



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

REPORT OF DEBATES

Tuesday 23 August 2022

REVISED EDITION

Contents

ABSENCE OF MEMBER	1
MEMBER FOR CLARK - MS OGILVIE	1
QUESTIONS.....	1
NUCLEAR SUBMARINE BASE PROPOSAL.....	1
ELECTRICITY PRICES - NATIONAL GRID	2
ASHLEY YOUTH DETENTION CENTRE - CLOSURE.....	3
FIRST RESPONDER EVENT - ABSENCE OF FIREFIGHTERS	5
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL OUTCOMES IN THE REGIONS	7
ASHLEY YOUTH DETENTION CENTRE - ALTERNATIVE SITES	8
ROCK LOBSTER INDUSTRY - WHARF CONVERSATIONS	11
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS - CALIBRE OF CANDIDATES.....	12
POWER PRICE CAPPING	13
INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.....	14
ELECTRICITY PRICES	16
ELECTRICITY PRICES	17
NATIONAL SKILLS WEEK.....	18
ANTI-TRANSGENDER MOTION - LIBERAL PARTY STATE COUNCIL.....	20
TASMANIAN MENTAL HEALTH REFORM PROGRAM.....	21
MESSAGE FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	22
JOINT SESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON GENDER AND EQUALITY	22
STADIUMS TASMANIA AMENDMENT (TRANSFERS) BILL 2022 (NO. 39)	23
FIRST READING	23
CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (NO. 63)	38
SECOND READING	38
CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (NO. 63)	47
SECOND READING	47
MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.....	47
HOMES TASMANIA BILL 2022	47
CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (NO. 63)	48
IN COMMITTEE	48
SITTING TIMES.....	74
ADJOURNMENT.....	108
GREENS OBSESSION WITH LABOR PARTY	108
SPRINGVALE STUDENT ACCOMMODATION - CLOSURE	110
<i>MATILDA</i> - MARIST REGIONAL COLLEGE	113
<i>LIKE YOU LIKE IT</i> - HELLYER COLLEGE.....	113
<i>AQUA SPA</i> - SALMON PROTEST.....	114
ROYAL COMMISSION INTO DEFENCE AND VETERAN SUICIDE - PAUL FAMILY	116
AGFEST	118
SALMON INDUSTRY	118
AGRICULTURED	118
FIRE AND FERMENT	118

Tuesday 23 August 2022

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

ABSENCE OF MEMBER

Member for Clark - Ms Ogilvie

Mr ROCKLIFF (Braddon - Premier) - Mr Speaker, Ms Ogilvie is away today due to ill-health. As a result of that, I will be taking questions on Ms Ogilvie's responsibilities of Small Business, Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries, Science and Technology, Heritage and Racing.

QUESTIONS

Nuclear Submarine Base Proposal

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.02 a.m.]

On the weekend your party declared its support for the establishment of a nuclear submarine base in southern Tasmania at a time when there are any number of issues your Government is struggling with. This reckless proposal again demonstrates your failure to get the basics right. When will your Government start work on establishing a nuclear submarine base and where exactly will it be located?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for firstly highlighting that we actually have a state Opposition because, effectively, due to the federal intervention, you are in administration. Because you could not run a chook raffle, you have had to be taken over. There will be no Labor state conference until 2025 so none of your members will get a say at all. I made some reference to you leading with your chin last week in question time and that was an own goal because your membership does not have the opportunity to have a say on policy matters until 2025.

Ms White - Do you support it, Premier?

Mr ROCKLIFF - I released two policies on the weekend, one involving strategic regional partnerships, which I am excited about. There is also opportunity to further strengthen our existing working together with three-year-olds, which provides that earlier access for young people to engage in quality early learning -

Ms White - What about the nuclear submarines?

Mr ROCKLIFF - so for the member to drag out policy -

Ms White - Drag out? We did not have to go very far.

Mr FERGUSON - Your pay's gone nuclear.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Thank you, Mr Ferguson, I like that line. That was good.

At least, our membership has a voice, an opportunity. The Parliamentary Liberal Party does not always align with the views of the membership necessarily -

Ms White - Are you going to listen to it or going to ignore that voice?

Mr SPEAKER - Ms White, order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The example you have raised is a case in point, which should not be a surprise to you. What is surprising me is the fact that you asked a question about our membership, coming to a state council to discuss policy areas and have a voice. The Labor Party membership has no voice until 2025 because your administration has been taken over.

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Mr Speaker. It goes to relevance, standing order 45. The question was about something very significant, about the establishment of a nuclear submarine base in Tasmania. I ask you to draw the Premier's attention to it. He has not once gone near that question.

Mr SPEAKER - As you know, you have options to ask further questions. In fact, the next question is yours.

Ms White - It will not be happening. So, you completely dismiss the members' views?

Mr SPEAKER - Order. The Premier has already sat down. I will hand the question back to Ms White. If you wish to go down that path again, you may.

Electricity Prices - National Grid

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.07 a.m.]

The Premier just said that matters that are brought to his attention by his own members will be dismissed, will not be happening.

Members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Ms WHITE - Thank you, Mr Speaker. Premier, on Saturday, your party voted for an energy policy where the Tasmanian Government has the greater discretion to determine the price at which energy is sold to the national grid. Even your own party believes Tasmanians should be paying Tasmanian prices for Tasmanian power, not mainland prices. Why don't you?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question. I realise there is a policy vacuum by those opposite. I did not expect them to pay such close attention to policy positions of the Liberal Party in trying to get some policy positions of their own. That smacks of desperation from the Labor Party in that sense.

You know our position when it comes to the National Electricity Market. You know very clearly, as I have stated here many times, that this is a government that will put downward pressure on power prices.

