plan, Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans, statewide climate change risk assessment, annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report and annual climate change activity statement. The Government also agreed to amend the bill to require the annual climate change activity statement to report on progress towards achieving the targets and objects of the sector-based Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans.

The Government also acknowledges the strong interest and expertise across the community, in Tasmania's approach to reducing emissions and responding to the climate changes underway and the importance of continuous communication and information-sharing in this rapidly changing field. That is why, following the passage of the bill, the Government will establish a Climate Change Reference Group to provide a forum for advice and feedback on strategic priorities and emerging opportunities in climate change mitigation and adaptation, as we work towards our 2030 net zero emissions target and increase community resilience to climate change. The Climate Change Reference group, will be convened by the Minister for the Environment and Climate Change and will include members of relevant industry, community, business and stakeholder groups, state and local government and individuals with relevant expertise.

I will now turn to the policy framework. Some feedback on the draft bill called for a legislative approach to consideration of climate change and government decision-making. In response to the independent review, the Government will develop a whole-of-government policy framework, to ensure that climate change is considered in the development of all relevant policies, plans and strategies.

This approach acknowledges the need for flexibility for decision-makers, given the range of factors to be considered and the diversity of decisions climate change is relevant to. The framework will include ministerial guidelines, principles to guide decision-making, including the principle of sustainable development and social equity, guidance material and decision support tools, information on recent scientific, legal and market developments and training opportunities. The framework will build the capacity and capability of the Tasmanian Government to imbed climate change into decision-making. The framework will be informed by the statewide Climate Change Risk Assessment and will be important in the implementation of the Government's Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans for its operations.

Mr President, our 2030 target sends a strong message that Tasmania is committed to leveraging our unique advantages to their greatest effect to respond to climate change, protect our lifestyle and environment and grow our economy and jobs.

It is one of the most ambitious legislated targets in the world, but one which we believe Tasmania can meet by building on the significant work already underway in our community and economy, leading by example in the government sector and harnessing the knowledge and ingenuity of Tasmanians to accelerate our transition to a successful, resilient and low emissions economy.

Mr President, I commend the bill to the House.

[11.36 a.m.]

**Ms FORREST** (Murchison) – Mr President, I am very aware of the real challenges we face and the amount of time lost, particularly under our previous federal governments, to take a decisive and meaningful action on the very real threat we in Tasmania, Australia and the world face in terms of our climate. We are facing a climate emergency that demands urgent global and local action. We are seeing many more so-called climate refugees seeking refuge in safer parts of our world, including here in Tasmania.

Many people are facing immediate risks, including complete loss of their homes and lands, whether through rising sea levels or extreme weather events that see much of their land washed away. Every night on the news there is another weather event. We cannot continue to ignore this with comments such as 'it is cyclical', 'we saw these floods in 19-whatever'. It is clearly not a cyclical change. The challenge is real and it is now and it needs urgent and effective action.

This bill is definitely an improvement on what we currently have. However, it may not go far enough in its current form and I will be keeping my mind open to all amendments that are proposed during the passage through this House.

I acknowledge the work of Climate Tasmania, the Tasmanian Independent Science Council and the Tasmanian Policy Exchange at the University of Tasmania, led by Professor Richard Eccleston, for their ongoing work in this area as well as the large number of Tasmanians who are genuinely committed to real action. This includes an active group of north-west coasters who go by the name of North Tasmania, Australian Parents for Climate Action led by Jasione Hull-Styles of Ulverstone and Hannah Sadler from Wynyard. AP4CA, as they are known, is a climate action group made up of parents - mostly mums - from right across the north-west coast. They are farmers, speech pathologists, teachers, natural resource managers, artists, planning consultants, occupational therapists and community volunteers and they all share the real and consistent concerns I have stated in my contribution thus far.

In a recent email to me and some other members received it, I am not sure if all members did and I quote from this email:

The thing we have in common and that brought us together is our fear for the future of the planet and therefore our children's future. We have read the reports. We know the science and the evidence. We are witnessing the impacts of climate change already. What we need to see now is action from our government. We are concerned that Tasmania is about to waste a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create climate legislation that will help to shape a livable and safe climate for our children and grandchildren.

While it is noted that the State Government's Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill is a modest improvement on the initial 2008 legislation, we strongly believe the legislation must be strengthened to reflect the scope, scale and urgency of the planetary emergency we face. North Tasmania AP4CA strongly recommends the recommendations made by the climate and policy experts, Climate Tasmania and the Tasmanian Independent Science Council, in their Brief for Proposed Amendments to the Climate Change (State Action) Bill (8 August 2022).

These amendments include ambitious 2030 targets for emissions reduction and resilience plans for each sector - waste, energy, industry, agriculture, and land-based sectors - to ensure a rapid transition to a low carbon economy.

Also crucial is the establishment of the independent Climate Change Commission to ensure this process stays on track, regardless of who is in government.

North Tasmania AP4CA would particularly like to draw your attention to the proposed amendment in section 1 of this document (p. 3) which states:

The Bill should amend the relevant mineral resources legislation to prevent the issuing of any new permits to explore for any fossil fuels.

This is in line with the recent International Energy Agency (of which Australia is a member country) special report *Net Zero by 2050*. It states:

Beyond projects already committed as of 2021, there are no new oil or gas fields approved for development ... and no new coal mines or mine extensions are required.

That is from page 11, Summary for Policy Makers.

The importance of this amendment is also reflected in the data recently published by the Global Registry of Fossil Fuels, at [carbontracker.org](https://carbontracker.org), which shows that if governments allow identified reserves of coal, oil and gas to be extracted and used, an enormous and catastrophic 3.5 trillion tonnes of greenhouse emissions will be created.

This would exceed the 500 billion tonne carbon budget required to keep the planet at or below 1.5°C of warming, by more than seven times.

As António Guterres, Secretary-General of the United Nations, said recently:

Our world is in big trouble. ... A winter of global discontent is on the horizon. A cost-of-living crisis is raging. Trust is crumbling. Inequalities are exploding. Our planet is burning.

Here in Tasmania right now, we have an historic opportunity to do the right thing, to take heed of the evidence, to protect the wild spaces that remain on our beautiful island home and in its oceans, to safeguard the futures of our children and grandchildren, to ensure the livability of our one and only planet Earth.

Passing all of the amendments proposed by Climate Tasmania and the Tasmanian Independent Science Council could move us all a long way toward a spring of recovery and safety, health and hope.

Mr President, I have met with members of this group some time ago, including some of their very young members, who are very passionate and very concerned about their future.

I acknowledge the Government's acceptance of a number of amendments in the other place - including one they brought in themselves - which begs the question as to why these recommendations that were given effect to in these agreed amendments were not already in the bill when it was tabled and presented.

I particularly ask this, as the Leader clearly acknowledged the urgency of action, and in her second reading speech, she said:

Recognising the urgency to reduce emissions, the Government agreed to amend the bill in the House of Assembly to legislate time frames for the first plans to be completed.

The bill now includes provisions for the first plans to be developed within two years of the commencement of the act, and the first plan for the transport sector to be developed within 12 months.

Furthermore, the plans will consider both the targets and the objects of the act and, responding to consultation feedback will be tabled in parliament, ensuring accountability and transparency in the Government's response to climate change.

The Leader also made comments about including our future generations, the voices of children and young people. I was absolutely gobsmacked that some of these things were not in the bill after the consultation period, when it was tabled in the other place. The inclusion of the requirement to consult and engage with children and young people was an imperative in my mind, and as I said, I was quite surprised this was not in the bill when it was presented. Children and young people care deeply about this matter, and have the most to lose if we, the adults in the room, do not get it right.

The Leader went on to explain other amendments that were accepted and that strengthen the bill. I will not go into all those comments, as they are on the record. However, we do have further amendments that I know will be proposed to be considered in this place, some that were tested downstairs and not supported by the Government, and some that were not.

I appreciate there may be some valid reasons to potentially reject some amendments that have been suggested in the submissions that have been received during the consultation period. However, overall, I absolutely agree with the sentiment of the email from the AP4CA group, and the submissions that have been made by Climate Tasmania, Tasmanian Policy Exchange and other key stakeholders that have a very long and vested interest in climate change generally, the future of our planet and this legislation. I will consider each amendment put in this place on its merit, and believe there are important measures that can still be taken to further ensure this bill is future-focused and provides urgent action.

Mr President, climate change and the need for urgent action were also key topics of consideration at the recent ACPAC Conference (Australasian Council of Public Accounts Committees Conference), which was held in Wellington, New Zealand this year. The conference had a strong and very clear focus on the real risk and emergency that climate change is. Many of the speakers spoke of the need for urgent action and pleaded with MPs to take it seriously. One older gentleman who presented a paper was literally jumping up and down urging us to it seriously and to take action - I have heard him speak at other conferences, and

although he does not have children of his own, he does have nieces and nephews. Public accounts committees, for example, are alert to the need to monitor and hold government to account. It is not just public accounts committees; it is all aspects of parliaments, parliamentary committees across the board, government administration committees, and the parliament itself.

I acknowledge some of the other amendments that have enhanced the transparency and reporting of some of the plans and other reporting structures that are put in place. It is very important that we do have transparency about what is happening, and accountability. That means any of us in this place, or the other place, can pick up any of those tabled reports and bring them on for noting. I am hoping we will see that occur to ensure they are debated and that there is the opportunity for us to ask questions in the Chamber here and, potentially, in committees as well.

At the ACPAC Conference, many in the room were from Pacific nations who are facing the very real threat and the evident impact of these changes on their homes and their people. Their homes and lands are going under water as we speak, so we simply cannot be complacent on this matter.

I do not think there are many people in this place, if any, who do not appreciate the need for aggressive climate action. The need is clear and it is compelling. I know many of the young people who I have spoken to about this are really quite anxious. I worry about their mental health and wellbeing because of the level of anxiety that some of our young people are experiencing. They are very concerned and quite frightened for their future. They need us to be the responsible adults and listen to them and take real action. We owe it to them.

Mr President, it is important to note that Tasmania does currently have a negative emissions profile and predominantly renewable energy generation assets. However, this does not mean that we can rest on our successes. Many of them are natural successes, and we need to ensure that more is done, particularly as our population grows.

As we discussed in the briefings, and it is obvious to everyone, our forests provide a wonderful carbon sink and storage of carbon but that can be lost overnight in a devastating bushfire. There is the rub - the reality of climate change with rising temperatures and altered rainfall patterns - particularly less rainfall in some Tasmanian world heritage areas - means that the risk of bushfires increases, and so the risk of us losing that benefit is very real. I am not sure of the year, although I know it was before COVID-19, but we had that significant bushfire in the TWWHA. It was in a very inaccessible area. I cannot recall the number of hectares that were burnt out, but it is frightening to think that that can occur. Those trees and forests do not grow back quickly. So, it is important that we are very vigilant and take action to prevent some of this. There are people who have a genuine fear that we have gone too far already. I hope we have not, but the very real risk is there. I talk to people on the west coast who tell me how dry it is again, in parts of these areas. The reality of climate change actually increases the risk of bushfires so we cannot rely on this to keep Tasmania as a net negative emitter. We have to take other specific and targeted action. Part of that is risk mitigation, but it is also direct action.

Climate change is also a gendered issue. Women are disproportionately negatively impacted by climate change around the world. In addition, people living in poverty also suffer the negative impacts of climate change more directly. It is also an equity and equality issue.



This is the greatest current challenge facing humanity. It demands a concerted and comprehensive response. Many who are climate change sceptics - and they are still out there - express concern for our high energy users. I can assure members that many in the resources and high-energy use sectors are already responding to this. The Leader mentioned a couple. They have been actively working towards decarbonising their work places. They have seen the writing on the wall. They know if they want to raise funds and raise capital, they have to demonstrate that they are operating in a socially and environmentally responsible manner.

We heard from Andrew Radonjic this morning, from Venture Minerals, who has actually made significant changes to their plans for Venture Minerals and the Mount Lindsay project to go underground to significantly reduce their footprint and to use electric mining equipment. Electric mining equipment has been developed and built in my electorate by Elphinstone.

There is a lot of work being done by this sector already. They are actually ahead of the game. They are investing in batteries and electric underground vehicles and above-ground mining vehicles as well. They are also looking at renewable energy sources to use to power their operations.

I was recently speaking to the Chief Operating Officer of Grange Resources, Ben Maynard, prior to a recent media announcement regarding the plans of Grange Resources to decarbonise its operations and cut its carbon emissions to net zero by 2035. Grange Resources is a very long-established mining operation. It has an enormously energy-intensive pelletising plant at Port Latta. It also has a very large open pit in Savage River. This was a very big and brave step to have net zero emissions by 2035. I commend Ben Maynard. I know it was not an easy thing to convince his owners of, even the CEO.

It was reported in *The Advocate* newspaper, which confirmed the conversation I have had with him. I quote from *The Advocate* newspaper:

The iron ore outfit is also targeting a net 50 per cent carbon dioxide emissions drop by 2030 -

So half way by 2030, net zero by 2035.

and to eliminate non-renewable energy coal sources like anthracite by 2025.

They have a very clear, stepped process to do this.

'It's an exciting time for the business,' chief operating officer Ben Maynard said on Thursday.

It's a transition for us as we seek to align ourselves with those core metrics of good governance, people, prosperity and looking after our planet.'

The company's board has endorsed the targets under Grange's commitment to ESG (environmental, social and governance) metrics as supported by the World Economic Forum.

'This new global environment is challenging the traditional expectations of corporations and redirecting investment capital,' Grange said in its ESG report released on Wednesday.

Further,

The company said it had developed a roadmap to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

'This will involve the reduction of energy used per tonne of product, upgrades to furnaces, recovery of heat in the pellet plant, application of technology and electric vehicles in the mining operation and alternative fuel sources,' Grange said.

Hydrogen power is one potential emissions cutter for Grange, which currently relies on diesel and natural gas.

Switching from open pit to underground mining, which is being investigated, could also help, and potentially be accompanied by electrification of underground mine works.

We should recognise the very real and genuine efforts being made in our resources sector. We need these minerals to decarbonise our future, as we heard from Andrew Radonjic this morning. Tin and tungsten are vital to enable the decarbonisation of our planet. We need them for electric vehicles, we need them for our mobile phones, we need them in a battery charging station for our electric vehicles. We also heard of the discovery of rare earth minerals there too, which is an exciting development. These are critical minerals. Members might have received an email from John Lamb, who is the Managing Director at Avebury Nickel Mine, Mallee Resources, who are seeking the support of the government to have nickel listed as an essential mineral because of the nature of that mineral and its requirement in these decarbonising products as well.

At the recent Tasmanian Minerals, Manufacturing and Energy Council conference, I also spoke to a number of other mining and manufacturing business leaders who stated similar goals to what we heard this morning from Andrew Radonjic and also from the media release from Grange Resources and Ben Maynard. They stated similar goals and actions. Some presentations that were provided at that conference clearly demonstrated that work is already being done. We have companies such as Elphinstone, as I have already mentioned, and Epiroc. Both are based in my electorate on the north-west coast, and are actively developing this technology. In many ways, they are ahead of our former federal government by 100 miles and others who choose, I suggest, to only see negative outcomes rather than positive outcomes for these businesses.

We should be proud of the work of many of these businesses who have recognised the need to act and have done so without actually being forced to. It is a commercial decision, in many respects, I agree absolutely, but they have got on and got started on it. We should support and assist them and do our bit to provide the framework to assist.

COVID-19 has shown us that we can work together to address the very real and serious threat to our health and welfare that COVID-19 presented and we need a similar approach to

the climate change emissions reduction, which is also a serious threat to our health and wellbeing. We have the opportunity to consolidate and capitalise on the world-leading carbon emissions profile that we currently have and the renewable energy generation assets that we have. I commend the Government for their commitment to address this through legislative change. I will consider the other amendments that were put to this place.

I do not wish to comment more fully on all the provisions in the bill because they have been well outlined by the Leader in her second reading speech. I will make a couple of comments on some of the points the Leader made. She commented on the Tasmanian Emissions Pathway Review, identifying six economy-wide emissions reduction opportunities, that, if implemented, are projected to not only achieve our target but to improve our net zero emissions profile over time. We have to make that the goal, particularly with the risk to our forests and of forest fire. I acknowledge some of these actions will have a longer lead time and/or a longer time to demonstrate a reduction in emissions. It has to be doing everything we can, not picking one thing and choosing that and going on to the next. We need to walk and chew gum at the same time.

A lot of these identified actions include increasing the uptake of electric vehicles. We are starting to see a few more electric vehicles on the road. One of my sons was over visiting recently and he actually hired an electric vehicle, a Polestar, which is like the Volvo off-to-the-side electric vehicle. He had to do very much a planned trip. He was going to the north-west to see other members of the family; he landed in Hobart where we were at the time. He is the sort of kid who likes to try new things, he likes shiny new things, he is always the first in line to get a new Apple iPhone when it is released. He had to particularly plan to make sure he would not be caught short anywhere without charge. Even when he plugged it in at his father's house to charge it that night, it did not fully charge overnight. He still had enough power to get back, but this is an ongoing issue. I will come more to that.

It is important to see that occurring and we do see more around but it is not something that is going to be rolled out within a very short space of time throughout the whole of our state.

Developing a renewable hydrogen industry - in that regard it is one aspect, but as was pointed out at the TMEC conference, that is not an answer for every application. The use of innovative feed supplements to reduce livestock emissions, I will speak to that in a moment. Fuel switching by replacing fossil fuel burners with alternatives powered by renewable energy, including bioenergy technology. The Smithton Wellbeing Indoor Recreation and Leisure centre, which is the new pool complex, that pool is heated by pellets from the waste wood from Ta Ann and Britton Timbers down the road. I am not sure how many years that has been operating now, but it began before COVID-19. It is a few years and has been successful. These things are already happening but I am glad to see they are being focused on more.

Reducing agriculture and soil emission through precision agriculture: it has taken some of our older members of our farming community a while to appreciate that. It was always spread your fertiliser whenever and spread it everywhere pretty much rather than taking a more targeted approach. There are lots of reasons why it is good to take a targeted approach, not just cost alone. You do not want it all washing into the creek either if it rains at the wrong time.

Those sorts of things are the future for farming and we are seeing a lot of our younger farmers absolutely embracing this new technology and improving their productivity, as well as reducing carbon emissions on their farms.