What was very clear, which I was able to talk about at state council, in front of the Liberal membership, was also a bit of a reminder of what life was like when you were last in government. I was able to talk about our strong support for our resource-based industries: our farmers, our foresters, our aquaculture industries, our miners, the people who work hard to generate the wealth to enable the services to be provided in and throughout Tasmania - health, education, housing and public safety. I was able to also remind our membership of the fact that when you were last in government, our power prices increased by 65 per cent.

We have put down the pressure on power prices. We have also been very agile in our policy response when it comes to investing \$17 million on the winter bill buster payment of \$180. We will always be very mindful of cost of living and the pressures on community members, and be policy agile and flexible to ensure the right support is targeted to those people who need it most in Tasmania.

Ashley Youth Detention Centre - Closure

Ms O'CONNOR question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.11 a.m.]

The commission of inquiry has heard harrowing evidence of extreme violence towards and sexual assault of children at Ashley Youth Detention Centre. It also heard corroborated evidence of an abusive culture amongst some staff who stood by and watched while children were being bashed or who enabled and covered up violent sexual assaults by older detainees against younger ones. We know this through the courage of whistleblowers who worked at Ashley.

Damningly, Premier, the inquiry heard evidence of bureaucratic failings, secrecy and cover up. Almost exactly a year ago, your predecessor promised Ashley would close within three years. Will it be? Can you detail progress? Why have you not already closed this house of horrors?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question and her reflections on the evidence that we have heard at the commission of inquiry. It is enormously confronting, to say the very least, and points to failures of past and present governments. I repeat the fact that I am deeply sorry on behalf of our Government and past governments for those failures that have left young people devastated and traumatised for life.

I also thank those who have come forward for their courage in coming forward, people from within the system, employees and people who work across government and victims/survivors themselves. They shine a light on failures. We are as committed now as we have always been since the announcement of the commission of inquiry to shine a light on failures of this and past governments of all colours. I repeat my desire and my commitment to implement the recommendations to the commission of inquiry. We have provided two ministerial statements for discussion in the parliament where we have clearly demonstrated that we are not waiting for those recommendations but are now acting where appropriate.

As a government we are committed to developing a youth justice system, including new custodial settings, that achieve better outcomes for young people, their families and keeps our community safe.

In September last year, we announced our intention to close the Ashley Youth Detention Centre and establish new youth custodial facilities. This is not just about custodial youth justice. It is about resetting our whole approach to a youth justice system and young people at risk. I hope that when it comes to our justice system more broadly, the appointment of our Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation is a strong signal to appropriately reform in this area. We want to support our young people, children and families, engage young people at risk early and direct them away from the youth justice system, and restore young people who come into conflict with the law as valued and productive members of the community.

I understand the calls for closing the Ashley Youth Detention Centre now. We have a plan in place to close Ashley and replace it with contemporary therapeutic facilities.

Ms O'Connor - Within two years?

Mr ROCKLIFF - It is important that we invest in the time to get this right, given the failures that they have highlighted.

Ms O'Connor - Every day those kids are in there is a day they're in danger.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I want to get this right. I am committed to it. Appropriate care of these young people is not about bricks and mortar. It is also about having the right models of care and contemporary therapeutic approaches through the entire youth justice system, which I am sure you would appreciate, Ms O'Connor.

Ms O'Connor - You do not need to reinvent the wheel here. I have done a lot of work on it.

Mr ROCKLIFF - You have done a lot of work on it and you were also the minister responsible.

Ms O'Connor - No.

Mr ROCKLIFF - You were not?

Ms O'Connor - No.

Mr ROCKLIFF - You were part of a government that certainly was for four years.

In the meantime, we are ensuring that those who are sent to Ashley by the courts are safe and have the supports they need as we transition to new facilities.

It is also important to note that Ashley today is not the same Ashley that we inherited or even the Ashley from two years ago. It has a more therapeutic approach, greater oversight and better protections in place. Over recent years, we have established better safeguards and protections for young people currently at Ashley, including new CCTV technology which has increased accountability and safety for both young people and staff. A new personal searches policy introduced in 2019 ensures that all personal searches at the Ashley Youth Detention Centre comply with the new intervention on the right to the child. The centre now has strong independent oversight mechanisms in place.

A custodial inspector appointed in 2017 provides that independent statutory oversight of Ashley. This includes completing independent inspections and reports relating to Ashley Youth Detention Centre. The Commissioner for Children and Young People also conducts monthly visits and provides direct advocacy for young people at the centre. Young people can contact the Commissioner for Children and Young People directly with concerns they have in relation to their care at the centre and the commissioner can advocate with centre management or the department on their behalf.

The centre also reports all critical incidents and follow up actions to both the Custodial Inspector and the commissioner for children and, importantly, each month provides the Ashley Youth Detention Centre incident, isolation and search registers. This has been further enhanced with the advocate for young people in detention now providing more regular advocacy services for young people on behalf of the Commissioner.

Ms O'Connor - Yes, but back to the question.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I am answering the question. In addition to these safeguards, engagement has commenced with the Australian Childhood Foundation and the Centre for Excellence in Therapeutic Care to provide an independent authoritative review on the safety for young people at Ashley Youth Detention Centre. They will also provide guidance on any further actions we can take now and during transition to improve the safety of a service for young people and staff.

First Responder Event - Absence of Firefighters

Mr O'BYRNE question to MINISTER for POLICE, FIRE and EMERGENCY SERVICES, Mr ELLIS

[10.19 a.m.]