The use of wood in construction in place of emissions intensive building products: I notice a couple of us would have been to the Forest and Forest Industry Council conference and dinner recently. I was at both. There were a number of interesting presentations on the importance of timber in our buildings, but supply can be the issue and we do not want to be buying it from countries where they do not have such high ESG requirements or even capacity. Planting trees to improve agricultural productivity and on-island timber processing - this is a bit of a constant challenge for some farmers who feel the need to clear land to make sure it is all accessible for whatever they are doing with their sheep, cattle, cropping. There have been problems in many parts of my electorate with people wanting to clear land and being told no, you cannot, because of the amount already been cleared or it is not a good area to clear it.

The Government needs to take a lead on this in helping our broader community, our older members of our community who have always managed their land a certain way, if there are other ways of doing it and the importance of planting trees on your farms for many reasons. It can increase their productivity in terms of shelter belts and things like that. It is a challenging thing for some farmers to fully appreciate.

**Ms Rattray** - I did say yesterday in the briefing there is that generation of farmers who still do things the way they have always done them. Perhaps, their fathers and mothers have done things so it is a challenge. On *Landline* on Sunday there was a good segment that showed shelter belts and they were planted in arcs. It was interesting.

**Ms FORREST** - These are the things that science teaches too. In fairness to some of our older farmers, some of the science was not done then. We did not understand and we did not know, so I am not criticising. I am saying we need to be willing to change when the science dictates we should.

**Mrs Hiscutt** - It has started to change a bit because I am aware of a time when they used to use TNT and dynamite to blow trees out of the ground.

**Ms FORREST** - In fairness, I think about my father who died just over a year ago. He cleared the land with bullock and dray. It was soldier settlement land. He might have used a bit of dynamite. I would not be surprised if he did. He lived to 93 to tell the tale.

**Mr Valentine** - Often it is the older farmers on the land who actually can see the change in climate.

**Ms FORREST** - They can. They are the ones we should also need to listen to. My dad also said he saw how the Aboriginal people managed the land, they managed it effectively. They did not have high intensity burns. When they did burn, they did low intensity burns and things like that. We have a lot to learn from the older people, but we also need to ensure we do not ignore science when science tells us to do things a little bit differently.

**Ms Rattray** - It is a compromise position.

**Ms FORREST** - It is actually listening to what science is telling us now. Diverting organic waste from landfill is an important thing too. It is not that hard to do in many respects, but you do need the facilities to process the waste et cetera.

I note another opportunity that was not on this list - I know it is not an exhaustive list - is that of battery storage. We have battery storage on our property here and the one in Wynyard. We were one of the first sites to put in the flow batteries. It has been interesting to be able to monitor and watch. We now have two, they are quite big flow batteries and solar on the roof. We had a bit of a hiccup to start with because we were basically a beta site from the South Australian company that put them in. The guy who came to install them brought his own Tesla. We did not even hear him coming up the drive. Anyway, he came from South Australia.

Getting back to the mining and manufacturing sectors, they have already identified the superior power source efficiency of lithium batteries plus electric motor over hydrogen fuel cell plus electric motor. We think hydrogen is the answer. It is not in all applications. The work has been done. At the conference there was a presenter from Elphinstone to provide this information, showing the power source efficiency that was superior with lithium battery plus electric motor over hydrogen fuel cell with electric motor. We need to look at all these options.

**Mr Duigan** - Did he look at the life time of the lithium battery, the eight-year life of that battery?

**Ms FORREST** - We did not really, I was looking at the power efficiency of it. We need to look at all these things. We are not saying one is going to be the answer for everything, we need to look at different applications.

**Mr Duigan** - Indeed, you throw away your electric cars every eight years, that is the problem.

**Ms FORREST** - Can you recycle lithium at the end of it?

**Mr Valentine** - They can make power walls out of them after they are used in cars.

**Mr Duigan** - However, they cannot do anything with the cars.

**Ms FORREST** - I will get onto this, I am astounded by some of the ideas that come forward. You think, who is going to actually think of that? Some people are very clever. I appreciate that hydrogen energy has a broader application than vehicles and no doubt will play an important part in our future.

I also note the Leader's comments that economic analysis demonstrates these 16 listed actions will not only reduce emissions, they can also improve productivity and increase demand for Tasmania's renewable energy and products, generating higher economic growth and employment. By 2050, the Leader said, our economy could be \$475 million larger, employing 1200 more Tasmanians as a result of these actions. We expect the population to increase. We need to be on the forefront to ensure we do not end up going backwards.

In many respects, some of these realities should put some of the fearmongering we have seen from some quarters related to the transition to renewable energy to bed. The evidence is becoming more compelling that this is not a detriment, there are benefits for everyone,

including to the planet. I also note the Government is working to reduce emissions across our economy through new investment in waste, transport, energy and the agriculture sectors, some of them I have mentioned.

I will comment more on the commitment to the \$6 million to fund two industrial-scale organic composting facilities in northern and southern Tasmania that will divert organic waste from landfill and thus reduce the association emissions. This is a very important part of our emissions reduction approach as we have much organic waste that can and should be returned to the ground in a more effective way, not just buried under it, with a risk of harmful emissions.

On an individual level, we can also contribute in our homes to this process and ensure all organic waste is re-used in ways that benefit the land and the planet, not just tossed out in the general rubbish. So, it will require a little bit of a change of behaviour. That is always a difficult thing for a lot of people, but slowly and surely. We do need to do our own from an individual level right up to the government and others.

**Mr PRESIDENT** - We should all get chooks.

**Ms FORREST** - Yes, I have chooks and they get a lot of the food scraps and the worms get the rest of them.

Transitioning the government fleet to electric vehicles by 2030: that is not that far away. Reducing emissions associated with imported liquid fossil fuels and increasing the supply of used EVs in Tasmania; clearly, new EVs are expensive, outside the reach of many ordinary Tasmanians. So, this is a way of getting more second-hand electric vehicles into the market and thus into circulation around Tasmania. Also, supporting the wider adoption of electric vehicles to reduce transport emissions with an investment of \$1.4 million into the statewide charging network.

Personally, I look forward to the time when my next vehicle can be and actually is fully electric. Coming from a large and rural electorate, this remains problematic until we have adequate numbers of fast charging stations around all parts of the state.

I appreciate it is getting better, and the Government has made this commitment and that is great, but at this moment I lack the confidence that I would not be stranded in a remote part of the state with no battery power and no phone coverage.

**Ms Rattray** - At Bracknell on a Saturday night at 11 o'clock, trying to get home, I am not sure how I am going to cope with that.

**Ms FORREST** - Or anywhere on the west coast too, let me tell you.

**Mr Valentine** - It is called a hybrid vehicle.

**Ms FORREST** - There is no phone coverage either. So, if you get in trouble, you are stuck.

**Ms Rattray** - At least at Bracknell I have a phone.

**Ms FORREST** - There is no phone, that is what I am saying. Without battery, you might have some hope if you can call for help but if you cannot even call for help, it is a hell of a long way to walk for reception in lots of those parts that I travel, not to mention on a dangerous road where you cannot actually get off it.

**Ms Rattray** - There is a way to go.

**Ms FORREST** - Small steps. I appreciate this change will occur, the rollout of the fast charging stations and there are challenges in ensuring that recharging our vehicles at home can occur in a way that does not negatively impact the electricity grid and also enables us to fully charge them overnight. More homes are going to have to get three-phase power. I am not sure if there is another answer, but I am not the expert in this.

I will speak briefly on the government support for Sea Forest with its investment of over \$500 000 to further research the use of asparagopsis seaweed that is a livestock feed supplement. How did someone actually think of this? There are many smart people, I have watched this with great interest.

**Mr Valentine** - It is probably those at Marawah who used to harvest seaweed.

**Ms FORREST** - Or King Island. King Island has a very active kelp industry. They only take the kelp off the beaches, of course. They harvest it.

**Mr Valentine** - It is probably where it started.

**Ms FORREST** - It may have been. It is interesting that this is a real potential game changer in the agricultural sector. There is very little you can do to stop cows burping and farting, when they eat and chew their cud, particularly.

**Mr PRESIDENT** - The parliamentary term is flatulence.

**Ms FORREST** - I am a farm girl at heart, you know. There is more burping that they do that releases the emissions because they chew their cud, they are cud-chewing animals.

**Ms Rattray** - You can take the girl out of the country, Mr President, but you cannot take the country out of the girl.

**Ms FORREST** – That is right. I find this absolutely fascinating. I was very attached to the cows when I was growing up. They all had names and I used to love them dearly and I would get amongst them in the cowyard. When they did burp, you could smell it. A happy cow chews their cud and an unhappy cow does not. They were always happy cows, which is lovely.

I am amazed by the work of scientists in this space and we are all proud of them. It has started very small and there is quite a long way to go until it is fully commercialised, but this, and potentially other great ideas, will also add to our capacity to remain net zero and get below, better than net zero.

It is for some of these reasons that we can have a sense of optimism and hope. Yes, some will take time and we need to move on these and many other measures. The need to do so is critical. As I said previously, we cannot just focus on one. We have to focus on many.

There is much that could be said with regard to this bill. However, I believe my comments have captured the key issues, and reiterated the need that I see, as shared by many others, for real and urgent action. We need to avoid any further delay in decarbonising our homes, workplaces, business and industries, to ensure the future of our planet, more so for our children and grandchildren.

The key point is this legislation must be future-focused in order to achieve our climate action strategy. I agree with the UTAS submissions and others of the need to include ambitious central emissions reduction targets and comprehensive sector-specific climate reduction strategies to build our reputation as a resilient, competitive and prosperous climate positive economy.

I acknowledge the work done in Renewables, Climate and Future Industries Tasmania (ReCFIT). I still wonder why it sits in Treasury. Anyway, maybe the Leader can tell me why it still sits in Treasury. I am going to ask Anton Voss. Also, the passion of the experts who work in this space. I note Dr Russell as one of the advisers and her very clear passion for the work in this area. I know there are many others but I acknowledge her work.

It is clear to all that our current action is inadequate and is not future-focused to the degree it certainly needs to be.

I commend the Government for bringing forward legislation to address this, and for agreeing to amendments in the other place that have strengthened the bill. I will keep my mind open to all the other amendments that are proposed during the Committee stage.

I am happy to support the bill into the Committee stage.

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery) - While the member is on her feet, the minister is coming to brief us very soon. I wonder whether the member could adjourn the debate?

**Ms FORREST** - I move -

That the debate stands adjourned.

**Debate adjourned.**

## **SUSPENSION OF SITTING**

[12.17 p.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - Mr President, I move

That the sitting be suspended until the ringing of the Division bells.



This is to enable the minister, Mr Jaensch, to brief members. We will be in Committee Room 2. He will be there in about five minutes, so if our members could please make their way to Committee Room 2.

**Sitting suspended from 12.17 p.m. until 2.30 p.m.**

## **QUESTIONS**

### **Pharmacists - Vaccination Programs**

**Ms RATTRAY question to DEPUTY LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Ms PALMER**

[2.31 p.m.]

Mr President, given that Sunday was World Pharmacists Day, and I am a former pharmacist, I am very interested in the response to these questions.

- (1) Due to fact that there have been over 10 million vaccinations delivered by pharmacists in Australia over the last 12 months, would the Government consider supporting access through pharmacists to all national immunisation program vaccinations with appropriate payments?
- (2) Would the Government consider supporting access to all vaccines?
- (3) As the arms of Tasmanian children requiring flu vaccinations are no different to those requiring a COVID-19 vaccination, would the Government consider supporting the expansion of all pharmacists' scope to include influenza vaccine for children aged five years and above, as currently COVID-19 vaccinations are available from five years of age, but influenza only from 10 years of age?

## **ANSWER**

Mr President I thank the member for her question.

- (1) Tasmania consistently achieves very high early childhood immunisation coverage rates, with general practice being the most common setting for childhood vaccination. Prior to any change in the current health service pathway, an evaluation of the existing program and consultation with various stakeholders is required to support the decision to enable pharmacy provision of National Immunisation Program (NIP) vaccines.

Alterations to the model of NIP vaccine provisions are associated with increased documentation, reporting and program requirements set by the Commonwealth. Community pharmacies have access to NIP-funded influenza vaccine for those aged 10 years and older, for the first time in 2022.

Prior to 2022, community pharmacies were only able to offer privately funded influenza vaccine. Provision of NIP-funded vaccines is associated with several additional implementation and resourcing considerations. In considering an

expansion of pharmacist access to all national immunisation program-funded vaccines, several implementation and resourcing considerations are to be considered:

- Potential fragmentation of primary care models of access;
- Potential cost-effectiveness and population benefits on increased access points;
- Workforce training and development, including resources required to provide oversight as standards of practice; and
- Additional costs associated with NIP vaccine storage, distribution, monitoring and reporting, that the state Government would be required to cover.

For Tasmania to consider an expansion for pharmacists to deliver other NIP vaccines, we would need to evaluate cost-effectiveness and population-level benefit. There is currently no Medicare item number to remunerate pharmacists for administering the vaccines, and this is a Commonwealth government decision.

- (2) Optimised immunisation coverage is a key priority of the Tasmanian Government through Public Health Services.

As I mentioned, consideration regarding the expansion of scope to include all vaccines would need to consider the existing service model, population health benefit, eligible cohort, resource implications, cost-effectiveness, safety and workforce training requirements.

The Tasmanian pharmacy immunisation program has primarily focused on adolescent and adult vaccines due, in part, to the increased complexity of vaccine schedules in younger cohorts. Additionally, childhood immunisation models that cover key childhood immunisation content have only been included in pharmacists' immuniser training courses since 2019.

- (3) Increasing the scope of pharmacy influenza vaccination programs to include vaccination of children from five years of age will be assessed in an evaluation of the 2022 influenza vaccination program. This evaluation will be provided to the Director of Public Health for consideration.

**Ms RATTRAY** (McIntyre) - I have received a text message. I might have elevated my former employment status. I was not a pharmacist, I was a pharmacy assistant. I appreciate the Deputy Leader's response.

**Mr PRESIDENT** - And if I might add, a tremendously good pharmacy assistant.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Thank you. It did not take long for the message to come in. Pharmacy assistant, not a pharmacist.

**Mr PRESIDENT** - We will let *Hansard* know.

## **Tasmania Police - Risdon Prison Surveillance Operation**

### **Ms WEBB question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.36 p.m.]

I asked the Leader of the Government a question regarding the warrant issues and surveillance operation conducted by Tasmania Police in Risdon Prison from June to August 2017 in relation to the Jeff Thompson matter. Can the Government:

- (1) confirm the date on which both the former ministers and the current Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management were first briefed as to what had occurred;
- (2) detail what role, including what communications with Tasmania Police the minister had in the decision for Tasmania Police to commission a review of the Thompson surveillance matter and the decision to appoint Michael O'Farrell SC to conduct the review;
- (3) detail if and when the minister was apprised of the terms of reference for the O'Farrell review;
- (4) detail whether the former and current ministers were made aware of any similar instances of potentially illegal surveillance by Tasmania Police that have occurred; and
- (5) detail what assurances the minister has been given that similar instances of potentially illegal surveillance by Tasmania Police are not currently occurring and will not occur in the future?

### **ANSWER**

- (1) The minister was informed that neither of the previous ministers for Police, Fire and Emergency Management were briefed on this matter. On 11 August 2022, the minister, Mr Ellis, was briefed that Mr Thompson's charges were to be discontinued. Reasons as to the discontinuation were not provided by the commissioner as Tasmania Police were complying with a court suppression order. On 31 August 2022 Tasmania Police advised Mr Ellis's office of the reasons why the charges for Mr Thompson had been discontinued. A written briefing was provided from the Commissioner of Police to Mr Ellis on 1 September 2022.
- (2) The decision to undertake a review of the Thompson matter was made by the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management on 31 August 2022. The decision to engage Michael O'Farrell SC to undertake the independent review was made by the Commissioner of Police on Wednesday 31 August 2022. Michael O'Farrell SC was engaged to undertake the independent review on Wednesday 31 August 2022. Mr Ellis's office was advised of the commissioner's decision as a courtesy just prior to the release of the Tasmania Police media release.

- (3) The terms of reference for this review were finalised on 28 September 2022 and provided to the minister.
- (4) The minister is informed that Tasmania Police has not advised any former or current minister of any issues regarding a similar surveillance device used by Tasmania Police outside the Thompson case.
- (5) The Commissioner of Police has advised that an internal review of procedures has been completed to ensure there are clear guidelines to police officers in relation to the use of surveillance devices. In addition, a higher level of oversight of surveillance warrants is now in place. Prior to the submission of any surveillance device warrant to a court, a supporting affidavit and related documents are to be vetted by Legal Services to further enhance operational and legislative compliance with the act and these must be approved by the Assistant Commissioner Operations.

### **Local Government - Introduction of Compulsory Voting**

**Mr WILLIE question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.40 p.m.]

With the recent introduction of compulsory voting for local government elections, has the state Government considered the following:

- (1) The provision of early or absentee voting?
- (2) The disenfranchisement of constituents who may have legitimate reasons for not being able to vote in the election period but want to have their say?
- (3) Since I submitted this, I note there is also some concern within the community for people with vision impairment being able to vote in a secret way where their vote is not known to a third party.

**Ms Forrest** - And people overseas.

**Mr WILLIE** - I am asking this on behalf of a constituent who cannot vote.

### **ANSWER**

I thank the member for his question.

- (1) The introduction of compulsory voting at this year's local government elections is intended to improve levels of democratic participation at a local level and strengthen connections between local communities and their councils. While voting has been made compulsory, the processes an elector must undertake to vote have not changed at these elections. Local government elections have been conducted by universal postal vote in Tasmania for more than two decades. The Tasmanian Electoral Commission conducts local government elections in accordance with the relevant provisions in the Local Government Act 1993.

- (2) Early or absentee voting provisions are not part of local government elections as they are for attendance elections. This is because local government elections are run during a two to three week polling period, rather than on one official polling day. The provision of an election polling period means that voters can consider their postal ballot pack and complete their council vote within their own time during that period. According to the election time line on the TEC website, electors should receive their ballot packs between Monday 3 and Friday 7 October 2022, polls then close at 2 p.m. Tuesday 25 October 2025. The Government recognises that - as in state elections - there may be individual circumstances which preclude some voters from accessing or returning their ballot papers within the polling period. The Local Government Act makes provisions for the issues of supplementary ballot papers in certain circumstances, including where the relevant officer is satisfied that a voter is to be absent from their address for part or all of the period, Section 286.
- (3) The act also contains provisions covering procedures for voting by persons outside of Tasmania, Section 296. However, for reasons of ballot security, these provisions are only currently used for people in Antarctica. The Local Government Amendment (Elections) Act 2022 has also introduced improved protections to ensure that people with additional barriers to election participation will not receive a fine for failure to vote, if such circumstances arise. Electors will be able to provide reasons for failing to vote. Significant flexibility is provided to the Electoral Commissioner in not issuing or withdrawing penalties for failure to vote, acknowledging the range of individual circumstances that may leave an elector unable to return their postal ballot.

**Mr Willie** - That is just saying we are not going to fine them.

### **COVID-19 - Review of Restrictions for Schools**

**Ms RATTRAY question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.44 p.m.]

Can the Leader please advise if the Education minister intends to review the current COVID-19 restrictions for access to our public schools in regard to end-of-year presentation events, to facilitate guests and members of the public to be able to once again attend?

### **ANSWER**

The need for schools to actively engage with families is recognised as highly important to student learning and wellbeing. For Term 3 and Term 4, whole-of-school assemblies and presentation events are able to occur as part of this Government's COVID Safe Schools Plan. COVID-19 safe measures are in place at all schools or externally used sites, including the use of well-ventilated spaces appropriate to the number of attendees, physical distancing where practical and engaging in good hygiene. All attendees must be well and symptom free. Staff and visitors should follow any other Public Health advice relative to the current COVID-19 risk in Tasmania.

## **Cat Management- Registration**

**Ms RATTRAY question to MINISTER for PRIMARY INDUSTRIES and WATER,  
Ms PALMER**

[2.45 p.m.]

This is a question I asked earlier in the week and the minister gave a commitment to provide an answer.

Minister, given that there are considerable concerns around feral cats, particularly in the rural community, is your Government considering re-looking at the licensing of cats in the future? Domestic cats that then can become feral cats. There have been some recent calls for the registration of cats. What is the Government thinking in regard to the registration of cats?

### **ANSWER**

I thank the member for the question. In my previous response to this question I outlined the amendments to the Cat Management Act 2009, with design to strengthen our cat management laws, proclaimed in January 2021.

The amendments are now being implemented which is the key focus for the Government's cat management activities.

Further to my response, I can advise the registration of cats is not mandatory under the Cat Management Act 2009 and that this was not an amendment being implemented or currently being reconsidered. However, I note that outside of this act, councils can introduce by-laws that cover the registration of cats in their municipality. The Cat Management Act does require a cat over the age of four months or before being sold - if the cat is younger than four months - to be microchipped and desexed. This is a requirement with the exception of a veterinary certificate stating microchipping or desexing would adversely affect the health and welfare of the cat; or for desexing, if the purchaser of the cat is a registered breeder or the holder of a cat breeding permit in relation to that cat. The details of the owner and the cat must be entered into a microchip database and kept current. The requirement to microchip can deliver similar benefits to registration. For example, it provides a unique identifier for each cat as well as providing a mechanism for a cat to be identified as owned and for a lost cat to be reunited with its owner.

In comparison, the Dog Control Act 2000 does not require compulsory microchipping of dogs; however, this act requires the owner of a dog to apply for registration to the general manager of the council in the municipal area in which the owner resides.

In general, local government has not shown strong support for introducing a registration system for cats.

## CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (No. 63)

### Second Reading

[2.48 p.m.]

**Ms FORREST** (Murchison) - Mr President, I have pretty much completed my contribution, but I did want to acknowledge the briefing from the minister who was listening to my contribution in another place, which is very gratifying. I will cover the points I raised in my speech and then subsequently in the briefing to make a couple of points about those.

Most of the points the minister was talking about in the briefing, in my view, will be debated more fully in the Committee stage and I am not going to go to that now.

I am grateful we are going to have another couple of weeks to look more closely at the amendments and engage more with those key stakeholders on some of the information we have from the administrator of the departmental offices on this matter, because that will give us time to make sure we make informed decisions on the amendments that could or should be supported or not.

I note the minister also heard my comments around the location of ReCFIT, which has now been moved to State Growth. I did ask them a while ago why it was there, in general conversation not a formal question for the Leader. I am sure that was not the reason it moved, but it was a concern to me that it was in Treasury, because Treasury to me is about holding the purse strings. It is not about ensuring such an important part of government business or government activity sits in Treasury when it really does not belong there. I appreciate the minister passing that information through. I have not checked the Treasury website to see if it has updated but if not, maybe it will be. When I last checked, it was still listed on the Treasury website.

**Mrs Hiscutt** - The minister is probably listening and taking notice.

**Ms FORREST** - I am sure he is. Nothing better to do. The minister talked about some of the challenges with hydrogen energy and the regulations that currently prevent progress in some of those areas. I sit on the Subordinate Legislation Committee with the Leader and the Chair, the member for McIntyre, and we have not seen any of the regulations come through yet. When these problems are identified, one would expect a fairly prompt response, particularly if these are the things we are focusing on to make a difference in our emissions reduction. I expect that the Subordinate Legislation Committee will see them pretty promptly. I know there is a degree of consultation that needs to go on and to make sure that there are no other areas that need to be addressed. This has been identified, and we would not expect to have to wait too long if this really is a key focus of the Government, in seeking to reduce our emissions and to keep our emissions below net zero. I acknowledge that there is a risk, as I said in my second reading contribution earlier, that without immediate and ongoing action, we could rise back to either a zero or a net positive which would not be good for many reasons. It would not be good for the state and the state's image in terms of being recognised and known as being a world leader in this, as being net negative emissions.

I note the minister's comments about not regulating business out of existence. I am not sure that is what is being suggested here. I consider there is absolute value in reporting against the emissions of each sector, even though sectors will have trouble reducing their emissions

quickly and I know that is what is being done. We all recognise there are some sectors that have a much bigger task and some have a task where there is no clear solution yet but they are vital to the health and wellbeing of our population - like being fed, for a start. Vegetarians may disagree on some of that, in terms of talking about beef and dairy farming. The minister did talk a bit about the differences between beef and dairy in terms of feeding both categories of cattle, and the asparagopsis pellets. As most farmers would know, even beef cattle get fed, they might graze but they are often fed silage and hay in the winter. It may be that it needs to be given more regularly than that. Anyway, I consider these are problems that will be sorted out. We have some examples where we can have some hope, but we cannot afford to take our foot off the pedal.

Mr President, I support the bill into the Committee stage and I look forward to continuing with it in two or three weeks, whenever it is we are back.

[2.54.p.m]

**Ms WEBB** (Nelson) - Mr President, I also thank the Leader for organising the briefings for us, and particularly, for the minister's time today to come to speak with us about the bill in some more detail. It was much appreciated and I look forward to the contributions of all members because this is an interesting one for us to be contemplating together. I welcome the debate on the Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill 2021 currently before us. I will begin with the following statement by a climate scientist:

It seems to me that our Government ... could encourage things like renewable energy use, energy conservation and could discourage high rates of usage of fossil fuel. Government could encourage solar energy research and development, including installation of suitable technology and could encourage more energy-efficient housing designs.

And this:

Total preservation seems to be impossible. We've already gone too far.

These climate change concern statements could have been made last month, last week or even today. However, in fact these statements were made by a climatologist and environmental scientist, Dr Albert Barrie Pittock OAM, who preferred to go by Barrie, in an interview published in February 1987. Dr Barrie Pittock was no lightweight or novice in this area. Between 1965 and 1999 he worked at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) Aspendale Laboratory, which was part of the Marine and Atmospheric Research Division.

He became one of Australia's leading scientists in the field of climate science, and was awarded the 1999 Australian Government Public Service Medal for his work. In 2007, Dr Pittock received a share in the Nobel Peace Prize for his role as a principal scientist on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). This was followed in 2019 with the award of the Medal of the Order of Australia (OAM). In 1987 Dr Barrie Pittock was warning us here in Australia, and I quote again, 'we've already gone too far.'

Dr Pittock was not alone in his views or his warnings, nor was he the first. It is beyond the scope of this debate to detail all specific developments of international climate science and intergovernmental policy development that occurred last century and continues into the current



century. However, it is worthwhile to highlight a few key climate milestones as context for today's discussion. In a paper summarising the history of climate activities and research, John Zillman, former chairman of the World Climate Conference-3 International Organizing Committee, former president of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), and former president of the International Council of Academies of Engineering and Technological Sciences, identified the origin of climate change science as emerging from the post-World War II combined scientific, technological and geopolitical developments in the 1950s.

Zillman's chronology details that by the late 1960s scientific concern was beginning to mount that human activities could already be starting to impact on the earth's climate at a global scale. 1970 saw a range of high-level scientific studies undertaken, with results prompting planning by the World Meteorological Organization for an inter-agency world climate program, also triggering the WMO decision to convene the historic First World Climate Conference of February 1979 in Geneva.

This historic 1979 conference was co-hosted by the WMO in collaboration with: the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; the World Health Organization; the United Nations Environment Programme; the International Council for Science (ICSU); and other scientific partners, as 'a world conference of experts on climate and mankind'. That involved approximately 350 specialists from 53 countries with 24 international organisations attending, representing a wide range of disciplines. In another first, a World Climate Change Conference Declaration was issued at the conclusion of this gathering, which was an appeal to all nations 'to strongly support the proposed World Climate Programme and suggested immediate strategies to assist countries to make better use of climate information in planning for social and economic development'.

In October 1985 another international climate conference was held in Villach, Austria. The primary focus of this gathering, known as the Villach Conference, was to assess the status of climate change knowledge at the time. It was attended by scientists from 29 countries, who produced highly influential statements foreshadowing temperature rises in the first half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century greater than any in human history.

This 1985 statement included the following unanimous conclusion:

The understanding of the greenhouse question is sufficiently developed that scientists and policy-makers should begin an active collaboration to explore the effectiveness of alternative policies and adjustments.

November 1988 saw the first session of the WMO-UNEP Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), an entity which most policymakers and many community members are now aware of. It was held in Geneva, and eventually resulted in the first IPCC Assessment Report in August 1990. Reports continued to be produced over the next 30 years, with the next one currently in preparation. Additional to the IPCC work in the 1990s, we saw the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) established as the main global forum for climate change negotiations.

The UNFCCC was adopted in 1992 at the Rio Earth Summit, entered into force in March 1994, binding most nations to avoid dangerous climate change. We saw the 1997 Kyoto

Protocol which sought to translate the Earth Summit's resolution into action, but by the time major nations and states came on board, such as the USA in 2005, climate events had largely overtaken it, with most global aspiration and hopes turning to the 2015 Paris Accord.

People are now probably familiar with the reference to the annual UNFCCC Conference of the Parties, known as the COP, the first of which was held in Berlin in 1995. The most recent meeting was the Glasgow COP 26, held last year.

November this year will see the 27<sup>th</sup> COP held in Egypt - 27 annual global climate summits yet the seas keep rising.

The point of that very quick overview of some key milestones in the global climate change scientific and policy community's history, is to highlight that we have known about the very real risk of, and threat posed by, climate change for the last 50 to 60 years.

The other pertinent points to note are the fact that these early warnings were issued to policymakers with urgency at the time, and also that a broad range of sectors were involved, all those decades ago, from agriculture to medicine, from sociology to economics.

More on that later but for the moment it is significant to note, not only what was known all those decades ago, but also who knew all those decades ago. It is 43 years since the inaugural World Climate Change Conference and declaration. It is 37 years since the 1985 Villach agreement, and 35 years since Dr Pittock warned us, we have already gone too far. In the meantime, the climate scientist's warnings get more and more dire, with increasingly urgent calls for action issued, culminating in a statement issued on 28 February this year, upon the release of the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, in which the IPCC Chair, Hoesung Lee said:

This report is a dire warning about the consequences of inaction. It recognises the interdependence of climate, biodiversity and people, and integrates natural, social and economic sciences, more strongly than earlier IPCC assessments.

It emphasises the urgency of immediate and more ambitious action to address climate risks. Half measures are no longer an option.

It is now broadly recognised that this is not some esoteric scaremongering fringe issue, that instead climate change is the greatest and most pressing public policy challenge facing us globally, nationally and locally. I would add technologically, socially and economically, which brings us to this bill.

As an aside, given the recognised gravity and urgency of the climate change challenge facing us, I recognise the tension between the impetus to swiftly pass this overdue bill, versus the impetus to take the time necessary to ensure we seize this opportunity to amend and refine the current principal act, which to be frank, barely qualifies as a gutted half shell of an act, to make it as effective as possible, on behalf of the Tasmanian community, and our unique biodiversity heritage.

I note that despite the pressure to progress this bill, which was introduced last year, the minister saw fit to resist rushing the recent debate in the other place, and instead paused

proceedings so that he had the opportunity to go away and carefully consider second reading contributions and the extensive series of amendments proposed.

I commend that effort to review and consider matters raised, and I hope that this place will also be encouraged to take the time necessary to debate and consider matters thoroughly as well, without being rushed. So far, indications are good that that is the case.

So that was a polite heads-up, that my contribution on the second reading may be a little lengthy, you may be surprised to hear, for which I am unapologetic, because I point to the minister's example of careful, thoughtful, thoroughness.

Back on track though, the bill provides us with an opportunity for a tale of two trajectories.

Trajectory 1. Let us imagine that we have got into our solar-powered Tardis because as we know, it is larger on the inside than it appears on the outside, so it can fit us all comfortably. Into the Tardis we go and we have landed in Tasmania, December 2030. We discover we have gatecrashed the premier's livestream press conference where she is congratulating all Tasmanians for their fantastic effort, all pulling together to be the first Australian jurisdiction to have verified by an independent climate audit that the state has built upon its threshold of maintaining the legislated December 2023 net zero greenhouse gas emissions by also meeting its initially set absolute greenhouse gas emissions reduction target legislated to occur no later than the end of 2030.

We would also be celebrating that the corresponding latest Climate Change Just Transition Authority status report continues to record an increase in new climate-friendly sectors with new job creation remaining steady and inclusive of new job entrants as well as those who are older and retrained.

Further, on this trajectory when we land in 2030, we find support for climate-friendly technologies and innovation continues to expand creating new export markets and, importantly, the brunt of addressing the climate crisis has not fallen disproportionately upon women, part-time and low-paid workers, people of colour, the disadvantaged, vulnerable and marginalised, unlike the experience of the COVID-19 pandemic that now features in our school history lessons.

On this trajectory in 2030 the Just Transition Authority also maps the cost of living improvements created by addressing former brittle and vulnerable food security routes. Hopefully that means no more \$13 iceberg lettuces for Tasmanians. Costs of living efforts include strong planning and construction codes requiring affordable new and retrofit housing to be eight-star energy rated with urban green canopy and water sensitive designs, improving both biodiversity and people's health and mental wellbeing.

The latest independent State of the Environment Report also details improvements in key indicators detailing the health of our natural environment, water quality and biodiversity. Significantly on this trajectory there appears to have been a halt to any further biodiversity loss. Well, there are cheers and much clinking of tea cups in celebration on the electric buses and the green hydrogen-powered ferries crossing the Derwent.

However, the premier warns that while it has been hard work to achieve the verified legislated absolute greenhouse gas emissions reduction target by the 2030 deadline, it will continue to take hard work to retain that status. However, for the moment, a collective pat on the back has been earned.

However, this is not climate utopia that we are imagining here or anything as simplistic as that. There will always be in this trajectory unease and uncertainty regarding the impacts and ramifications of other jurisdictions, state or global, that have not managed to meet the emissions reduction commitments. However, this Tasmania that we are imagining is about to step into the 2030s with robust and rigorous climate change actions plans detailing adaptation and resilience-building capacity and which are supported by all political parties and, just as importantly, are implemented in a transparent manner and an accountable parliament.

It reflects input from those with relevant expertise and experience across the community. Tasmanians from all walks of life, whether captains of industry, to workers transitioning to new climate friendly sectors, to local Tasmanian Aboriginal representatives, climate scientists, ecologists, health practitioners and children and young people can see not only how their concerns are addressed but also identify where and how their direct input was incorporated.

In this scenario we are imagining there are major dissenting voices. However, they know that within the next three years they would have an opportunity to raise their concerns and propose alternatives via the legislated climate change risk assessment processes, updated action plans, or through the broad community representation of the advisory council, as well as via the ongoing work of the Parliamentary Joint House Standing Committee on Climate Change. In this 'trajectory 1' Tasmania, if you want to be an active participant in shaping Tasmania's climate change prevention, adaptation and resilience action plans you are welcome to do so via a variety of avenues. If you are disinclined or unable to participate in the policy formation process you can feel assured that it is rigorous with parliamentary accountability and oversight hardwired into the policy development and delivery framework.

This 2030s future is characterised by social equity and inclusion, just transitions incorporated into action plans, fostering equity and innovation, adherence to precautionary principles to minimise creating biodiversity risk and loss that then require expensive and extensive diversion of finite resources and efforts to create technological fixes and a commitment to rigorous independent oversight and parliamentary accountability. That is trajectory 1.

Now let us leave that and explore and compare trajectory 2. The Tardis takes us for another spin into a parallel universe where we land on the date of 1 July 2030, though in a very different Tasmania. There is no congratulatory press conference under way. Instead, we blinked and almost missed the 4 p.m. media release quietly issued by the government media office, which, reading between the lines, appears to be saying that by some calculations it could be said the 2030 net zero greenhouse gas emissions target may have been met, though some sectors may have begun to increase emitting again and are underperforming. However, that is evened out by the international carbon offsets made and the credits bought. This consultant's report is currently being considered by government and will be tabled in parliament in due course, in a one-way process which equates, apparently, to consultation. It is evident, the community of this 2030 Tasmania is riven with conflict and division. Protests are more frequent, louder and angrier as those who are directly affected feel locked out of decision-making processes. Some sectors appear to have benefited from the climate changes, whereas

others are struggling or shutting down. Health and mental health problems are the main statistics to steadily increase.

Infrastructure damaged in the recent catastrophic natural disaster events has not been repaired or replaced. Coastal properties cannot secure insurance. The government is being sued by young people, displaced people and others arguing a failure of duty of care.

Tourists ask, what happened to the wildlife? Which can only now be readily seen in zoos, due to the combined impacts of disease, habitat loss and other unaddressed ecological pressures.