Tasmanians value and appreciate the work of our first responders. Over the weekend, your Government dedicated a football match in Launceston to our hard-working emergency service workers which I am sure was appreciated by all those in attendance. You invited police, volunteer and career SES, volunteer and career paramedics, and volunteer firefighters to participate. All of these emergency service workers work tirelessly around the clock to keep

Tasmanians safe. It turns out your thanks to first responder event was missing a key group of first responders. Why did you not invite career firefighters to participate in this special event?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for his question and his interest in our emergency services personnel who do phenomenal work. The partnership with the AFL and the Hawthorn Football Club to thank a first responder at the football on the weekend was enormously appreciated by the emergency services personnel who were there. It was a great opportunity to catch up with people from the SES, the fire service, police and Ambulance Tasmania. There was an incredible feeling amongst the crowd, who really stepped up with the applause, and the kids giving all our responders high-fives. It was a wonderful display of how valued they are in our community and the importance of the work they do.

The decision around tickets and invitations is ultimately one made in the department -

Dr Woodruff - So the minister's not in charge. Okay, what's going to happen when there's a bushfire?

Mr ELLIS - but it does reflect -

Dr Woodruff - What's going to happen in an emergency? Will you go to Hawaii?

Ms Finlay interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. Order. Please allow the minister to continue. Member for Bass, order - you are warned.

Mr ELLIS - Mr Speaker, we have a very large cohort of volunteers in the fire service. It is our largest cohort of volunteers. Nine out of 10 people who jump on a fire truck in Tasmania are not paid a cent. We thought it was appropriate for that group of people to be invited to those games, to take those tickets, and that is really important. I would not want to see any of those volunteer firefighters who came to the game lose their tickets. Personally, I think that is important. More broadly, we think it was disappointing that the UFU was protesting outside the front. It was not in the spirit of the game and particularly in the spirit of thanks -

Dr Woodruff - Shame on you.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, member for Franklin.

Mr ELLIS - Mr Speaker, our Government wants to send our thanks to all our emergency responders, career and volunteer. It was a wonderful gesture by the AFL, the Hawthorn Football Club and all our first responders.

Economic and Social Outcomes in the Regions

Mr TUCKER question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.22 a.m.]

Can you outline how the Tasmanian Liberal Government will partner with regions to drive positive economic and social outcomes and ensure they have the services, support and infrastructure needed to strengthen Tasmania's future?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for his question and considerable interest in this matter and recognise his hard work in the very regional electorate of Lyons.

For Tasmania to thrive, our regions must thrive and that is why a Tasmania Liberal government will implement strategic regional partnerships to support our regions with the infrastructure services, the skills and training and the supports they need, while also ensuring we are giving our young people the best start in life with universal access to early education.

Tasmania's differences are our greatest strengths. They underpin our unique and diverse economy. Tasmania has very distinct regions, each with key strengths and advantages and the potential to attract new investment, expand business and drive economies forward. With so much interest in Tasmania and what our state has to offer, we need to ensure every region has a targeted growth strategy and the support required to harness those advantages through people, infrastructure and resources.

Our ambition will be for the regional strategic partnerships to set a 20-year framework and vision and direction for planning and land use, ensuring regions have what they need to thrive.

Ms Butler interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, member for Lyons.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The partnerships will be made between the Tasmanian Government and the Local Government Association of Tasmania directly with council clusters in those regions with designated working groups established. The partnerships will look to identify opportunities, including the establishment of regional offices, which is consistent with the recommendations of the State Service Review, to provide strategic support and regional development services throughout Tasmania and maintaining a competitive advantage in our core industries, while attracting and supporting future-focused industries such as a clean economy, blue economy, digital technology, advanced manufacturing and modern technology, MedTech, future infrastructure, agribusiness, visitor economy, international education, defence and aerospace.

Working with the Office of the Coordinator-General to streamline due diligence to inform investment decisions and regulatory approvals process is an effective and efficient way. They will provide targeted local support to create jobs, investment and a pipeline of regional projects and services to enable delivery of the Government's priority sector roadmaps and strategies. They will work closely with local business, local government and regional

economic development organisations to identify direct and distinct opportunities and advantages - identifying options for redundant crown land use, for example, whether that is for housing or reserves; partnering with skills and training providers to align with growth industries and key regional strengths; and identifying opportunities to partner with post-tertiary providers and skills and training to look at options such as guaranteed service partnerships to attract and retain key professional and trade personnel into our regions, aligned with business industry and service needs.

These partnerships will build on the work already commenced under our statewide planning reforms. We will also draw on learnings from similar strategies in other jurisdictions with an aim to have each regional partnership completed by the end of 2023 to feed into the 2024-25 budget process, working directly with local areas to determine what is needed for communities to thrive.

This will bring together LGAT, the Department of State Growth, Office of Local Government and the state planning office to work through delivery, and other important stakeholders such as TasCOSS will be engaged shortly. It is about strengthening partnerships with regional communities and listening to them, as my colleagues have done so well. We enjoy our community cabinets.

It was great to be in Clarence yesterday and it was fantastic to be in St Helens a month or so ago, Burnie more recently, and we are looking forward to being in the north-east in a very short time. We are out there listening, engaging with our communities and recognising the importance of economic development in those communities, establishing very strong partnerships, working together for the benefit of not only employment in regional areas but valuing the sectors and industries in regional areas which of course those opposite ignore and certainly ignored between 2010 and 2014 when they tried to shut down the forest industry and sent 10 000 people to the dole queue.

This is a government that has demonstrated our capacity by increasing jobs: 30 000 jobs created since 2014. Our announcement over the weekend, as I have outlined today, will build on the great fundamentals of which this Government is very proud.

Ashley Youth Detention Centre - Alternative Sites

**Ms O'CONNOR question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, CHILDREN and YOUTH,
Mr JAENSCH**

[10.28 a.m.]

It is almost exactly a year ago since it was announced Ashley Youth Detention Centre would close. While Amnesty International and UNICEF Australia are calling for Ashley to close immediately, we are worried you have been dithering again. Can you tell the House whether the two sites have been identified, designs for the two facilities are finalised and tenders are being prepared for construction and service delivery? We did not get an answer out of the Premier, so can you tell us? Will the new model be in place within two years, as Tasmanians were promised?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Greens for her question. As the Premier referred in his answer to your similar question -

Ms O'Connor - No, it's a very different question.

Mr JAENSCH - we remain committed to our decision to close Ashley and establish new purpose-built facilities.

Ms O'Connor - But you've done nothing for a year; that's the evidence that came from the inquiry.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor, you have asked the question so allow the minister to answer it, please.

Mr JAENSCH - Importantly, the Premier said that this is not about postcodes and bricks and mortar. It is about the young people who our courts determine, for their care and rehabilitation, and for the safety of the community -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Mr Speaker, standing order 45, relevance. The question asked if sites had been identified, tenders issued, or designs finalised? We want an update.

Mr SPEAKER - Ms O'Connor, standing order 45 is not an opportunity to re-ask the question. The minister had only been going for 30 seconds so I do not expect standing order 45 to be used until the minister has at least half-completed his question. Minister, please continue.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you. I believe Ms O'Connor also agrees that the most important thing is that we are providing the right environments and the right care model for the young people who find themselves -

Ms O'Connor - It is not.

Mr JAENSCH - That is not the most important thing to you?

Ms O'Connor - No. Ashley is not the right place.

Mr JAENSCH - We agree then that the Ashley Youth Detention Centre is no longer the right place for us, long-term, as a youth justice custodial facility. That is why we have committed to closing Ashley and moving to new facilities.

The Premier outlined a range of safeguarding provisions made to ensure that the Ashley of today, where we have young people in detention, is a different place to the Ashley that we had before.

Ms O'Connor - Are you going to answer the question?

Mr SPEAKER - Ms O'Connor, if you are not prepared to listen to the answer I will ask you to leave. You have put the question to the minister. Please allow him to answer it and stop interjecting.

Mr JAENSCH - I am going to attempt to go through some of the steps we have taken to answer Ms O'Connor's question.

We have now appointed a chair of our Youth Justice Reform Steering Committee and a new executive director to lead our youth justice reform team. Shan Tennant will be our independent chair of the Youth Justice Reform Steering Committee, and Chris Simcock has been appointed to lead the youth justice reform process.

There has been considerable work done on the youth justice reform process to date. Following the release of our Youth Justice Blueprint discussion paper, a comprehensive consultation process has been undertaken with a broad range of stakeholders. This includes young people who are themselves currently involved with the youth justice system and their advocates. We have also closely engaged with the Commissioner for Children and Young People and the Custodial Inspector, who have particular statutory roles and functions relating to youth justice. These consultations are now informing the finalisation of the blueprint that will set the strategic directions for the whole system over the next 10 years.

Regarding the transition to new facilities, the Noetic Group has been engaged to undertake an options brief for new facilities, which includes an analysis of Tasmanian data, consultation with Tasmanian stakeholders and a review of best-practice approaches from around the world.

We have taken additional time to work with Noetic to consider how alternatives to detention raised through our blueprint consultation might also impact on our detention population and, therefore, the design of our future facilities. We want to make the most of this once-in-a-generation opportunity to design and deliver new custodial facilities while also reforming the youth justice system as a whole.

We have a unique opportunity in terms of our population of young people in detention and I remind you that in 2021 we had the equal-lowest rate of young people in detention, with the number of people in detention on an average day at 9.4 per cent. However, we know that 71 per cent of young people in custody in 2021 were awaiting the outcome of their court matter and a number of these people did not go on to receive sentences of detention. We are currently considering how we can provide more alternatives to detention, particularly for those young people who are currently remanded in custody awaiting the outcome of their court matter but do not go on to receive sentences of detention.

We are looking at bail and accommodation support options, and new community-based sentencing options. We have already committed to raising the minimum age of detention from 10 years to 14 years. We are also considering options for co-location of detention facilities and other related youth services such as alcohol and drug treatment, and mental health support.

These and other factors will impact on the size and site requirements, and design of the custodial facilities we build. Form should follow function. We are taking this opportunity not just to decant Ashley into two smaller buildings in different postcodes. We are taking this opportunity to fundamentally redesign the custodial elements of our youth justice system for

the very small number of people they are required to serve and to increase the number of alternative secure accommodation and other service provision facilities within that system.

Mr SPEAKER - If you could wind up, please, minister.

Mr JAENSCH - These things are worth investigating and getting right. We have a policy position and a deadline. We have made no change to that. We are working thoroughly to ensure that the product we come out with is more than just closing a building. It is about providing the care, the therapeutic through-care that the young people who are sentenced by courts to a custodial sentence need and deserve if they are to have their best chance at a productive life.

Rock Lobster Industry - Wharf Conversations

Ms FINLAY question to MINISTER for PRIMARY INDUSTRIES and WATER, Ms PALMER

[10.36 a.m.]

Last week in response to a question about small, single-handed rock lobster fishers, who make an incredible contribution to regional Tasmania, you said:

I sat at different wharves around our state just waiting for fishers to come in and have just sat and talked to them, just honest and open conversations.

Which specific wharves did you sit at and how many small, single-handed fishers did you sit and have honest, open conversations with on these wharves across Tasmania?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question because it gives me an opportunity to reiterate what I had the opportunity to say last Thursday. When I consult with people, I do not take a film crew. I do not take my phone and splash it all over social media. I go quietly and talk to them, on both sides of the argument. That is what I do.

Last week you highlighted an administrative error that came out of my office and I thank you for that because I was able to pick up the phone straight away and apologise to the people I had done that to, and they were fantastic. They were quite surprised I had picked up the phone and we ended up having lovely conversations. I appreciate you highlighting that for me.