People do not feel part of the Climate Change Action Plan and they do not have much hope it will make much difference. This future is characterised by top-down exclusive decision-making; an increasingly disenfranchised, alienated and resentful populous; entrenched social inequalities and an apparently ineffectual Climate Change Action Plan which failed to prevent the impact of adaptation and economic shifts from being inflicted disproportionately upon those least able to absorb it. It also failed to address unsustainable uses of natural resources, growing urbanisation or losses and damages from extreme events.

I realise the Tardis has a reputation for being unpredictable, but looking at trajectory 1 and trajectory 2, I know which future Tasmania I want to see and be part of. I am sure most people would choose the same version.

The question facing this parliament is, on what trajectory does this Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill place us? In all likelihood and honesty, it probably places us somewhere in between the positive trajectory 1 and the negative trajectory 2 I have described. The bill in its current form, we can actually agree, does not deliver what is required to fully reach trajectory 1, even if it keeps us somewhat bubbling along above trajectory 2.

To be blunt, it will not prevent us from sliding down a less collaborative robust and resilient pathway towards trajectory 2.

To be clear, neither the purpose of the amendment bill before us nor the Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008, will do the decarbonising of our economy nor reduce greenhouse gas emissions by themselves. Instead, they are to provide the framework, establishing particular mechanisms by which Tasmania's greenhouse gas emissions are reduced by a particular time frame.

The framework sets out who is responsible for what, how and by when. The issue facing us here today is whether that framework in this bill is as robust, transparent and effective as it could be, as it needs to be in face of the climate emergency.

This legislative framework also details the interface between government, the private sector, the community and the parliament. The key components of the bill can be loosely grouped into four broad categories:

- (1) Contemporary updates of the objects of the act, definitions and emissions reduction targets.

- (2) The range of assessments, reports and plans for which the minister is responsible to deliver and the time frames by which that is to occur.
- (3) Sector-based emission reduction plans.
- (4) Who is to be involved and to what degree and when.

I am aware there are a range of proposed amendments which relate to these areas of the bill, however and I will leave substantive arguments on those to when those amendments are debated; assuming that the bill will go to the Committee stages. Instead, I now wish to touch on some specific areas relating to the bill which were raised through the last round of consultation on it, as well as during briefings that we have received.

One of the key characteristics which propels the climate change crisis into the realm of being a key public policy challenge of our time is its intergenerational reach and implications. Decisions made now will impact upon and determine the future of our children and grandchildren and their children's children. Actions taken now, or potentially those we fail to take, will pose dramatic ramifications for those coming after us. We all know this. It has been pointed out emphatically by regular mass school walkouts held around the globe and by the collectives of young people taking court action against governments, even in this country.

Days prior to the 2021 Glasgow COP26, another UN conference was held, the 16<sup>th</sup> United Nations Climate Change Conference of Youth, known as the COY16. This conference focused on capacity building and policy training in order to prepare young people for their participation at COP and their life as local and international climate activists and advocates. The COY16 culminated in the Global Youth Position Statement, representing the views of over 40 000 young people worldwide. This statement opens with the following words:

Our overarching demand that unifies all themes is that the youth should be actively and meaningfully included in all decision-making processes concerning climate change governance and implementation. We call for these policy demands to be integrated into national and international agendas and commitments. We demand an intersectional approach to youth inclusion in environmental governance, acknowledging that the climate crisis affects some communities and social groups disproportionately and recognising that the climate crisis is a broader sociopolitical crisis that necessitates systemic and radical action.

In Tasmania we heard from the Commissioner for Children and Young People who reiterated the global COY statement sentiment. He stated clearly that not only are young Tasmanians very aware of climate change, they also wish to be actively and meaningfully included in the state's response. Rather than attempt to speak for Tasmania's young people, I spoke to some, inviting them to write down in their own words to allow their perspective to be included in this debate firsthand; from the horse's mouth, as it were.

Two Tasmanian young people have given me permission to read out their perspectives as part of this debate. The first statement I will share with the Chamber is by Ali Barry, who is currently undertaking grade 12 at Hobart College:

In the year 2020 the Australian Bureau of Statistics estimated that 12% of the Australian population was made up of young people aged 15 to 24. That is 3.2 million people whose future lies in the hands of today's politicians and decision-makers. 3.2 million people with no formal involvement or consultation outside of their vote and recommendations. As one of these young people, I find our voices are often left unheard and our future compromised by politicians who do not seek to understand or represent us, and do not consider the impacts that decisions made today have on our future and the life ahead of us. This is absurd.

It is critical to allow us to have a say on issues that involve us. If the Bill fails to do so adequately, this shows, young people and other members of the community that our voices aren't valued and appreciated, and that the decisions made for our future, on our behalf aren't taking our wants and opinions into consideration. This is hurtful, scary and isolating. I want a say in my own future. I want a say in decisions that will affect me and I want people to listen.

That was Ali's request to us all here today. The second statement that I will share was provided by Kuba Meikle, who is 17 years old and lives in Launceston. This was his message:

We know the importance of community engagement to ensure people can have their say. However, for the youth, such consultation is crucial. Young people are underrepresented in Federal and State Parliament. We are not in positions of power or authority and we're dismissed as 'not having enough experience' by many of our elders. If the youth isn't consulted, we are silenced. We cannot vote, we cannot donate millions to political parties and our questions are answered with 'Thank you for contacting us, your views have been considered.' Most politicians ignore us. Even still, it would be ridiculous not to consult young people on climate change.

Today's youth are the ones who will have to face the reality of global warming. The reality of a changed Earth. For over 40 years, politicians have ignored the climate science. They've given the green light to fossil fuels and forest logging, shifting the blame to meaningless carbon footprints. Politicians of the past destroyed the youth's future but now you can show that today's reps are better than past members.

Giving youth the opportunity to have a say on such a life-changing issue, will acknowledge rather than entrench those past mistakes. Sure, some will say that there's no point in consultation if people's opinions are ultimately ignored. No matter if our thoughts are implemented or not, reaching out to the youth shows that to some degree, politicians now care.

Not requiring community consultation in such an instrumental piece of legislation reinforces people's beliefs, young and old, that politicians only serve themselves. It says the decision-makers don't care what will happen next because by then, they'll be in 20 non-executive board positions, living the high life while the rest of the world burns.

We just have one simple request: please listen to us, then one day, when we are the ones writing the history books, we can write that you stood up, that you cared and that you were true leaders.

It is forthright stuff, Mr President. In their own words, these young people have made their position quite clear. They do not purport to be representative of anyone other than themselves, and I am not seeking to suggest that they are representative of all other young Tasmanians. However, it is quite clear that, should there be a formal appropriate mechanism provided by which they could have input and genuinely participate in developing Tasmania's climate change efforts prescribed by this bill, in all likelihood they will leap at that opportunity. I acknowledge that the current bill before us was amended in the other place to make specific reference to children and young people and future generations in the new objects of the act clause, as well as in the development of the action plan, the statewide risk assessment and also in the review of the act provisions. All of that is very welcome. However, where these inclusions relate to consultation, they are fairly general, rather than prescriptive and there may be potential to explore options for a more direct involvement - for example, involvement with or representation on an advisory council, should such an entity be established.

Another area of inexplicable silence in this bill is the absence of any specific inclusion of the Tasmanian Aboriginal community as a specifically recognised stakeholder to be included in the range of consultation processes provided in the bill. I do not understand this omission. It is undisputed that for Australian and Tasmanian Aboriginal peoples, land is intrinsically entwined with culture. Climate change impacts, industrial development and environmental degradation can all impact upon the ability of Aboriginal communities to remain connected to country, to protect their heritage and maintain culture. As an Aboriginal academic based at the ANU stated in an article recently:

As people uniquely impacted by - and with demonstrable knowledge and practices to mitigate against - climate change, Indigenous peoples must be at the table in all climate change talks.

We cannot allow climate change mitigation and adaptation to become another colonial process of dispossession and disempowerment.

Excluding our voices will inevitably mean opportunities will pass us by, or negatively impact us, even when we're expected to contribute our knowledge and skills to support larger climate mitigation and adaptation efforts.

These are unique skills and knowledge and also unique impacts. Only last week, a United Nations committee found the Australian Government had violated the rights of Torres Strait Islanders by failing to take adequate action to cut emissions. The committee stated the Australian Government should pay compensation and also:

... engage in meaningful consultations [with their communities] to assess their needs, and take measures to secure their communities' safe existence ...

A call which the Tasmanian Government could also heed. In an attempt to justify the omission of the Tasmanian Aboriginal community from the list of those detailed to be included in consultation processes, it was argued that the Government did not receive any submissions from Tasmanian Aboriginal representatives during the consultation period on this bill, the



inference being, I take it, that if this community was interested they would have made a submission. Given they were apparently not interested to do so, then ipso facto, they do not want to be included in climate change policy development discussions hereon in.

I hope this was not the argument relied upon, inference or otherwise. It would be laughable for this to be considered a serious argument except that I find it quite insulting and I believe others would also. I refer back to what that United Nations committee suggested to the Australian Government that it do which is this: engage in meaningful consultations to assess their needs and take measures to secure their communities' safe existence.

The key question for any government would be, if Tasmanian Aboriginal community members have not participated in the consultation exercise that you have undertaken, perhaps you have to ask yourself how you failed in that consultation process and what more, or differently, you needed to do in order to meaningfully consult with that community.

My question for the Government is - and I am hoping that the Leader of the Government can clarify for me - whether the Government has meaningfully sought feedback from any Tasmanian Aboriginal representatives since the bill was originally consulted on or since the bill was tabled in the other place regarding the lack of submissions that were received during the public consultation. Also, whether the Government has sought any feedback from the Tasmanian Aboriginal representatives in the community on whether, and how, future consultations regarding the state's climate change approach could occur. Have they been asked whether they should or should not be included as specific stakeholders in this bill? Have they been asked how they might tie into the mechanisms presented in the bill?

I will briefly discuss tipping points. A tipping point is defined as a small intervention that leads to major long-term consequences which are hard to reverse. During debate in the other place the minister refers to 2030 as the climate tipping point, hence the bill seeking to amend the net zero emissions target deadline to 2030. On the surface, that appears consistent with the latest IPCC report which warned global emissions must peak before 2025 and be reduced by 43 per cent by 2030. In this context, the climate tipping point is a recognised negative tipping point. This is particularly relevant in relation to this bill in that it seeks to define the state's emissions reduction target as net zero greenhouse gas emissions or lower from 30 June 2030.

Without wanting to get bogged down discussing in detail the difference between net and actual emissions, this proposed target, I feel, borders on the ridiculous. Tasmanian governments have been patting themselves on the back for the last half dozen or so years or so that our greenhouse gas reporting indicates Tasmania has already achieved net zero status. I recognise there is still contention regarding that greenhouse gas reporting methodology but the point remains, why on earth are we legislating that in seven years or so time we are to achieve something we apparently already did six years ago? Surely, we would have red tape busters from the Office of the Coordinator-General swooping down on a provision like that before the ink was even dry.

Submissions to the exposure draft bill argue that instead we should be legislating something meaningful which will then also serve as a tangible baseline from which serious ongoing climate adaptation and mitigation efforts can build so that we are as well positioned as possible by the time we reach the 2030 tipping point. Such submissions made by those with relevant expertise, such as the Climate Tasmania group that I know has been engaging with

many of us, have nominated the net zero target to be 31 December 2023. While that may appear awfully soon, remember that according to the latest greenhouse gas reports we are already there.

If the backslapping is to be believed then actually there should not be an issue with nominating 31 December this year. Legislating for an earlier target is also consistent with the IPCC statement, to which I referred earlier, that emissions must peak before 2025 and then be well on the decrease leading into 2030.

Nor can we leave the tipping point of 2030 as if it is an end in itself. This bill is disturbingly silent on what happens after the tipping point has been passed.

Presumably, the rolling sequence of stipulated plans et cetera will be reporting progress, but without meaningful or legislated targets. Therefore, addressing the nonsensical net zero target of 2030 by instead stipulating that threshold is to be achieved by the end of December next year, then provides an opportunity to legislate actual emission reduction targets to be achieved prior to 2030.

At this stage, I am inclined to agree that solely legislating for a 2023 net zero target without also legislating an absolute target down the track would render the 2023 target as meaningless, without there also being explicit and structural mechanisms signalling it is to be maintained and to serve as a basis to drive down actual emissions as we transition through to the decarbonised economy we know we need to arrive at.

I expect this point will be discussed further in detail in the Committee stage, so I will leave it there. The key point I will make is that the 2030 tipping point is very real, within and at the global scale, and therefore locally we have a responsibility to make our preparation for it as meaningful and robust as possible. The role of tipping points is something I will come back to later when discussing amendments during this debate.

We have heard a lot about the need for a 'just transition', particularly in the context of impacts upon local economies, industries and employment insecurity, and we will continue to do so, I expect. It will no doubt be a feature of this particular debate, especially once we begin to consider amendments.

I will not comment in detail on any specific amendments to do with providing a just transition mechanism; however, I want to spend some time discussing the concept's principles, and why those just transition principles should be embedded in this bill before us.

It is indisputable: the transition to net zero emissions will require a considerable transformation of particular sectors and industries. It is equally indisputable that this prospect can create significant anxiety, confusion and uncertainty, about those communities' futures.

The involvement and consideration of those affected by the state's adaptation and resilience plans is pivotal in achieving a just transition leading up to, and continuing beyond, the identified 2030 tipping point.

There are already international examples of effective transition authorities established in countries such as Canada, Germany and Spain. Nationally here, there are moves to legislate a

federal independent statutory national energy transition authority that would plan and coordinate new opportunities for affected workers and provide advice to government.

The proposed national transition authority has the support of the Business Council of Australia, the Australian Council of Trade Unions, as well as local councils, superannuation funds and environmental groups. There is also an established regional transition authority in Victoria's Latrobe Valley, for example, and currently an alliance of unions, local and environmental groups are campaigning for one to be established in the Hunter Valley, as its coal-based industries begin to shut down.

Given the established clear need for transition entities as experienced interstate, plus moves to establish one as part of the federal government's climate response, clearly there is going to be similar need for a similar focus and support to be provided to adjusting Tasmanian communities and workers.

We may not have such a coal-reliant economy as some of the examples that I mentioned, but transition shocks will still be felt. Investing in a formal mechanism by which to secure a just transition as we move towards a decarbonised economy, is essential. To not address this now, while debating this amendment bill, would be a wasted opportunity to say the least because it also risks leaving Tasmanians out of step with our national counterparts.

This current bill should provide an opportunity, a vehicle by which this parliament recognises the need for, and provides an integrated and holistic approach delivering a just transition strategy. I look forward to a more thorough and detailed debate on the merits of a just transition mechanism and what it may look like when we get - and if we get - to the Committee stage.

It will come as a surprise to very few here, that the protection of human rights is a core passion of mine. It was, and remains, pivotal to my seeking election to this place, to work, to progress and build a strong human rights ethos through all our systems of governance.

The climate change crisis is a human rights issue. On 28 July this year, the United Nations General Assembly voted overwhelmingly to declare the ability to live in a clean healthy and sustainable environment a universal human right. It also called on governments, the private sector and other organisations to increase efforts to deliver that human right.

I do not have the time now to detail all the ways in which climate change is a human rights issue, but it is pertinent to this debate and this bill to examine some implications of the July UN resolution. While this UN resolution is not legally binding on its member states, such as Australia, in some jurisdictions it could have serious ramifications for the growing field of climate-related litigation. Again, something from which Tasmania is not immune.

However, even without specific human rights laws, a human rights-based approach to climate change can drive the prioritisation of environmental protection and climate action by highlighting the ways in which climate harms impact our human rights and by ensuring any climate responses are driven by those most affected by climate change. Studies have identified that successful human rights-based climate response models tend to share common elements, including these: the participation of rights holders in decision-making processes; clear links to human rights; accountability for duty bearers with respect to human rights; respect for principles of equality and non-discrimination of rights holders; the empowerment of rights

holders to understand and enjoy their human rights and participate in decision-making and the formulation of laws, policies and practices that impact upon them; and finally, transparency for all stakeholders involved.

Legal researcher at the Monash University Centre for Human Rights Law, Scott Walker, states:

A human rights-based approach to climate policy has the potential to focus our nation's climate change responses on those most directly impacted by climate change, including First Nations peoples, persons experiencing homelessness and those living in rural and remote communities. It would empower them to participate in decision-making and the formulation of laws, policies and practices to address climate change.

I am sure it is clear where I am going with this. Not only is climate change a human rights issue, but by taking a human rights-based approach and developing and implementing our climate response, we can ensure we are on a trajectory towards a more effective, inclusive, accountable and just transition. An inclusive human rights-based approach is consistent with and furthers the proposed new objects of the act as set out in this bill. As Scott Walker states in his article:

While progress will not be linear and will require sustained campaigning and community action, a human rights-based approach has the potential to provide us tools to respond to the turbulent climate we face. A human rights response to climate change has the potential to marshal actions to avoid falling over the precipice into climate disaster.

A human rights-based approach clearly has a bearing upon the themes discussed earlier in my contribution of the need to specifically include sectors such as Tasmanian young people and the Tasmanian Aboriginal communities into our climate response framework, as well as the identified need for a formal just transition method. A human rights-based approach is also central to the need for broader representation of involvement in greater accountability, transparency and parliamentary oversight.

This bill basically provides for the minister of the day, along with select business and industry representatives from specified sectors, to do the doing, or at least develop a plan by which the rest of us would need to abide. Other than the occasional consultation opportunity or receipt of tabled reports and draft plans, those empowered to act in any meaningful way within the Climate Change (State Action) Act are remarkably limited, especially given the urgent imperative on this most pressing policy issue of our time. There are amendments circulating to provide greater inclusion and improved ongoing parliamentary oversight and accountability mechanisms. I will leave making my substantive argument in relation to those particular proposals until later.

In the interim though, I will address some of the things in the argument put forward to justify rejecting calls for the inclusion of, say an expert advisory body and the establishment of a joint House standing committee on climate change. Hopefully, that will mean we do not have to waste too much time in the Committee stages discussing these, because I consider them to be mostly quite blatant red herrings, one of which is the spurious argument that scientists have made the case so we do not need them in the room anymore. We are now convinced of the

climate emergency and now we just need to talk to those who can fix it, i.e. apparently, those in the sectors which can drive the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

At the risk of generalisation, the main reason those sectors are in a position to drive emissions down is because they are, in the main, responsible for producing those emissions and have usually benefitted, financially or otherwise, while doing so. This is commonly referred to as a vested interest. By all means, they should be involved, but other voices and other areas of expertise should also be involved and included.