I will say again that I am not ever going to be the sort of minister who has a chat to someone in a genuine effort to understand where they are coming from then publicly go out without their permission and sing that in order to score political points.

Ms Finlay - Which wharves?

Ms PALMER - I know where I was and who I spoke to. I know that when it comes time to make decisions in relation to my portfolio, I will be across it because I will have spoken directly to the people who are affected by those decisions.

Local Government Elections - Calibre of Candidates

Ms JOHNSTON question to MINISTER for LOCAL GOVERNMENT, Mr STREET

[10.39 a.m.]

Tasmanians deserve elected members who uphold high standards of governance and ethics, demonstrate competency, are law-abiding and will act in the community's best interests rather than their own self-interest. Yet, with local government elections around the corner, we are already seeing candidates coming forward who do not meet these standards by any stretch of the imagination.

Only last weekend the disgraced former Glenorchy mayor and alderman, Stuart Slade, announced his intention to again stand for deputy mayor. I understand that disgraced ex-Glenorchy aldermen are also considering standing again. Disgraced former alderman, Stuart Slade, was found to be up to his eyeballs in maladministration. His plain incompetence and misguided self-interest plagued the council for decades. His conduct was subject of damning findings from both the board of inquiry and the Integrity Commission. It took an act of parliament to dismiss him to mitigate the damage he caused to protect the Glenorchy community. Despite these findings and the fact that his actions directly cost the Glenorchy ratepayers millions of dollars, he is still able to nominate.

Likewise, Waratah-Wynyard Council's Darren Fairbrother has been found guilty of a sexual offence, placed on the Sex Offenders Register and suspended from that council for three months for breaching the Code of Conduct, yet he too, can renominate.

Do you agree that where a current or former local government councillor has been found by a court of law, the Integrity Commission, or another judicial inquiry to act in an unethical or improper manner, or has been found guilty of an offence that brings a council into disrepute, they should be banned from nominating in the future? What will you do to protect Tasmanians and councils from these disgraced candidates?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question and understand her concerns in this area. I welcome discussions surrounding the important issue of eligibility criteria for individuals to serve as councillors and issues on councillor behaviour.

With the events at Waratah-Wynyard, it is understandable that questions have arisen about the rules for holding or being eligible for the public office of councillor as well as questions around sanctions for bad behaviour. That is why I have committed that the Government will consult specifically with the local government sector and the broader community on these important issues after the upcoming elections.

I have recognised that introducing a requirement that councillors have a registration to work with vulnerable people card, in order to hold or be eligible for public office, may seem like a fix for the circumstances that were surrounding that particular councillor at Waratah-Wynyard. However, the Working with Vulnerable People legislative framework is neither intended nor designed as a broad character test for local councillors.

Importantly right now, there is nothing preventing an individual council from requiring its members to have a Working with Vulnerable People card and then limiting the activities that a particular councillor can undertake on behalf of the council if they are not able to obtain it. It is my view that the adoption of any eligibility requirements should be considered carefully to safeguard the integrity of our democratic processes.

I do not want to comment on the specifics of what you talked about in your question, Ms Johnston, but I understand why there is a concern around these issues. We need a better code of conduct process, which is what we have committed to consider. We need a better dispute resolution policy within local government as well, so only the most serious charges get to the code of conduct process. We also need sanctions at the back end of that process, which is exactly what I have committed to do. However, LGAT has also made it clear that they want their caretaker period respected in relation to their local government elections. That is why we are waiting until after the elections to undertake that further consultation with them.

Power Price Capping

Mr WINTER question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.43 a.m.]

The Treasury website currently says:

The Government delinked from mainland wholesale market volatility when it was required by capping regulated power prices through ... the use of a commercial and industrial customer rebate scheme. In the event of further volatility in mainland prices National Electricity Market prices in the future, the Government retains the ability to re-introduce one or both of these schemes in order to protect Tasmanian households and businesses.

Even the Tasmanian Treasury believes that price capping is an appropriate response to protect Tasmanian households and businesses from soaring mainland prices. Why are you so opposed to ensuring Tasmanians only pay Tasmanian prices for Tasmanian power?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for his question and interest in this matter. Every single member of my team has great interest in ensuring that we put downward pressure on power prices and do what we can to support vulnerable Tasmanians; those on low and fixed incomes who particularly feel the effects and the pressures of costs of living.

That is why we have very targeted support with our winter bill buster payment of \$180. It is a \$17 million investment and further recognises the agility that is needed in this space. I am interested in the agility of the federal government to deliver on their commitment of \$275 reduction in energy costs for consumers, as was their commitment at the last federal election. Perhaps you can lobby your colleagues about that, Mr Winter. I am interested to see a media release from you advocating delivering on their commitments on behalf of your party.

I have seen the other rubbish you throw out with your media releases, calling people all sorts of names and acting in a very undignified manner - publicly referring to people as biggest

losers and that kind of stuff, which I find appalling. I will have none of it. People expect us in our workplace, for the hour of day in the Chamber of question time, to act in a dignified manner. They expect us to robustly and vigorously debate ideas but not to target people with name calling as you appear to do in press releases and the media as well. It highlights a problem we have. People do not take you seriously because of the way you act. Question time today is a demonstration of that.

Mr WINTER - Point of order, Mr Speaker, standing order 45. The question is about power prices. I do not think the Premier has said 'power price'.

Mr SPEAKER - I do not accept the point of order because the Premier has already mentioned the relief the Government is offering in power prices. I will give the call back to the Premier.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Tasmania can be the nation's cleanest, smartest and the most innovative state. This means that through the development of more renewable energy we will deliver jobs for future generations of Tasmanians and ensure the cheapest form of electricity, renewable energy, supporting growing investment and new industries in Tasmania, while also supporting our nation's efforts to cut emissions and tackle climate change.