To briefly circle back to the potted chronology, I opened with. That, in itself, paints a stark picture detailing that climate science is not static. It is the understanding of climate impacts and ramifications. The diverse range of particular expertise has developed exponentially since the 1950s and it will continue to do so. Yet, some things do remain consistent over the decades, such as the historic first World Climate Conference of 1979, which had 350 specialists spanning diverse disciplines which included agriculture, water resources, fisheries, energy, environment, ecology, biology, medicine, sociology and economics. While nobody here is arguing for 350 representatives to be involved in developing sector-based emissions reduction plans, the diversity of experience and lived experience does need to be formally provided for in an appropriate mechanism.

The impact of these industries and sectors does not not occur in isolation, nor should any purported solution be developed in isolation. This crisis requires a new way for government to do business and clearly the other paramount consideration is making the delivery of action plans, risk assessment reports and sector emission reduction and resilience plans meaningful and accountable. The tabling of reports periodically in parliament is a useful first step, but it is limited in providing for interrogation or relevant evidence-based input. I also note here the phenomena we have heard described in briefing as 'the policy churn.' This refers to the fact that say, here in Tasmania, we have seen a lot of plans, but not a lot of progress in reducing non-forestry emissions.

From 2007 until now, there have been seven ministers responsible for climate change, two of whom held the role twice, from parties of every stripe, Labor, Greens and Liberal. Across the same period, there have been six climate-related emissions reduction plans put forward by those ministers. Yet, from 2007 to 2019, non-forestry emissions have barely reduced in Tasmania.

'Policy churn' - it is interesting we have heard the minister make the argument to us today, apparently, that is because those were produced just by consulting with the scientists about the problem. We have not then engaged with the industries themselves who will be the ones, according to the minister, to fix the problem. That is interesting, it is his government that has been responsible for that for the last eight or so years and probably quite a number of those reports if not four or five of the ministers. I am glad they are pivoting to something they feel might work better. In the meantime, I am not sure. He is being somewhat disingenuous in attributing a lack of progress purely to absence of industry from those plans. It probably felt quite virtuous in the past to produce lovely looking glossy plans. There is plenty of busy work in it. The thing that was missing, perhaps alongside the presence of engagement with industry, was rigorous accountability. Specified targets and accountability around them. Ambitious oversight, ambitious and appropriate expectations from the community incorporated into those plans.

Without that kind of rigorous accountability, we risk a continued lack of progress. The longer that continues, the more exponentially we see damages and costs rise for all of us in community and particularly, for those most vulnerable.

I am very interested to see, perhaps the minister and I are both somewhat right, but the bill as it stands now incorporates the minister's view of what is needed, engagement with industry, but it does not incorporate sufficiently what is needed, and that is that much more rigorous accountability. I would like us to put both those things in there and see if we can use both our ideas of what is needed to work, going forward. Why not do everything we can, pull every lever we can?

How do we ensure that action and real progress are made beyond producing plans? We need to find ways that hold people to account, hold governments, hold sectors, hold the community, for us to hold each other to account.

We know that in the course of considering this bill there is a range of potential oversight and accountability issues that have been identified that are not currently provided for in the bill, which could be addressed and will be addressed in discussion of some amendments.

It brings me to the second spurious argument that I have heard that I will mention that needs to be rebuffed. It relates to one of the proposed oversight mechanisms which is a joint House standing committee on climate change. I will mention briefly, although we will discuss it in much more detail later, that apparently it has been argued that this parliament does not have a culture or precedent of establishing special parliamentary standing committees on such areas as health or others, where there is a shared interest across the Chamber or parliament.

I beg to differ, and so does the public record on this. At the same time this bill was being debated in the lower House, in fact, both Chambers had just formally agreed to the establishment of a joint committee on gender and equality. Further, if we look back since the enactment of the Integrity Commission Act 2009, this parliament has had in place a Joint Standing Committee on Integrity, this particular issue, established under Division 2 of that act. I am hopeful that we will get a chance to discuss proposed amendments in these areas and we can, I hope, forgo silly excuses or unsubstantiated arguments and focus on the real benefits and rationale for a joint standing committee that relates to this area.

Things like the joint standing committee and other accountability mechanisms are consistent with a human rights-based approach by encouraging all Tasmanians to contribute to our climate response, and goes some way towards providing 'the mechanisms to reckon with the exploitation of our environment and hold accountable governments which fail to act adequately on climate change'.

That was a quote again from Scott Walker.

I also note, there is a range of other amendments being circulated and I will discuss them in greater detail at the time of their debate. I am going to flag here some of the areas I am interested in exploring in greater detail during the Committee stages. The refining of meaningful net zero emissions targets and actual emissions reduction targets is a key area. There is also discussion to be had regarding the inclusion of numerical estimates of emissions reduction in the climate change action plan, as well as the sectoral or emission reduction and resilience plans. Time frames by which particular plans and risk assessments are to occur is an

area for discussion, and the range of stakeholders able to participate at various stages of the framework provided for in this bill, are also areas I intend to explore more thoroughly during Committee stages.

In the meantime, I have another question relating to this bill that I will take the opportunity to ask the Leader. There are numerous references to time frames in this bill being triggered by receiving royal assent. For example, new clause 5C subclauses (3) and (4) on page 14 which detail that within 12 months of the act receiving royal assent, the transport sector-based emissions reduction and resilience plan is to be prepared. Whereas, for other sectors they have until 24 months from the day on which the act receives royal assent.

In other cases, such as new clause 5B, 'Statewide climate change risk assessment', on page 12 of the bill, subclause (1) requires the minister to prepare a statewide climate change risk assessment within two years after the commencement of this act. It is a practical question, but my question is this: Leader, could you clarify for me that it is the Government's intent that all sections of the final bill will commence the same time the final act receives royal assent? Is there a particular reason why some specified time frames are triggered by commencement rather than royal assent? It is probably my lack of experience to not understand what that is.

To conclude, following the positive tipping point sparked by Greta Thunberg and the global young people's movement demanding decision-makers act on climate change, the European Parliament voted in 2019 to declare a climate emergency with speakers attributing their decision to support this to Greta and that youth movement. Others followed suit, including Pope Francis, who declared a climate emergency in June 2019 and in November that year the Oxford dictionary declared the term 'climate emergency' word of the year.

However, as members may recall, the first governmental declaration of a climate emergency in the world was made by the City of Darebin in Melbourne which declared a climate emergency on 5 December 2016. A recent estimate has put the global number of jurisdictions that have since declared a climate emergency as of September 2022 at 2274 jurisdictions which demonstrates how instrumental catalysts can originate from all walks of life, from all tiny corners of the globe. Such instrumental catalysts could originate in proposed independent expert advisory bodies, in just transition mechanisms and also from those even appearing before parliamentary committee hearings.

The minister has declared he considers 2030 our tipping point in line with the IPCC's projections. The intent of this bill, it is argued, is to establish frameworks by which the new to-be-mandated net zero greenhouse gas emissions target is reached by the mid 2030 tipping point. There are regular reports on progress with sectors of the community consulted to some degree at specific steps along the way. As mentioned earlier, there is a strong argument that we need to have moved beyond net zero emissions by the time we reach 2030 if we are to have embarked on a sustainable inclusive trajectory towards transition to a low emissions future, as mentioned in the proposed new objects of the act.

What will be apparent as we draw closer to the 2030 tipping point and when we look back on it in future decades, is whether the framework we are debating here today made the type of intervention resulting in long-term and hard-to-reverse consequences that benefit a few, such as those represented by mobilised capital, that left people behind, entrenching divisions and leaving avoidable gaps and missed opportunities to protect our unique natural environment. Or did the tipping point mark a milestone in our drive to develop a positive synergy between

achieving actual emission reduction targets and building a genuinely just transition that was inclusive, equitable, innovative, resilient, accountable and transparent? Whether the state's climate change action plan is a living document open to being regularly fine-tuned, detailing a pathway that people can see and feel confident in, rather than feeling alienated and resentful towards.

The suite of amendments flagged that touch on the areas I have discussed here in my contribution are consistent with the intent of this bill. They are to intervene in our greenhouse gas-impacting activities in a manner that sets Tasmania on a trajectory where the irreversible long-term consequences of that intervention respect universal human rights while building a stronger, healthier, resilient and more equitable society, and also protecting our natural environment for future generations. That will be the baseline criteria by which I will evaluate any amendments debated in the Committee stage - which trajectory to and beyond the 2030 tipping point will they reinforce? As I consider each amendment, will they put Tasmania on to the positive trajectory of climate change mitigation and application in an effective and coherent and just way? If so, they are arguably consistent with the new objects of the act as detailed in the bill.

The harsh reality is we have barely eight years before the 2030 tipping point. We are already on a trajectory of some sort. It is whether we can wrench back some degree of control to use that trajectory to fashion the sustainable future for the Tasmania we want. Well may we look back at the chronology with which I opened and rue our collective failure to heed the warnings and calls to action from 1979 through the 1980s, the 1990s, to earlier this year with the release of the IPCC's warning bell to humanity as described by the UN Secretary-General.

Let us ensure we take whatever opportunity is available to us now to ensure that in future decades Tasmanians have little need to look back and rue any current unheeded warnings or calls to action as we consider this bill.

I wish to close by again quoting from the IPCC statement released with the working group's recent report in February, this year.

It said this:

Our assessment clearly shows that tackling all these different challenges involves everyone - governments, the private sector, civil society - working together to prioritize risk reduction, as well as equity and justice, in decision-making and investment.

In this way different interests, values and world views can be reconciled. By bringing together scientific and technological know-how as well as Indigenous and local knowledge, solutions will be more effective. Failure to achieve climate resilient and sustainable development will result in a sub-optimal future for people and nature.

[3.56 p.m.]

**Mr GAFFNEY** (Mersey) - Madam Deputy President, I am not sure whether Madam is the right honorific now because it should just be Deputy President, I suppose, if we are getting away from the his and hers.



**Madam DEPUTY PRESIDENT** - I quite like the sound of Madam, but whatever.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - So do I. Okay. I will leave that alone, Madam Deputy President.

The one thing that we are going to find out of this is that everybody's contribution will be a little bit different.

There is so much information and material out there, it is what to bring to this Chamber to add to the conversation and the debate. I appreciate the briefings we have received from the Government. I appreciate the amount of information we have received and the openness from the minister to be available at any time. That has been good, because if we think about what this is all about, it is about what is good for us as a community, as a state, into the next generations and that is a difficult one.

I am not going to take that long, but I will roll around a few different places, trying not to repeat some of the stuff that has already been said.

I appreciate the contribution of each member and think there is a difference here between Independents and party members. Do not get me wrong here. I am not making a judgment about those. The parties - Labor, Liberal and Greens - have a policy position regarding certain things, for example, climate.

As an Independent, we do not so much. We sort of pick pieces or we like that from that party, I like that from that policy, how is that going to fit together.

We are very much aware there is a huge amount of information. There is a huge amount of scientific evidence in the community and there is a huge amount of community angst. It is impossible and not beneficial to provide hours and hours of documentation, analysis and papers and commentary on this topic in this place.

Saying that, it is acknowledged climate change is the greatest threat in current times and we as a parliament, and the community representatives, get very few opportunities to have an impact and improve the legislation. This is our time to be able to do what we can for the future generations and this is one of those chances.

It is interesting. I am not sure how other people organise their bills, but I have a folder, and I have the bills in line and then every now and then you will get a bill that comes up and you get two separate folders just for that legislation. It could have been more. There has been so much information come to us and it is sifting through that, what to bring to this place.

I acknowledge that because that bulk of information means that in 14 or 15 of us speaking, we can cover a lot of that and come up with, perhaps something that will encourage us when we get into Committee, to listen to other people's points of view and what they are saying and what is the intent behind that comment.

We all want the best thing. Even this morning, we would have received an email. It is important and not very long, but it highlights the concern from the community, what people want to do.

It said:

Dear Mr Gaffney,

I am concerned about the lack of ambition and urgency in the Tasmanian Government's proposed Climate Change Bill. Given that Tasmania has already been boasting about being carbon neutral for several years, legislating for net zero emissions by 2030 is meaningless. Tasmania should be aiming for ambitious emissions reduction targets rather than relying on offsets and reductions in native forest logging.

The only way to curb climate change is to stop burning fossil fuels, stop land clearing and change agricultural practices. Thus, we should be legislating for no new fossil fuel exploration or mining in and around Tasmania. We need ambitious emission reduction targets and plans for industry, energy and waste sectors. We need legislation to support electrification of the transport sector. We need to stop clearing land, start ecological restoration and support farmers to find better ways to manage their land. We need to legislate for ambitious emission reduction targets so we can become carbon negative by 2030 and set a shining example to the rest of Australia.

This is a climate emergency. Which part of the word 'emergency' does the Government not understand?

When I received this I spoke to the person and said, do you mind if I read that in? It is typical of what we are hearing and seeing. I suppose people are so passionate about climate change, as we have heard from the mobs around the world and schools going on, that when I think back to the protest laws we just passed, the climate is one of those issues those laws are going to be tested on.

Then you hear logos and slogans about net emissions, getting it right by 2050, then I go back to the healthiest state by 2025, I go back to target the 10 000 houses by 2032. All that target stuff is good, but if the target stuff does not come to reality, it is meaningless. We have to be aware of that. If we think about the rallies and catchcries, there are too many variables. If we think about rallies and catchcries we hear from the community, we want change and we want it now. You hear that when you go to the rallies, but what that change looks like and what that change will be is hard to put a finger on, because what that change means is what is going to change to make this better?

I have some concerns about what we are doing here. The Leader's speech appears to focus heavily on the economy and perhaps does not go far enough to address the real needs of this emergency. The Government is in an interesting place, because whilst they have to contend with the climate emergency, they also have to say well, how can we also keep the economy rolling on? That is a bit of a balancing act.

It also worries me some information we have received has long-term predictions out to 2050, 30 years from now and as we get older, we realise that goes quite quickly. I can remember, I heard a radio commentator say one day that life is like a roll of toilet paper, the first half goes really slowly. I found some synergy to that. However, if you think about 2050, 30 years from now, that means 1990. Most of us were well into our profession there. What was it like in 1990? What happened there?

The total warming effect from greenhouse gases from 1990 to now, earth's atmosphere has increased by 45 per cent. Earth's temperature classically has risen by 0.8 per cent Celsius per decade since 1880. However, since 1980, 40 years ago, the rate of warming is more than twice that, 0.18 per cent. 2021 was the sixth warmest year on record. In the last 12 years we have had 10 of the hottest years on record. It is an emergency. That is what we need to focus on. In what we are planning now, in our opportunity to change legislation, are we saying to the Government, we want you to do this, we do not really care about the economics of this over here so much, because this is what is happening?

That is the conundrum. Not only are we getting hotter temperatures, more severe storms, increased drought, a rising ocean, sea levels have risen by eight centimetres in the last 20 years. No wonder some of the islands that we heard about before are worried about it. Loss of species, not enough food, more health risks and poverty and displacement. The funny thing about - not the funny thing - a thing about climate change, once the vortex starts, exponentially these things will happen. Once the degrees of temperature go up a bit more, we lose so many more species that cannot adapt.

From that point of view, are we doing enough by 2050? It is difficult, as we heard from our briefings. It is hard to know. It is best guestimates, I suppose, of what is going to happen. What we know is, what energies do we need to put into the legislation today, that can create change? It is not going to happen overnight. With all due respect, I taught people for 25 to 30 years, and they want things to happen right away, they want to see things happen.

**Ms Rattray** - Yesterday.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Exactly. What we need to do is be able to say 'we have listened to what you have been saying and, in our capacity, this is what we are going to do in legislation. This is what we can do to make sure those targets get hit quicker, make sure we put more energy, more finance, more money, more backing, more whatever, expertise, into the things that are going to happen and matter in 2050.' That is where the conundrum is.

The evidence is clear and this comes from many different sources: the main cause of climate change is burning fossil fuels, such as oil, gas and coal. No matter how we try to massage it, and no matter how we try to protect our businesses, that is the main thing. When burned, fossil fuels release carbon dioxide into the air, causing the planet to heat up. With that for an opening, I will focus on parts of one submission that we received because it highlights across the board. A young man from the University of Tasmania came to see me, with a group, about their concerns. It was an articulate group of people, and he sent an email:

I am contacting you today on behalf of the Climate Collective, the former School Strike for Climate in Hobart, an organisation fighting for climate action on behalf of young people in Southern lutruwita/Tasmania. As you would be aware, the Gutwein government has recently introduced the Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill of 2021 to the Tasmanian Parliament. Young people in our state believe that the bill as written fails to deliver both on the promises made to the young people by Premier Gutwein during the last State election, and the expectations of the Tasmanian community. Over the past 3 years, over 50 000 Tasmanians, overwhelmingly young Tasmanians, have attended our events to demand immediate effective climate action.

To the Government's credit, they have taken on some of those and amendments have been introduced. It is about, have there been enough? Can we do more? That is the debate that we will have in a couple of weeks time when we come back. They went on to say:

We are eager to meet with you, directly to discuss the bill and proposed amendments as well as its effect on climate change.

I was quite pleased to be able to meet with them. When I looked at their submission, which was 76 pages - so here we go, page 1. No, I am kidding. I will take a few points out of it though -

**Ms Webb** - Trying to beat me.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - I hope not. I do not think I have ever been able to beat either of the two previous -

However, I will highlight some points and then I will finish my contribution.

**Mr Valentine** - It is making my speech a lot less.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Good. This submission has been prepared by the Tasmanian Policy Exchange, the TPE at the University of Tasmania. It was established to enable the University of Tasmania to make timely and informed contributions to key policy debates occurring in Tasmania, thus making a positive contribution to the future of our state and its people. This submission provides a blueprint for climate action to maximise the long-term benefits for the Tasmanian community. I remember the member for Nelson and the member for Murchison saying it is all very good to have different representatives trying to fix things, but over the course of this journey we need different ideas and representatives of groups at that discussion point, so that they can say, this is what you have to fix now. Do not just leave it up to industry or the government. We have a scientific community there, we have a university community there that have expertise in other areas. They have their fingers on the pulse that sometimes people in industry may not, because they are working so hard in their space. A few of the things from their submission, and they write:

Climate change is the greatest contemporary challenge facing humanity and demands a concerted and comprehensive response, encompassing individual, community, business and Government action.