That is in contrast to you. You want to take us back to the dark ages with your ill-conceived bill, which was not even drafted correctly.

Ms White - It is on the Treasurer's website. Is he undermining you, and you do not even know about it?

Mr SPEAKER - Order, Ms White.

Mr ROCKLIFF - This is a government that understands, because of past experience of a 65 per cent increase in power prices under those opposite when they were last in government, the effects on small business and the effects on people, particularly on fixed and low incomes. For those reasons we have re-targeted support particularly for those on fixed and low incomes for the power price increase pressures, with the added bill buster payment and our \$5 million package we announced last week to support the organisations that support vulnerable Tasmanians.

Infrastructure Investment

Mr YOUNG question to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE and TRANSPORT, Mr FERGUSON

[10.48 a.m.]

Can you update the House on the Government's performance in infrastructure investment and the direction of future investment planned across Tasmania?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for Franklin, Mr Young, for his question - Australia's newest MP and doing a fine job.

Members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr FERGUSON - That is the sound of a toxic culture over there. It was wonderful catching up with my colleague, Mr Young, member for Franklin in the beautiful electorate of Pembroke, just yesterday and last Thursday as well, campaigning for Brownie. Like Mr Young, I love the smell of asphalt in the morning.

It made my heart sing when recently we saw the national labour market figures produced for Tasmania. We saw for Tasmania the lowest level of unemployment in the state's history; that made me very glad. How good is it to see the unemployment at the lowest level ever at 3.7 per cent? That means food on the table for Tasmanian families.

Members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. I am going to allow the Opposition a moment to calm down. I know it is a question from this side to the Treasurer, but when any minister is on their feet, I expect the Chamber to listen to the answer in silence and not have this incessant mumbling going on. The question is, do I need to throw one of you out in order for you to obey the standing orders?

Mr FERGUSON - Mr Speaker, it is important for Tasmanians to have the economic security that comes from having employment security. It means food on the tables of those families and the ability to make decisions about their future with confidence, and that is what this Government stands for. We will always do everything we can to support our economy because we want to support families around our beautiful state.

It made me very happy earlier this month to see the release of the Preliminary Outcomes Report from Treasury for the outgoing financial year. In particular, it highlighted record infrastructure delivery of \$817 million, just 1 per cent shy of the target we had in the previous year's budget. That is fantastic and it is supporting thousands of jobs around Tasmania, thousands of men and women in our construction sectors. This could not have been delivered without the great partnership I want to highlight between the Government and our industry partners and the initiatives we have had, including the construction blitz through the pandemic, which was led by former premier Gutwein, with my support and the full support of our team, but also the home builder programs.

It worked, and due to that economic growth, a growing population and record low unemployment that I have highlighted, I am very sure that our Government's infrastructure investments will continue to create jobs, underpin employment and job security, and make Tasmania a better place to live because the infrastructure we are building is actually about supporting a better quality of life for our people.

A record investment of more than \$400 million was made on our road and bridge infrastructure in the 2021-22 financial year, but this is forecast to grow over the years ahead, so budget and forward Estimates, with \$2.7 billion to be invested, the biggest of those being the new Bridgewater Bridge. That is the largest transport infrastructure project in our state's history. We are getting on with it. It is the centrepiece of our forward infrastructure budget,

but every corner of our state is being improved now because of our commitment to make our road network safer and more efficient.

Just to put that into some context, last year's investment just in roads and bridges alone, leaving aside all of the other infrastructure investments like port and rail and irrigation, is more than three times the commitment that was made by the Labor-Greens government in its last full year of office. To give you some perspective on that, three times more, and I am not even referring to private sector investment, so let us bring that in.

I am delighted today to announce and update to the House that the latest Tasmanian 10-year infrastructure pipeline, which is public and private, and is available on the Department of State Growth website, has now grown to a whopping \$27 billion in known infrastructure projects across the economy over the next 10 years. That is great news for Tasmania. It is very good news for our economy and the needs of our beautiful but growing state.

I want to put that in context. We pioneered the pipeline process. When Premier Rockliff was in my role he initiated the pipeline. The first one was in July 2018. I have just said that the latest is \$27 billion. The first pipeline in 2017 was \$13.9 billion -

Ms O'Connor - You've been talking a long time.

Mr FERGUSON - so as you can see, it is almost double and it is good news for Tasmania. Not every member of this House loves the smell of asphalt as I do, Mr Speaker, but as I wind up, I want to say that is an important vote of confidence in Tasmania, not just by government, which we often talk about, but we should focus as well on what the private sector is doing for our state. Their vote of confidence is a great sign of that partnership with the Rockliff Liberal Government.

I will speak well of our economy and our state because we are living in times of great economic security arising from job security, and we will always work to do everything we can to do more to support families, in particular, as the Premier has highlighted, those on low and fixed incomes who may be more vulnerable and deserving of our continued support.

Electricity Prices

Mr WINTER question to the PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.55 a.m.]

You would be aware that a number of large Tasmanian businesses are currently renegotiating their electricity supply contracts and that many of them are facing enormous and potentially damaging increases in their costs. Do you believe Tasmanian businesses should be paying Tasmanian prices for Tasmanian power? Noting again the statement on the Treasury website, why will you not reintroduce a commercial and industrial rebate scheme, as the Government has done previously?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for his question and his interest in this matter. Once again I say that we are a government that will always act in the best interests of Tasmanians.

That is the fundamental principle and our policies will reflect that, as they have done since we have been elected. Our policies for employment growth, for example, have increased the number of people employed in Tasmania by 30 000 people. Our Treasurer has just been on his feet talking about our record low unemployment rate of 3.7 per cent. When you were in government it was around 8.8 per cent, so do not come in here and talk about pain. I can talk to you about pain when you were in government and power prices increased by 65 per cent and 10 000 people were put on the dole queue.