In that paper, they are saying, we need everybody working together.

As of April 2021, more than 110 countries accounting for more than 85 per cent of global economic output have made net zero pledges. Much of the attention focuses on international agreements and national emission targets but there is also growing recognition that state and regional governments have a critical role to play in promoting climate action. Indeed, some of the most significant initiatives aimed at reducing emissions and preparing for the impacts of climate change, have been at the sub-national level.

In Tasmania, that is important, because we know we are lucky we have a close relationship between local, state and federal governments and representatives in this state. We know that on the ground, our local communities are prepared to work and are prepared to get in and have a go, and we just have to look at the different sectors.

The current review of the Tasmanian Climate Change Act and the associated Climate Change Action Plan is timely, given this critical juncture in global climate action provides Tasmania with an important opportunity to consolidate and capitalise on its world-leading carbon emissions profile and renewable electricity assets. However, Tasmania cannot be complacent.

This submission argues that Tasmania's Climate Action Strategy must include more ambitious sectorial emissions reduction targets and comprehensive sector-specific climate adaptation strategies to build our reputation as a resilient, competitive and prosperous climate positive economy.

A commitment to a climate positive Tasmania will not only ensure that Tasmanians are making an important contribution to addressing climate change, but a more systemic focus on adaptation laws, and so help reduce the impacts of unavoidable climate change on Tasmanians, communities and environment.

I listened to the minister this morning and I appreciated his thoughts. I am not verballing him for what he said, but the idea of having a total emissions reduction target against a sectoral one because he did not want sectors to get penalties if they could not get to this. I made the comment that Tasmanians are smarter than that. They understand that if one sector cannot get the emissions down in a certain amount of time or by a certain year, that is understandable. Hopefully, a group over here will be able to get it down. However, do not cover it over. I am not saying cover it over in a bad way; but do not say we are winning because it has dropped a little bit over here. We need to be able to be honest, because it is the people out there that need that honesty.

Despite the clear costs and risks of global warming, being a leader on climate change also provides opportunities - given the accelerating global transition to low carbon technologies and processes. Tasmania has the potential to capitalise on its climate positive status to attract investment industries and people seeking to contribute to a more sustainable, low carbon world.

This submission has been informed by the research analysis of experts from a range of academic disciplines across the University of Tasmania, who share a commitment to practical, evidence-based climate action in the long-term interests of all Tasmanians.

Going back to Venture Minerals that we heard from this morning, that you helped facilitate, Madam Deputy President, I found it interesting that that group was acknowledging the role that they could play in trying to decrease, by accessing the right sort of minerals. This submission had two broad aims. Firstly, the submission was to present the most recent

scientific evidence on the likely climate challenge facing Tasmania and secondly, to inform the development of the next Tasmanian climate change act and associated climate action plan to ensure Tasmania retains climate-positive status and can continue to credibly claim to be an international leader on climate action.

It is not just being about being a leader; it is about being a prototype or a template for other communities to look at. I was interested in 2016, there was the City of Darebin in Melbourne that came out. If Tasmania can come out there and show the different things and show the areas and what they are trying to do, that helps other places. You do not want to reinvent the wheel, you just want to pick up from it. That is why it makes sense having climatologists on board, because they have a different network of friends and a different network of backgrounds and information that they can access and they can contribute to the conversation.

**Mr Valentine** - It is what they can add to solutions, is it not?

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Exactly. That is important. I am not going to read much of this one, I will just do the headings under the recommendations in the UTAS submission. They identified the recommendations. If people are listening - and my Mum will be - go to these pages and look at this: Part 1 - the climate challenge; Part 2 - sectoral emissions targets; Part 3 - sectoral mitigation strategies. Under their mitigation strategies they include energy, transport, agriculture and industry. In Part 4 they have adaptation strategies, and under that heading they have health and emergency management, ecosystems and habitat, agriculture and aquaculture, infrastructure in the built environment, communities and climate education and literacy.

What I like about that submission is they had the bigger picture and then they broke it down into sectors, and then under these sectors there were the recommendations. I do not know enough about this to say whether those recommendations are right. That is not my job, that will be for other people; but they had it worked out so that if you were reading this you would go, 'yes; now what is the government going to do?'. 'Okay, they do not agree with that one', and let's target those and see what we can do.

In conclusion, Madam Deputy President, there were many pragmatic, rational and achievable recommendations made by the Tasmanian Policy Exchange. I will be supporting every amendment that improves and endeavours to strengthen the legislation to address the significant, detrimental and damaging impacts of climate change. This legislation will go to the Committee stage. I have no doubt about that, none of us do. However, when it comes out of that Committee stage we want to make certain that we have taken this opportunity to ensure that the legislation is going to be in the very best interests of Tasmania - not for now, but for the future, and also for those young people to see today that this parliament has listened to their concerns and has acted accordingly and strengthened the legislation to provide a blueprint on the way forward not just for this government, but the next government and the people of Tasmania. I will be supporting this into the Committee stage.

[4.17 p.m.]

**Ms LOVELL** (Rumney) - Madam Deputy President, something that should be obvious to us all, is the importance of taking action now to limit the impacts of climate change on our environment, on our society and on our economy. We all have a responsibility to develop a comprehensive understanding of how our changing climate will affect Tasmania, our communities and our regions and to develop strategies to respond to this. Successful strategies

are proactive, inclusive and well communicated. We need to change the way we do business, our planning processes and how we construct infrastructure. Our communities will need to be resilient, and we should support them to become so. All of these actions need to be undertaken in an open and transparent manner - a manner that welcomes scrutiny and evaluates progress in a publicly accountable way.

Tasmanians are rightfully proud of our reputation for renewable energy, but we cannot stop there. There is much more that needs to be done to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change on our environment. Tasmania has achieved and maintained net zero emissions since 2014 as revised by the most recent State and Territory Greenhouse Gas Inventories, and so I find it peculiar that the target the Government adopted is to reach net zero by 2030. I understand the review by Point Advisory that was provided to Government indicates that without further action to limit emissions we may not maintain our net zero status but I do not expect this is reason to push that target out so significantly.

I have an amendment to update this target and we can debate that in more detail at the appropriate time. However, presumably, setting and achieving a target also means efforts are made to maintain that target, not that it is achieved and forgotten. We should be ambitious with this. There is no doubt that adapting to climate change and moving to decarbonise our economy will impact on many communities and industries, including workers in those industries. I also have amendments to move to ensure that with this bill we are doing everything possible to support those communities to make those adjustments in a way that is fair and just and encourages innovation.

There is no doubt that the climate is changing. We see that with the growing number of extreme weather events, with severe floods and bushfires across the country. We can see it in noticeable changes to ecosystems. We know that these changes impact most severely on the most vulnerable in our communities who are less equipped to deal with extreme heat and extreme cold. We need to ensure that we have a rigorous framework in place to support our community and to support industry transition. I intend to move a number of amendments to the bill to strengthen it, and to achieve three key things: to protect those who are most vulnerable; to set out clear plans for a just transition for workers and communities; and to ensure there is an independent oversight to measure progress and to evaluate that progress.

We need to ensure that the bill sets out appropriate actions for our state to address climate change that are in the best interests of our children and future generations. Climate change is the biggest challenge facing our state and our planet. I thank all of those who made submissions through the consultation process for this climate change amendment bill. They took the time to do so because they recognise this is the biggest challenge facing our state. They deserve to be treated with more respect by the Government. I acknowledge all the businesses, unions, research bodies, peak groups, community organisations who did participate in the public consultation and in further consultation with the Labor Party. I also want to thank the department staff for the briefings provided.

In Tasmania, we are uniquely positioned to lead the country when it comes to action on climate change, building on the work that generations before us have already undertaken. Tasmania's most recent greenhouse gas emissions inventory shows that for 2020 our net emissions were once again negative. We are at a distinct advantage to many other places because our energy comes primarily from renewable sources. One of the real opportunities for

Tasmania is to make sure we can offer training and opportunities that capitalise on this, so future generations can take advantage of these emerging industries.

For Tasmania to capitalise on the renewable energy we generate, we must invest in our people and their skills to help transform our industries and support the decarbonisation of the global economy. The greatest benefits for Tasmanians from our renewable energy are when we use it to create jobs here in our state, when we have world class training opportunities for young people and for those who want or need to transition to new industries. That is why debates like this one must also consider our responsibility to ensure there is the just transition principle embedded in legislation, so that as sectors decarbonise, the jobs and communities that rely on them do not go as well.

There is no doubt that more action needs to be taken to address the impacts of climate change, but it is a reality that many communities in Tasmania rely on those industries that will require significant change. We have a responsibility to ensure those communities, the workers and the families are supported through this transition. I have amendments that will not only embed a just transition clause to ensure it is a fundamental part of this legislation, but will also state it as an objective of the bill. There are improvements that need to be made to this bill to ensure that vulnerable people do not bear a disproportionate impact to the emissions reduction action and to ensure that nobody is left behind.

There currently are no provisions in the bill to consult with workers or their representatives. That is an oversight. I will be moving amendments to include a requirement that relevant unions and their peak bodies be consulted in the development of the climate action plan and a sector-based emissions reduction and resilience plan. To effectively understand how any transition will impact on an industry, the voices of the workers in those industries must be at the table. The bill must also be improved to ensure there is much greater transparency about progress on the climate action plan and sector-based emissions reduction and resilience plan as well as added accountability to those plans.

I will move an amendment to the bill to establish a joint standing committee on climate change that will act in the same way the Joint Standing Committee on Integrity works, to support the role of the Integrity Commission and to provide reports to parliament. I will seek for the bill to establish a climate change advisory council that will report to the relevant minister. The areas of expertise of members of the council are to cover as many of the following as possible, environmental and climate change policy, technology development, economic analysis and forecasting, regional development, and environmental determinants of health and civil society, with two members to be climatologists to ensure an evidence-based approach.

The advisory council will be responsible for providing advice to the minister on the preparation of this climate action plan, the preparation of the statewide climate change risk assessment, the setting of targets to reduce emissions and importantly, within 18 months of the commencement of the bill, inquiring into and reporting to the minister on the establishment of a transition authority. The establishment of a transition authority is critical so that people and communities are considered when action is taken to address climate change. This work will be assisted with guiding principles for fair and equitable transition to be set out in the legislation, stating that in determining whether the transition towards a low carbon economy and a low emissions future is fair and equitable, regard must be had to the following principles: community engagement; the provision of appropriate information to members of affected



communities, especially Aboriginal, vulnerable or marginalised communities; the pursuit of sustainable, economic, social and ecological solutions for affected communities; equity for households, businesses, workers, communities, and rural and regional areas, taking into account their social, cultural and economic differences.

These guiding principles would also prioritise employment, transition opportunities, to new or existing industries within those communities, offering appropriate education and training opportunities for those communities. Allowing reasonable time for the implementation of transition solutions and, for a worker who is unable to pursue transition opportunities, the provision of the mechanism for compensated redundancy or voluntary redeployment of the worker to another site where the worker wishes to continue working, without undermining the incentives for transition.

The member for Mersey talked about political parties having policies on climate change, and on this matter, and that is true, we do. The Labor Party does have a policy on climate change, and the fundamental principle guiding our policy and approach to this bill and our amendments, is to ensure that nobody is left behind and no one community is disproportionately and negatively affected.

There is no doubt we need to act to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change. There is broad agreement across the country on this now. Young Tasmanians are looking to the parliament for leadership on this issue. The community broadly is looking for leadership. The climate is already changing. We cannot stop that now, but we can protect our community, our economy and our environment from the worst impacts, and in doing so, protect the most vulnerable from bearing a disproportionate impact, and help communities and industries transition toward lower emissions in a way that is respectful and ensures maintained employment.

We can set in place a framework that is both ambitious enough to make a difference and transparent enough that we can be held accountable.

I will ensure that my amendments are circulated to members shortly. I am aiming for that to happen by the end of the day, but understanding we will not be moving into the Committee stage on the bill today. It is to provide adequate time for members to consider those amendments prior to the next stage of the debate.

I am pleased that we are progressing this bill after not insignificant delays and I look forward to hearing the contributions of other members.

[4.27 p.m.]

**Ms RATTRAY** (McIntyre) – Mr President, I appreciate the opportunity to make a contribution to this important legislation. It is one of those there is so much interest in and also, I place my thanks and acknowledgement of the many organisations, groups, individuals, and the like, that have made representation over quite a long period of time.

I know that David Hamilton, who was sitting in the back of the Chamber for quite some time today, had been to my office twelve months ago and again he has had repeat visits. He lives at Wyena, which is not far away from my office. He is part of the climate change group in Tasmania.

We have had a lot of contact for a long time and it certainly is, as has other members have indicated, something that our young people do have a view on, and by interjection, when the member for Mersey was speaking, he talked about how young people want things to happen tomorrow. Most of them wanted it to happen yesterday, is my experience.

There is, in their view, and the view of many others, an urgency around this. I appreciated, not only the contribution from the Deputy President, but also the member for Nelson, and the member for Mersey, and whoever else chooses. However, particularly, the member for Rumney, about her focus on those industries and those workers who might be more impacted by the changes that are perhaps, possibly and more likely will be put in place through this legislation we are dealing with today.

Leader, thank you very much for the opportunity to have briefings from two lots from your department. Their expertise does not go unnoticed. Thank you. Also, it has already been acknowledged, but for the minister to take the time to come and speak directly to Legislative Councillors is something we do not always have on pieces of legislation. I expect this is such important legislation for our future, for the future of our state, for our people, for our country and for the world.

We often say, what can Tasmania do to contribute? We can do something but we have to be mindful of how we do that and how quickly we do that because of the impact that it might well have, and most probably will, on various groups and organisations. The member for Hobart called them legacy industries this morning and we had quite a discussion about one that I particularly know well, which is Cornwall Colliery in the Fingal Valley and it is owned by the cement company. There is that relationship. The cement company owns it and they are based at Railton but the people who work at Cornwall Colliery are based in the Fingal Valley and right out to east coast. We have to be mindful that those people are not necessarily looking to pick up their life and start somewhere else.

There is a lot in this and I have been interested in the journey and when you have a look at the information - and I also do not want to repeat what others have said so if I start repeating what somebody else has said, please hold me to account. I have already put a couple of documents that I was going to refer to already out, so there is less for my contribution.

We need to remember that it is a framework and building on that framework might not necessarily come with the suite of amendments that have been put forward but there will be an opportunity. I will be listening intently to what is being proposed and some that have been already raised with members in the House about supporting workers in that transition and that type of thing. That is something that piqued my interest and I will be looking closely at those that the member for Nelson has also presented. I note that the member for Mersey has something as well.

There will be an opportunity as we get to work our way through the Committee stage and I appreciate the opportunity that the Leader has provided in not going into the Committee stage today. That couple of weeks where we can drill down into the effect of any amendments that have been proposed will be beneficial, albeit that the government of the day might not necessarily have taken them in another place, they may well in two weeks time see the merits of what has been put forward. You would hope that from the debate that has been delivered in this House and I expect that all of those organisations and groups, they are not only writing to us and making contact with Legislative councillors, we know that all of those emails - or quite

a lot of them - have every member of the parliament on the top of the list. They will continue and I know Climate Tasmania will certainly keep engaging with them.

I thought it would be useful to make a brief reference to the independent review of the Climate Change (State Action) Act of 2008 which was commenced in 2020 by the Jacobs Group. I will touch on a number of those recommendations to legislate for a more ambitious emissions reduction target for Tasmania of a net zero emissions by 2030. I put beside that, or lower, but I appreciated the discussion by the minister about why 2030 was in the Government's view an ideal target, or the target. Through that debate in the Committee stage I will be listening to the arguments put forward for a lower date. I believe 2023 is too short. I am not a scientist, I am not a climatologist, I am not any of those experts that people have -

**Ms Forrest** - Or a pharmacist.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Or a pharmacist, I did elevate myself very quickly, but I spent a lot out in the dispensary supporting the pharmacist at times. I possibly thought that I might well have been. I definitely know I was not because everything had to be checked by the pharmacist. I got excited, being a pharmacist, the World Pharmacists Day just overwhelmed me. I am thankful for my colleagues who picked it up straightaway

Back to climate change, the second one, consolidate the act's existing objectives and that was outlined quite extensively in the Leader's second reading speech. I have no reason to rehash that. That is fair and reasonable. Include a set of principles to guide climate action: absolutely necessary if we are going to make these changes. There has to be a set of principles to deliver that. Ensure relevant Tasmanian government policies, plans and strategies are informed by climate change considerations: that was a commitment that was made by the minister and through the various comments that were made in the briefing session today, prior to the lunchbreak.

We know that there has to be that opportunity to consider what policies and plans and strategies the Government does put forward. For that matter, any form of development or what we do in our state, it will not be long until it will be like the bushfire code. You will have to have a tick. When we were talking about 'tick, is it relevant? No, it is not'. That is what I was thinking. The building, that is what happens with your DA now. Part of the building development application, are you within this much distance of a bushfire prone area? If not, move on to the next box. If it is a tick, then you have to meet those requirements and get yourself the appropriate documentation. That is where I see that.

Make the development of a climate change action plan a statutory requirement: it will need to be that sort of arrangement. Require a five-yearly statewide climate risk assessment to be completed: we know that is part of what was being presented and there has also been some adjustments to the time frames for reporting. That is something that is additional to what was initially considered as a requirement by government. They have been listening to the input that has been coming from the community and others. Include the completion of a sector-based decarbonisation and resilience plan: that is a big one and that will take some focus as well.

When we had the briefing with the department at an earlier time, on page 7 of our handout it talked about no industry division is estimated to have a lower GSP or employment in 2050 under the modelling scenario. Then, when I went and had a look at what I have a significant interest in, which is agriculture and forestry and dairying, and the cattle and beef

industry, it says - and these are economic impact analyses - in 2050, relative to base-case levels, real value added in the sheep, including lamb, and the cattle, beef plus dairy industries could expand by about \$70 million, while real value added in forestry and logging could be up to \$55 million. That was in the long term.

My question was about the short term and the initial stages of any of that transfer and the impacts and what is going to be expected from those very important industries. We know that there is this aspiration from this Government about growing the Tasmanian economy, particularly the agriculture economy, significantly to 2050. How do you marry that with what is proposed here and not impact in the initial short- to medium-term future on those industries? The member for Murchison in her contribution talked about some of our farmers and some of their practices, albeit that some of them have seen many changes in the industry and have gone with it. Often, if they were like my Dad, because of their younger sons on the farm they had to get with the program. My Mum and brother always ganged up on my Dad and ended up winning the day. That was pretty much how it worked on the farm at home. Mum would say the boy thinks we need it, well the boy thinks we need it so that is what we will do. It has worked quite well but not everyone has that opportunity to hand on to the younger generation. In the case of our farm that is how it has worked.

It is also having that ability to take people on the journey with you. We have talked about that as well today, because if you do not take people on the journey, bring them in with you and take that expertise they have, then sometimes it is hard to get them to move. We will need a lot of movement if we are going to meet some of the targets that have been put forward.

That is something I did think about when I read those figures from the economic impact analysis. There will be a lot more to talk about in the future by those people, whether it becomes an advisory committee or whether there is also a committee of the parliament. There is going to be a lot of discussion about the benefits and the merits of establishing those and I look forward to the opportunity to engage in that debate.

I did also note when the minister spoke to us earlier today on the sector targets he talked about it would put pressure on some in the short term. We want no hard targets and we need to work with the sectors to meet the reduction emissions targets. He cited the red meat industry as one of those and we know how important that has been to the Tasmanian agriculture industry for some time. If you have a paddock full of black angus anything you are pretty fortunate in this climate and at the moment there is a bit of a shortage all round. I notice the saleyard numbers have been down quite a bit of late and it means that prices go up, supply and demand.

I wrote down committees. The Government's preference would be to work with industry sectors and perhaps not have as much oversight or committee input from the parliament. We will have that debate at a later time. It was interesting the minister talked and referred to the Chas Kelly scenario. We know he has a zillion trucks on our Tasmanians roads and I expect they are all running on diesel, because the transfer over to other fuels was not quite as successful as was anticipated a few years ago. An outlet not far out from where I am based has now been transferred from gas to liquid fuel. It has not quite delivered what was expected in the way of that. It is not only the Chas Kellys of the Tasmanian community, there are plenty of small operators as well. It might be easier for a large operator to gradually change a fleet over, not so easy for smaller operators to change fleets over. There is about 12 months wait time on a prime mover at the moment, even if you can afford one. It is not as simple as sometimes people might believe it is.

I have already touched on that there has been quite a bit of contact. I do not have permission to read this person's name at this point in time, but want to touch on some areas where there is general support for this climate change legislation, but there have also been some good suggestions on what they believe would be of benefit. I am going to touch on a few and give you the outline. We can, as we do through the Committee stage, fill in some more gaps. The first one was a mechanism which puts climate change front and centre of any new project, land use plan legislation or any amended legislation from now on. That is a rather large expectation. Aspiration - yes. Can this Government deliver? That will be a question for Government.

I have been provided with an example. An example would be a business which intends to use helicopters for transport of goods or people. Helicopters use aviation fuel which creates greenhouse gas emissions. There are some genuine issues out there, but they are also talking about what examples we have in our community at this point in time.

A plan for legislated annual reduction in emissions and a mechanism which records and publishes this each year: at present, scientists state this should be between 7 and 10 per cent each year. This would lead to a 60 per cent emissions reduction by 2030.

Climate science should inform the figures used and the situation is urgent and changes each year. Their take-home message is: the longer we wait, the worse it becomes.

A requirement for each business and sector of the economy to undertake the same reductions so that one sector does not do all the heavy lifting. Energy, for example, is the low hanging fruit; agriculture and transport are our biggest emitters and need urgently to cut back emissions. The point I just made, Mr President, is around. You know, the Chas Kellys of our community, the Hingstons, the Page Transports, there are so many and those very small operators as well. You have to be very mindful of how you do that and not put people out of work. And then, who delivers the services, who provides the transport options? We have to work with industry, all sectors.

Next one. No future fossil fuel projects, oil, gas or coal to be commenced after the start date of the legislation: despite the Government PR, Tasmania has only 100 per cent renewable electricity and it is not 100 per cent carbon emissions free - this applies to both Tasmanian land and offshore waters. We have already touched on the fact we have a coal mine in the Fingal Valley that supplies to the cement company or is owned by and supplies to the cement company. What do you do with those workers? How do you tell them they no longer have a job? It is going to take time and is really the take-home message here.

There is a suggestion that fossil fuel subsidies of any description must be removed and this includes offsets. It talks about offsets being shown by research to be totally impotent and in addressing present day emissions and liable for other stresses.

It goes on to talk about forests where the plantation of native must be protected, not cut down if they are to benefit our economy. I did not attend the forest industries actual conference day last week, but I attended the evening event. The number of people in that room absolutely committed to the forest industry and they are looking at what they can do, but they are still reliant on a renewable resource.

**Mr Valentine** - The ultimate renewable resource.

**Ms RATTRAY** - You cut it down, you replant it, it grows, and it also stores carbon.

These are very useful areas to explore but we need to carefully work through what impacts, negative impacts, going straight into something like that may end up causing grief and uncertainty, and problems for our community, and for our economy.

Plans for a just transition of workers from fossil fuel-dependent sectors of the economy to other work - and I know when we had the TFA debate from many years ago, and there was a suggestion that a lot of those people who worked in the industry would be able to transition into other industries. There was always some discussion about what type of industries would they transition into. Would it perhaps be the dairy industry? Here we have some issues relating to that as well, so we have to be careful how we move down this path.

Any subsidies or assistance for industry and business for transition to renewable energy must be subject to a scale of importance in the overall plan. For example, the subsidy for farmers could be given to help pay for seaweed concentrate which reduces the methane emissions from cattle. It is more urgent than providing assistance to buy electric tractors. Someone has to decide.

There are people in our community who are very focused on their thoughts and ideas, and I appreciated receiving the information. We know that when people get together as groups in our community, they discuss this. It is high on an event chatter, if you like, or discussion.

I thank them very much. I am not able to share the name of that person, because it has not come through for me, but I appreciate the opportunity.

I had a list here of key elements of the Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill. However, given that I read out the recommendations from the Jacobs report, and we know that the Government has embraced those recommendations, I feel no need to rehash that, and talk about that.

The member for Mersey touched on the University of Tasmania, and we had a briefing with Professor Richard Eccleston at an earlier time, back in May. The message was very clear from that briefing, and we were also left with plenty of information. To name a couple: require draft climate action plans to be published together with a call for submissions; require business and community consultation are given; require the minister to prepare, table and publish an annual report of actions in relation to the act and efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; require the minister to provide reasons and remedies if a target is not met.

We also heard what the member for Mersey said, that if something, if a target, cannot be met, the community of Tasmania would be understanding - if a business cannot, or a particular area, one of those legacy areas, we have to be reasonable about it and formalise the role of independent expert advice in climate policy, including the setting of targets and measuring progress. The other one was incorporate a set of guiding principles to support decision-making and require consultation with Tasmania's Aboriginal people and the younger Tasmanians in developing climate plans. We heard from the children's commissioner as well, who made sure that members understood the aspirations. The member for Nelson read out a couple of specific responses that she received from younger people, one from year 12 and another one.

We have, in my view, been listening. I have been listening. From what I am hearing from contributions around the Chamber, other members are acutely aware that this is a complex area. Even though there are some very smart people, most of them sitting right up in the back of the Chamber, they are really smart when it comes to this. They have an understanding that there is an expectation in the community that we will do something, and we need to do it as quickly as we can. From my perspective, we also need to be very cautious about how quickly you put things in place. We need to have those strong conversations with those various stakeholders.

There are many, there is no denying of that, there are many of those stakeholders that need to have a continued conversation about this important issue in our community, one of the most important, particularly for a lot of younger people and people who live and breathe this area. I look forward to further contributions. I have no doubt that this will proceed into the Committee stage at a later time. I thank members for their time.

[4.57 p.m.]

**Mr VALENTINE** (Hobart) – Mr President, it has been interesting to listen to the various offerings of members. I thank them for their contributions. I also thank the Leader for briefings that have been provided and particularly, I thank those who have been very active in this space over many years. Climate Tasmania is one of those. They have been undertaking a power of work over that time, also the University of Tasmania's Policy Exchange. The advocacy of our young people, we all know that young people are concerned about climate change and what sort of a world they are going to be left to manage into the future. I was contacted, as I am sure other members were, by the nipaluna Climate Collective, and a plethora of individuals who have written to us over time to express their concern.

I dutifully have taken those emails out of my offering as they have been read out by other people, other members, in their contributions. It is clear that there is a very significant concern out there in the community. We know that because we saw a federal election play out with climate change as one of the more significant issues that was up there front and centre. Apart from COVID-19, climate change has been one of the most talked about subjects out there in the community. Yes, the health system, ambulance ramping, housing and other topics are high in the minds, but there is an underlying current of concern for some and has been there for many years, about the issues of climate change. I can say that with some experience in this space. When I was with the Hobart City Council, the first time we looked at issues around climate change was in late 1990s. As a council, we were extracting methane from our landfill and it was simply being flared off to reduce its impact. Then a third party came along and said you are flaring this off, we can put a generator on that and put power back into the grid. We put out expressions of interest and they did. I cannot remember the figures, but the council probably made \$100 000 per year by simply allowing that company to do its work. We received a percentage. Then Glenorchy City Council did the same.

Down at the Macquarie Point waste water treatment plant in an enclosed space they drew off all of the methane that was coming out, put it through a generator system and ended up putting that back into the plant. So, there were savings there. The council took all sorts of steps to reduce its impact on the globe and every time they did, it saved money. There was a lot of debate back then - 'oh, is climate change real?'. I do not think many people would say it is not real. There are some. I always used to say at that time whether it is real or not, whatever you do to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions saves you money. It does.

For some industries that might be over a long term. There would be short-term losses, no doubt. That has to be approached carefully, as some have already pointed out. It is important to understand that there is an economic benefit of going down this track. It is not only cleaning up the world, and reducing the warming blanket that stretches around the globe as a result of carbon dioxide; it can save money.

Some of us will have received a communication from Dick Smith some time ago. I do not know whether people recall this; some newer members will not but other members will. This particular article is not by Dick Smith but is an article by Kevin Casey and it is alerting us to the fact that climate change is not the biggest threat to the world's environment.

**Ms Rattray** - Because he has a helicopter?

**Mr VALENTINE** - It is only one of many symptoms of an out-of-control disease. It is the fact that we have 7.7 billion people crammed onto a planet that is dying under the pressure of our greedy self-abuse. It is an interesting read. We all know what plastics do to the environment and how that is becoming increasingly a real issue. There are other things that impact the globe apart from climate change; but climate change is here and its effects are being felt. We can see that if we do not do something about it as a globe, it can only get worse and it gets to those tipping points. One article that I read on tipping points - and you might ask, what would those tipping points be? Julian Cribb is an author, journalist, editor and science communicator. He is principal of Julian Cribb & Associates who provide specialist consultancy in the communication of science, agriculture, food, mining, energy and the environment. His career includes appointments as newspaper editor; scientific editor for *The Australian* newspaper; Director of National Awareness for Australia's science agency, CSIRO; member of numerous scientific boards and advisory panels; and president of national professional bodies for agriculture, journalism and science communication. His published work includes over 8000 articles, 3000 media releases and eight books. He has received 32 awards for journalism. His internationally acclaimed book *The Coming Famine* explores the question of whether we can feed humanity through the mid-century peak in numbers and food demand.

I give you that little bit of an introduction to him. I am not championing what he has to say here, because I have not had the time to verify a lot of what he is saying. However, he talks about some of those tipping points that the member for Nelson first mentioned in her offering.

Most people by now have heard of tipping points, where the earth's systems flip rapidly from one state to another, without the possibility of a return; where a small change in a system makes a big difference. In the end, humanity's fate will most probably depend not on our own actions but on what happens with these nine key tipping points. He talks about the West Antarctic ice sheet, which is currently melting three times faster than it was in the 1990s. That sheet is on land. It is not in the water already, it is not ice in the water. If the sheet goes, the oceans will lift by 3.3 metres, in his estimation, and will add to global warming through the loss of ice that reflects the earth's excess heat into space. That is pretty sobering when you think about it, if it is accurate.

There is the Greenland ice sheet. This is now on track to disintegrate completely, raising sea level by 7.7 metres and adding to global warming by the loss of its reflectance. He goes on and talks about the Amazon dieback:



The world's largest rain forest is shrinking rapidly through human destruction and fire. Scientists believe that once 25 per cent is lost, the rest will rapidly convert to dry savannah and desert, changing the climate both locally and globally. From soaking up carbon, the Amazon has now began pouring out a billion tons a year, adding to human-caused global warming.

He talks about the boreal forest dieback and goes through that, as well as monsoonal shifts, ocean circulation changes, global wildfires, cloud changes. There are lots of things that he deals with, when it comes to tipping points. When you read something like that and you also read some of the information that comes from Kevin Anderson's publication - he is a British climate scientist, professor at Manchester University - it helps you realise that we are dealing with something that is urgent. There is no question about that.

I was part of the briefings from the university, with Professor Richard Eccleston, Professor Peter Strutton, professor Neil Holbrook and Amelie Meyer when they talked to us about their submission with regard to the act.

**Ms Rattray** - Thank you for reminding me of those other three people who attended.

**Mr VALENTINE** - You could not quite remember?

**Ms Rattray** - No, I did not have it written down.

**Mr VALENTINE** - They gave us a paper: The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report - what does it mean for Tasmania? They covered a whole number of things. I am not going to read the whole paper.

**Ms Rattray** - You could table it.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I will read some of the components that they talk about. Temperature in Tasmania. It is interesting reading. Global surface temperatures are around 1.1 degrees warmer than pre-industrial.

By 2050, Tasmania has projected to experience an increase of at least 1.5°C compared to historical temperatures, even if a low emissions scenario is followed.

All scenario assessments indicate an increase in all types of high-temperature extremes, including maximum daily temperatures, heatwave intensity and heatwave duration. For example, while Launceston experienced an average of 29 days of 25°C per year between 1961-1990, by 2070-2099 this is projected to be 75 days per year.

**Ms Forrest** - It might be a reason to live there.

**Ms Rattray** - Sunshine coast.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I thought I would get some comment. I did it on purpose because I knew I would get it. It is here to read and I wanted to talk about that.

Human health and disaster management in Tasmania: research has identified the negative effects of climate-induced heatwaves and bushfires on Tasmanian communities. For example, ambulance dispatches increased by 34% during extreme heatwaves, by 10% during severe heatwaves and by 4% during low-intensity heatwaves in Tasmania.

Rainfall in Tasmania.

This is an interesting one and I have to say this was predicted some years ago in early 2000s when I went to a CSRIO forum on climate change and they were saying similar things. But here it is through Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the climate projections and risks that have been put forward by the University of Tasmania:

Globally, rainfall has increased but it is patchy and variable. It is likely that Tasmania will experience less annual rainfall into the future. However, this is less certain than projections for temperature. While we expect the frequency of westerly rain-bearing fronts to decrease gradually and east-coast lows to increase, we are unsure how these changes will balance out. In some models projecting a wetter scenario, it is the increase in the frequency of east-coast lows that balances the overall annual rainfall totals. This would mean more damaging, high-intensity rainfall. In other models that project a dryer scenario, there is also an increase in the frequency of east-coast lows, although not as large. Tasmania will see important shifts in rainfall seasonality with a large reduction autumn rainfall (up to 50% less rain for some areas relative to 2010-2020), a consistent decline in spring rainfall (10-20% less rain in some areas, and up to 25% by 2050 in the central north) and a substantial increase in winter rainfall over the next 20 to 30 years.

These changes in when the rain falls, will have important consequences for Tasmanian hydroelectricity, the agricultural sector and unique natural ecosystems such as the temperate rainforests and other Wilderness World Heritage Areas in Tasmania.

It is an interesting analysis.

Drought in Tasmania: Parts of the world including southern Australia are experiencing increasing droughts. In Tasmania, the episodic and regional nature of drought events will continue. The east coast of Tasmania will stay especially drought-prone. The ecological impacts of lower rainfall will be intensified by increased evaporation associated with warming.

Fire danger in Tasmania: Australia will see an increase in the number and intensity of bushfires driven by anthropogenic climate change

That is human-caused climate change.

Tasmania will see a steady increase in fire danger throughout the current century, including an increase in the length of the fire season and an increase in the number of days at the highest range of fire danger.

By the end of this century, we expect twice the fire danger, over twice the area, twice as often in Tasmania. This is an 8-fold increase in fire risk. Hobart is extremely vulnerable to bush fire. There are increases in mortality, asthma emergency presentations, cardiovascular disease and respiratory hospital admissions attributed to bushfires.

Then he talks about marine heatwaves in Tasmania.

The western Tasman Sea, east of Tasmania, is considered a global warming hotspot.

Breaking away from that, I can remember about three years ago when the water temperature of the east coast was 26 degrees. That is a temperature like a swimming pool. That was measured. You are shaking your head, my friend – 26 degrees, that is exactly right. I will do my best to find that thing for you so I am not being misquoted, but that is what I believe I heard. I will say that here because we are in parliament. It was a marine heat wave.

It is considered a global warming hot spot. 'Marine heat waves have caused a widespread decline in giant kelp ecosystems and impacted local fisheries and aquaculture industries'. I know that that has been exacerbated by the spiny sea urchin, which I am sure the member for Windermere understands with his experience.

**Ms Rattray** - The member for Rosevears might know as well.

**Mr VALENTINE** - They all do. She is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Currently intense marine heatwave events occur approximately once every 20 years. By 2060, under higher emissions scenarios, intense marine heatwave events such as in 2017-18 are expected to occur almost every year in Tasmania. Under the low emission scenario, they will be considerably less frequent, every 15 years.

Sea level rise in Tasmania, this is the last one:

Sea level rise is now irreversible, even if warming is limited to 1.5°C and will continue for centuries to millennia. For Australia, this could lead to the loss of 50 to 200 metres of shoreline along sandy coasts under high emissions scenarios. In Tasmania, the exposed locations are projected to see a 1-in-100-year coastal inundation event move towards an event occurring almost every year during the annual high tide.

However, the areas experiencing these risks in Tasmania are small and well identified and the rate of change means responses can be adequately managed.