Our minister for Infrastructure has just reflected on our 10-year pipeline - \$27 billion. What a vote of confidence in Tasmania, and that is a combination of public and private capital investment which every Tasmanian should be very proud of.

I will tell you this, Mr Winter. You and your people have no policies for the future of Tasmania and cannot even organise yourselves one weekend of policy discussion until 2025, so do not come in here talking about policies when you cannot even get your own ducks in a row and organise your own weekend. One weekend over the next three years is all you will devote to policy so we are not looking forward too much for too many bright ideas over there, coming from Mr Winter or others.

Dr Broad - You're not answering the question.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I am answering the question. We will always be a government that puts Tasmania's best interests first. We have done that when it comes to employment growth. We have done that when it comes to investment in key social services such as health, education and a \$1.5 billion investment over the next 10 years constructing 10 000 homes to 2032 in housing, for example, and we will do it when it comes to energy prices as well and renewable energy. I am excited for Tasmania and the opportunities of a new frontier, if you like, of renewable energy investment. It is enormously exciting. Whether it be the battler around power bills or indeed larger industrials, Tasmanians' interests will always come first under this Government.

Electricity Prices

Mr WINTER question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.59 a.m.]

Labor believes Tasmanians should pay Tasmanian prices for Tasmanian power. At the weekend the Liberal State Council declared their support for Labor's policy. Treasury evidently does not have a problem with it and Tasmanians are furious because they are the ones who are bearing the brunt for your broken promise on energy. As Sophia said -

I'm struggling trying to pay off my current bill. I'm terrified for the next one.
It's really, really scary times.

Are you the only person who does not believe Tasmanians should be paying Tasmanian prices for Tasmanian power?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I appreciate the question from the member. I appreciate the person who he quoted. I appreciate many people in Tasmania are facing cost of living pressures, as they are right across the nation. We will be very interested in the federal government delivering on their commitments of putting downward pressure on energy prices, in fact, \$275 was the figure that comes to mind.

We will be the Government that supports people on low and fixed incomes when it comes to their power bills. We have done it. We have demonstrated that through our Winter Bill Buster with \$180, a \$17 million investment and we have demonstrated that by also supporting Tasmanians with cost of living pressure by supporting the organisations that support vulnerable Tasmanians. We are keeping a very close eye on cost of living pressures and we are responding flexibly and quickly to Tasmania's needs.

National Skills Week

Mr WOOD question to MINISTER for SKILLS, TRAINING and WORKFORCE GROWTH, Mr ELLIS

[11.01 a.m.]

Yesterday marked the beginning of National Skills Week, so can the minister please update the House on how the Government's investments into skills and training are delivering for Tasmanians and why this is so important to keep our economy strong?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for Bass, particularly with his background in small business. He knows how important it is that we have a skilled workforce to deliver on the priorities for this Government and for all Tasmanians. Mr Speaker, as a former TAFE teacher and motor mechanic, you would know how important these skills are and how crucial they are for our community.

I say to everyone watching today, happy National Skills Week. This is an outstanding time to recognise the contribution of those who are going through training, those who deliver training and those who provide the jobs so that young people in our state, in our community, can get an apprenticeship, can set themselves up for life and deliver some of the big projects for our state.

I was on a building site yesterday in the beautiful electorate of Pembroke with our friend and hopefully colleague, Gregory Brown, and also the Master builders' Matt Pollock and a third-year building apprentice, Tom. I know the rivalry between plumbers and builders is strong. Tom had a better moustache and mullet than when I was a third year, but not by very much. He is a big part of the story. He is a young man who, in his third year, is saving up because he wants to buy house. He is working on some great projects that are popping up around Hobart and around Tasmania.

We have an outstanding story to tell this National Skills Week. The National Centre for Vocational and Educational Research has shown that Tasmania is, once again, leading the

nation when it comes to skills and skills development. Our completion rate for apprentices in electro-technology and communications is 15 per cent ahead of the national average. That is leading the country. Our completion rate for building apprentices, just like Tom, is 20 per cent higher than the national average. That is leading the country.

Even more exciting is that in Tasmania we have delivered a remarkable growth in young Tasmanians and older who are taking up apprenticeships and traineeships: 39 per cent compared to five years ago, together with a massive 71 per cent increase in trade apprenticeship starts.

That is what happens when you have a strong economy. That is what happens when you keep unemployment rates to record lows. It means that you can get an opportunity in this economy if you are a young person. There are now over 10 000 Tasmanian apprentices and trainees getting stuck into training so that they can save up to buy a house, have a family, live a wonderful life and build something big in that outstanding industry. There are 29 000 more Tasmanians in work than when the Liberal Party was first elected to government and many of those people are apprentices. Many of those people have done their time and are now making great money.

Since I began in this portfolio I have been talking with trainers, businesses, industry, and more importantly, apprentices and trainees. This is a government that wants to put them at the centre of what we do in terms of trades training and in terms of skilling up.

I was at the Clarence campus of TasTAFE the other day, at the Water and Energy Trade Centre of Excellence. That is going to be an enormously exciting project for tradies right across our state, particularly, for those who are involved in those industries. In my local patch, Free to Farm is going to be a wonderful Centre of Excellence for those involved in agriculture. We have so much in store for the regions right across our state. We are a believer in them being the drivers of Tasmania's economic growth.

In my portfolio, Resources, Mining and Forest Industries, employ apprentices and are helping to deliver us. I encourage all people to take part in this National Skills Week, whether it is a young person who signs up for the apprentice information night with TasTAFE on Wednesday or whether it is some of our apprentices who are taking part in world skills in the member for Bass' electorate in Launceston on Wednesday. We are putting some of Tasmania's apprentices against some of the best of the country and the best in the world. That is an exciting time.