There is some positivity there. It is an interesting read. Whether it is 26 degrees or whether it is 20 degrees or whether it is 23, it is still really hot either way. It shows the currents are bringing the warm water down. It is having an impact on us. Our kelp is going, our environment is changing. That can have all sorts of impacts. The point is, if we do not do anything it will only get worse.

We say, well, what can little old Tasmania do? I heard the member for McIntyre raise that question and give her answer to it. The point is, it is leadership. It is also capitalising on our natural advantage we have now with our renewable energy. It is an advantage for us. Why would we not want to be a global leader in this climate change area? Why would we not want to see a Tasmania that is leading the field, a leader in its industry associated with new technologies?

We have certain levels of minerals here. We have the possibility of hydrogen generation here. We have all sorts of things we might look at promoting and getting into. It may well mean we become a world leader in renewable energies and the application of them.

**Ms Rattray** - Sounds good to me.

**Mr VALENTINE** - We have to think innovatively. We all know Tasmania is innovative. In the past we have had to be because we are an island. We spent a lot of time back in the 1940s and 1950s creating a renewable energy environment in hydro-electricity. It took a lot of effort, a lot of infrastructure, probably gave off a lot of greenhouse gases back in the day with all the concrete that was involved. We had the expertise. We were world leaders in that. We had engineers who were very much right up there and we should be proud of that.

We should be proud of our government that had the foresight to look at some of those solutions that was going to see us well into the future supported by renewable energy, and it is certainly not polluting. It attracted significant industries. A lot of people would say, well, some of those industries were polluting as well and yes, they may well have been in their own way. The earlier days of the Zinc Works and what they were putting into the river. A lot of that has been cleaned up. Their practices these days have changed, the pollution levels, same with ANM as it was then, a lot of fibre going into the river. That is no longer happening. Their act has been cleaned up a lot.

There are options now going forward with renewable energy for us to concentrate on not only reducing greenhouse gas emissions but making product that comes from Tasmania more sustainable and we have to keep that in mind. When we are looking at legislation like this we have to think to ourselves, what are we doing to prepare ourselves for the future? What can we do today that is going to be resilient, improve our resilience, that is going to help us to grow our clean green industries that can then be attractive to those who may wish to come and either live here or do business in our state?

I thank the Government for bringing the legislation forward. It is here before us. It is specifically climate change-related and they are to be congratulated for bringing it forward. It needs sharpening. It needs to make sure that the mechanisms that are put in place are effective, that we do not get policy churn, as someone was talking about, it might have been the member for Nelson, or somebody else who raised the issue of how many ministers we have had. Here it is, I have it right here. In 2007 Paul Lennon, 2008 David Bartlett, 2011 Cassy O'Connor, 2013 Cassy O'Connor, 2016 Matthew Groom, 2017 Elise Archer, Peter Gutwein, Roger Jaensch, Peter Gutwein, Roger Jaensch. Seven ministers, six plans, et cetera. Some would say policy churn.

**Ms Forrest** - Probably six new members in their team since then.

**Mr VALENTINE** - That may well be true but the point is here we have with this Government prepared to bring on a climate change bill and to put it forward to be debated. We need to make sure we can make it the best legislation that it can be for our future. I am not going to read any more. I know time is getting on and there are other people to speak but I urge you to think carefully when we go through the Committee stage on this bill and the various amendments are brought forward. We need to think carefully about how we can lead the nation, how we can capitalise on our advantages of renewable energy and see Tasmania benefit and the globe benefit as well.

[5.25 p.m.]

**Mr WILLIE** (Elwick) – Mr President, I thank other members for their contributions. I do not intend to go over the same ground that they have but to raise a point that has been touched on by a number of members. Before I do that, the world wants what we have here and we are fortunate to have made decisions in the past, whether they were designed around climate change or cheap power is there for conjecture, but we are the beneficiaries of a renewable energy source and good environmental protections here in Tasmania that make us the envy of many other nations.

It gives us a huge opportunity to lead and we will discuss the merits of this bill and the provisions within the bill and how ambitious they are. It is probably quite a rigorous debate to be had whether this is ambitious enough given the position that we are already in.

Along with science and technology as being probably our way out of this grave situation in some circumstances, the education system has to be part of the thinking. The education system should be aligned to the legislated targets because it is not going to be us who make the biggest inroads in this area. It is going to be our students now and students of the future and we should be teaching them about the changing world. There has been some discussion at a national level and some changes to the Australian Curriculum recently. There has been some criticism to that and some positive commentary about that too.

In the geography curriculum I read an article on a conversation about how that has been restricted. I have it here. The article was titled: 'Dumbed-down curriculum means primary students will learn less about the world and nothing about climate'. I will not go into the whole article but some of the concepts that have been lost that they outline are the concept of place, including the definition of a place and the understanding of the importance of places to people. The study of places is the core of primary school geography, the concept of location including why things are located where they are and the influence of location and accessibility on people's activities. These were in the curriculum to get students thinking about the effects of location and distance on their lives and about where things should be located.

The concept of space has also been lost, including the management of space or spaces within neighbourhoods and towns. This introduced students to debates about how land should be used and how development conflicts are resolved and to the idea of town planning and this one is of particular importance, the concept of climate. The difference between climate and weather still confuses debate over climate change so an understanding of this difference is vital. The concept of settlement, including the difference between places in types of settlement and demographic characteristics. This added another concept to students' knowledge of places and introduced them to the small area Census data that revealed much about Australian communities. All of this content has been removed from the geography curriculum.

In other areas, climate change has more references and in particular, in the science curriculum, climate change features more heavily in the revised curriculum, which is a good thing. I am interested in the Government's response to this. I flagged it in the briefing with the minister. He did have to rush off. He is also the Education minister so I am interested in his views and what he might do about this because there are other nations that are absolutely doing this well. The reason is to mitigate climate change but there is another reason too: it is pure economics. It is economics and education services.

Education services is big business and they want to make their economies attractive for people around the world to come to study, to learn innovation in climate change and then to go back to their own countries and lead in that area. A place like the UK; it felt ironic to point to a conservative, dysfunctional government, but the UK -

**Ms Forrest** - They just about destroyed Great Britain's pound.

**Mr WILLIE** - The UK is doing some good things in this space. They have a very grassroots movement that is pushing this along, called Teach the Future. It is about sustainability and climate change that needs to be taught across the curriculum. That is, to tackle the climate crisis, the world has to transition to net zero carbon emissions. We are already there. We are having that debate today. This will require fundamental changes to every sector of our economy and every part of our society. Climate education prepares young people for the future. It will help them mitigate and deal with the effects of climate change, and teach them the skills they need to thrive in a net zero society. This is a movement that is happening in the UK, and it is making the political system respond.

**Ms Forrest** - Through you, Mr President, a lot of our young people are educating themselves better than the system is.

**Mr WILLIE** - I will get to that. There are some good things happening here too, and I will get to that.

**Ms Forrest** - Some of the young people in my electorate are very well informed, and others, I am sure.

**Mr WILLIE** - Before the COP26, the then Secretary of State for Education in the UK, Mr Nadhim Zahawi, set out a vision for all children to be taught about the importance of conserving and protecting the planet. He said the teachers will be supported to deliver world-leading climate change education through a model science curriculum, which will be in place by 2023, to teach children about nature and the impact on the world around them.

Children and young people will also be encouraged to get involved in the natural world by increasing biodiversity in the grounds of their nursery, school or college by taking small steps like installing bird feeders. They will be able to upload their data onto a new virtual national education nature park, which will allow them to track their progress against other schools in the country, increase their knowledge of different species and develop skills in biodiversity mapping. Combined, the grounds of schools, colleges, nurseries and universities in England, take up an area over twice the size of Birmingham, so improving their biodiversity could have a significant impact on the environment.

I am reading one of his statements before the COP26.

Children and young people will also be able to undertake a new Climate Award in recognition of their work to improve their environment, with a prestigious national award ceremony held every year. The Climate Leaders Award will help children and young people develop their skills and knowledge of biodiversity and sustainability, and celebrate and recognise their work in protecting their local environment. For example, young people may choose to undertake a project that delivers change in their local community, such as increasing the biodiversity of a neighbourhood piece of land, or helping to deliver experiences for younger children to explore nature and local woodlands. It will be developed in collaboration with children and young people so that we can ensure it supports them in making an impact in their local community.

This is about empowering young people to influence the environment around them.

Pupils and students will be able to progress through different levels of the award, bronze, silver and gold in a similar way to the Duke of Edinburgh Awards.

Some of the quotes attributed to him are: 'We want to deliver a better, safer, greener world for future generations of young people'. 'Education is one of our key weapons in the fight against climate change'. That is the point I am trying to make: education is key to fighting climate change.

Empowering teachers in every school to deliver world-leading climate change education will not only raise awareness and understanding of the problem, but also equips young people with the skills and knowledge to build a sustainable future.

I will not go into all of it, but I raise this point, because it has not been covered in this debate so far. The member for Murchison talked about the local education system, and there are some good things happening. There is a Curious Climate Schools initiative. I encourage members to look it up. There are 1300 Tasmanian students that have participated in that in recent times. School students work with their teachers to send questions about climate change to climate scientists, conservation biologists, fire scientists, chemists, lawyers, engineers, psychologists, social scientists, oceanographers, indigenous knowledge specialists and health experts to answer them. Recently, in another *Conversation* article, a group of academics that have been involved with that initiative said that the education system is not giving the young people what they need and their questions are not being answered by the education system. They said that education fundamentally prepares children for life, and so it should be expected to address the existential issues of our time.

On our current trajectory, climate change will drastically affect children's health, wealth and job futures. Today's children face up to seven times as many extreme weather events as people born in the 1960s experienced. If we are to tackle climate change and adapt to the impacts that are already unavoidable then children need to be

educated for a changing future. Until now, however, this subject matter has been largely missing from the Australian Curriculum.

I touched on that - it has recently been revised. In some areas it has been expanded, in others it has been restricted. The research project, Curious Climate Schools - and the University of Tasmania has been involved in this too - has involved 1300 Tasmanian students to date in student-led climate literacy learning. It shows current teaching leaves students with many unanswered questions about climate change. From their lightning analysis of the new curriculum, it seems it will not routinely deal with the kinds of questions students are asking.

In their work with students, they are coming across a range of issues including wide-ranging questions about climate change, encompassing ethics, politics, their careers and their futures.

Students are interested in climate science and projected impacts, but have more questions about the urgency of action and what can be done. This illustrates that learning about climate change must be suffused through all subject areas if students are to become climate literate. Many young people want to contribute their skills and knowledge to climate action in their future careers.

We have heard other members say that today and some have quoted young people.

We need to show them, through the curriculum, that in whatever subject area their interests lie - health, arts, law, engineering, ecology or many other fields - they will be able to use their talents to tackle the climate crisis.

I am interested in what the Government is doing and whether there is some plan to align the education system with the legislated targets, wherever we end up once we get out of Committee in this debate. I am also interested in whether the Government views education as one of those key pillars, along with science and technology and legislative change, to combating climate change. Does the Government view that opportunity - that a conservative government in the UK has clearly cottoned on to - that we could be world leaders, here in Tasmania, across sectors? We could have world-class climate education here.

**Ms Forrest** - At least the bill now includes the legislative requirement to consult children and young people.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes, that was a positive input from the commissioner for children. I know she has been very strong in advocating for this.

**Ms Forrest** - It is absolutely the right thing to do.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes. It is the right thing to do. I know from attending the commissioner for children Ambassador forums and things like that, this is the number one issue for them. It is impacting things like their mental health.

**Ms Forrest** - Yes. That is what I talked about, their anxieties.



**Mr WILLIE** - Their anxieties. I could not imagine being a young person again with all these existential things happening around you and trying to make sense of it.

**Mr Valentine** - They have to manage it at the end of the day though.

**Ms Forrest** - They will have to deal with the legacy we leave them.

**Mr WILLIE** - I have young children, and I am sure as they get older we will be having these sorts of conversations too.

**Ms Forrest** - I have grandchildren I have to worry about.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes. That was a positive contribution from the children's commissioner and making sure there are easily accessible formats is something important too, member for Murchison, that the materials produced on this are accessible to kids. It is something that I would like to have seen with the parliamentary website upgrades being more accessible to kids but we never got there in the end. I did raise it with the Government a few times.

**Ms Forrest** - One day we might.

**Mr WILLIE** - One day we might get there. I did not plan to speak for a long time because I know of the time, but I thought I would raise this point and give the Government an opportunity to maybe outline - and I know it is a different portfolio area, but I see this as one of the key areas that we can combat climate change. The climate wars are over. The member for Hobart talked a bit about that. There was a time when there was climate change denialism writ large in the community. We are past that now and most people look at the evidence.

**Mr Valentine** - There are still some in the dark.

**Mr WILLIE** - Maybe they do not have children. Maybe they are not looking at the evidence. Maybe they do not feel the sense of anxiety I do about my children's future. The education system is key to all of this. It has been touched on but I give the Government an opportunity for a different angle. I value the contribution of other members. I will not go across all the ground that has been covered, but look forward to participating in this debate in the Committee stage on the ambitions within the provisions of this bill.

I will let other members make the second reading before we adjourn tonight.

[5.42 p.m.]

**Ms ARMITAGE** (Launceston) – Mr President, firstly, to the Leader, I appreciate the briefings we have had, particularly with the minister coming along today. It is always helpful to hear a little more and to hear some answers to some of the questions raised. As we are all aware, the Tasmanian environment and ecological system is unique, important and there is nothing like it anywhere in the world and to this end I will make some brief remarks on the bill.

Amongst its aims, it seeks to legislate for a statewide emissions target for Tasmania of net zero or lower from 2030, just eight years away. This a positive step towards ensuring we do our part locally and as global citizens to reduce the mark we make on environmentally damaging emissions. Tasmania already possesses a reputation for being clean, green and

environmentally conscious. The bill represents many of the good elements of political cooperation across the aisles. I accept there are many amendments to come and do have several briefings coming up in these next couple of weeks from people with comments on the amendments. I am not going to comment on what the amendments are. I am going to comment on the bill we have before us at this stage, rather than go into that. I will go into that when they come up.

Sustainability is not just about environmental protection. It also goes to ensuring any measures we implement to address emissions and pollution do not unfairly or unreasonably affect anyone living, working and operating a business in Tasmania. Therefore, the consolidation of the existing tenets, objects of the act, around five key themes including explicit reference to a consultative partnership with business, industry and the broader community, including local government, will assist with keeping everybody on board and legitimising decisions and policies which come out of these consultations.

It is in everyone's interests our environment be protected and we leave a healthy environment for our children and their children. We all know how much children care about this and how many letters we get from children. I do not know about other members, but I am sure they do. Many different groups, particularly groups that are in Years 10, 11, 12 and high school students have a real interest in climate change. Certainly, a lot more in these last few years than I have ever noticed in the past. It bodes well for the future, that our young people are interested in our environment.

Elsewhere policies like reaching net zero can be controversial and perhaps considered too big a task. Here in Tasmania, we have for decades been of the trend in this aspect, which puts us on a good footing to keep implementing measures that will not just protect the environment, but encourage ongoing business and industry sustainability.

This is the best of both worlds. The bill will be conducive to these ends. Whether it is enough, that is obviously for debate when we come back. Moreover, the Tasmanian Emissions Pathway Review's identification of 16 economy-wide emissions target opportunities gives us actual objective to help us reach net zero and beyond. Things like increasing the uptake of electric vehicles, developing a renewable hydrogen industry, using innovative feed supplements to reduce livestock emissions, planting more trees and focusing on the development of renewable hydrogen, all present significant opportunities, not just to reach net zero, but to provide opportunities in our technology and innovation sector.

I thought it was interesting today, particularly with the minister - and we heard it before in the other briefings - with regard to the seaweed food supplements for the dairy cows, how that can reduce the belching and the flatulence. It is interesting to see how they will manage that obviously with the beef cattle, but it is great that at least with the dairy cattle it is certainly something that can be achieved.

As the Leader mentioned in her second reading speech, actions like these have the potential to improve productivity and increase demands for Tasmania's renewable energy and products, meaning that by 2050 our economy could be \$475 million larger and employing over 1200 more Tasmanians. This is a very exciting prospect and I hope we can start seeing the benefits of taking these actions well before 2050. The requirement for the minister to prepare a climate change action plan every five years is a good way to keep our government and

relevant departments transparent and accountable, but also provide some leeway to adapt and pivot to the changing environment and economic circumstances.

The Tasmanian public rightly expects action to be taken on climate change. We all have a vested interest in ensuring our unique state remains habitable, safe, functional and beautiful, now and for the generations to come. It is important that we listen to the concerns of our community, particularly our children who obviously will be seeing this into the future. I am not sure many of us will be here in 1950 - I am trying to think how old I will be. We might still be around in 2050, maybe not many years after that, but we probably will not be in this place in 2050, I guess is what I should say.

The threats presented by climate change to a place like Tasmania are no joke. Our forests, our fauna and population are all inherently vulnerable to things like increases to bushfires and significant weather events. It is incumbent upon us, as lawmakers, to ensure we put in place as early as possible, measures to ensure the impacts we have on the environment are minimal and net zero by 2030. This sends a strong message that we do take this problem seriously.

I thank the Leader for bringing this bill on. I look forward to the contributions. I have enjoyed the contributions that members have made and the contributions of members to come.

[5.51 p.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) – Mr President, I thank all the members for their contributions. I know that my advisers have been listening very carefully. I am looking forward to some wholesome answers, but I will adjourn the debate at this point.

**Debate adjourned.**

**JUSTICE MISCELLANEOUS (ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES) BILL 2022  
(No. 41)**

**LAND USE PLANNING AND APPROVALS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (No. 29)**

**ROADS AND JETTIES AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (No. 12)**

**First Reading**

**Bills received from the House of Assembly and read the first time.**

[5.52 p.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - I move -

That the second reading of the bills be made an order of the day for Tuesday next.

**Motion agreed to.**

## **MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

### **Homes Tasmania Bill 2022 (No. 35)**

**The House of Assembly advised that it agreed to the Council amendments.**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
I move -

That at its rising the Council does adjourn until 11 a.m. on Tuesday  
18 October 2022.

The reason is that we do not need our Quorum Call tomorrow. So members, there will  
not be a Quorum Call tomorrow.

**Motion agreed to.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
I move -

That the Council do now adjourn.

**The Council adjourned at 5.54 p.m.**