Tasmanians are getting on with the job. That is in stark contrast to those opposite, who are riven with division; a bitter, divided, toxic culture. They have no vision. They cannot even let their members meet to discuss policy, to elect their leadership.

I saw an article in the paper the other day from Stephen McCallum, a good man from the UFU saying that David O'Byrne should perhaps be the leader of the Labor Party. Sadly, he cannot have a say in who is going to be any office bearers in terms of any policy for the Labor Party. That is a sad indictment on those opposite, who come in here and try to tell us about policy when they have nothing on that side but bitterness, division and a toxic culture.

Anti-Transgender Motion - Liberal Party State Council

Ms HADDAD question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.06.a.m]

Over the weekend it was reported in the media that a divisive anti-transgender motion was passed unanimously by the Liberal Party State Council. Is that correct? Was it passed unanimously and does this mean that you voted for it?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question. It was passed. The membership has its say on the floor of the State Council.

Ms O'Connor - Did you speak against it?

Mr ROCKLIFF - I spoke on the state for the State Council.

Ms Haddad - Was it unanimous?

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Unlike you, not having a conference until 2025.

Senator Chandler's motion supporting single-sex participation in women's sport and the right for women and girls to have access to single-sex sport at elite and community levels was supported by the membership of the party at our recent state conference -

Ms Haddad - Are you a member? Do you support it?

Mr ROCKLIFF - My position remains the same -

Ms White - What is that?

Mr ROCKLIFF - I believe that every Tasmanian regardless of their age, background or gender has the right to lead an active and healthy lifestyle and participate in sport. My views are well known. They are on the record publicly with respect to Senator Chandler's motion. I do not support Senator Chandler's bill that she had in the last parliament.

I will always stand up for inclusive communities, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The Labor Party is obsessed by the Liberal Party State conference. -

I understand that we have pressures in our health system. I want to improve our education and engagement for young people for good reason because we can do better when it comes to our literacy and numeracy. My concern is that waiting lists are too high in our hospitals.

Despite our good record in public housing, we need to build more houses. Not a single question on health, on education, on public housing from those opposite. You are obsessed by Liberal Party State conference because you cannot organise your own.

Tasmanian Mental Health Reform Program

Mrs ALEXANDER question to MINISTER for MENTAL HEALTH and WELLBEING, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.10 a.m.]

The Tasmanian Mental Health Reform Program is a significant aspect of our statewide mental health services in which the Government has significantly invested. However, the entire body of work for this reform will require recruitment and training of additional skilled clinicians. Can you please update the House on what the Government is doing to support the growth of this important workforce?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question and I know her considerable interest in this matter. The Tasmanian Liberal Government is committed to growing our mental health workforce. In fact in the last four financial years we have seen an increase of just over 35.5 FTEs in statewide mental health services. In the next few years we will see significant reform arising from the Tasmanian Mental Health Reform Program, which includes adult mental health services, child and adolescent mental health services, older persons' mental health services, correctional primary health and forensic mental services.

Collectively, these reforms will have a significant impact on our current services and how we support our consumers into the future, including a considerable growth in clinical positions. We are very pleased to be expanding our mental health workforce and this is a critical investment to support the delivery of quality services and ensure Tasmanians have access to the treatment and care they need.

Today I am pleased to announce a new partnership between the Department of Health and the University of Tasmania to further grow the mental health workforce. Mental health service development and reform will be united with research, training and academia to produce world-leading mental health services in Tasmania. Together we are creating Tasmania's first centre for mental health services innovation and this has recently been formalised by a memorandum of understanding. The aim of the centre is to create and engage in opportunities across statewide mental health services and the university, including training and education, workforce development, research and development, policy and advocacy, accommodation, marketing and governance.

The Tasmanian Government's Mental Health Reform Program includes large-scale structural and service improvements across statewide mental health services. This provides rich opportunities for integrating new service creation and innovation with academic research and evaluation. The centre will help to grow, attract and retain a skilled and energised workforce to provide better access to evidence-based mental health services for all ages and will drive continuous quality improvement through rigorous research and planning. Partnering with the university, we will combine resources to create new academic and research pathways

for students, developing clinician specialists and future leaders in a range of mental health multidisciplinary professions that can be matched with career options in the state.

The centre will promote statewide mental health services and the University of Tasmania as a distinctive and recognised training and career provider of choice. Key activities of the centre will include new academic and career pathways for students and clinicians across medical, nursing, psychology and other allied health specialists; statewide mental health service workplace rotations and placements across hospital and community settings; growing mental health experts and leaders through advanced academic opportunities, including academic career pathways and conjoined appointments; academic research projects that directly relate to and aim to improve the lived experience of consumers and carers; leading national data collection and analytics to review service performance and development, with the aim to create a sustainable and continuous cycle of service innovation; creating infrastructure to seek, pursue and facilitate opportunities; applications for national and international research grants; improving the expanding technology to deliver telehealth remote clinics for remote learning supervision and service delivery; celebrating success through awards, innovation, promotion, information-sharing and talks; and becoming nationally recognised for the publishing of mental health service research and evaluation.

There are a lot of exciting developments to come, including the formation of the centre's governance and leadership, and I look forward to further announcements on these in coming months.

Time expired.

MESSAGE FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Joint Sessional Committee on Gender and Equality

Mr SPEAKER - I am in receipt of a message from the Legislative Council, which reads:

The Legislative Council has this day agreed to the following resolution and acquaints the House of Assembly accordingly -

Resolved that the Legislative Council, having taken into consideration the message from the House of Assembly dated 17 August 2022 relating to the establishment of a Joint Sessional Gender and Equality Committee, has appointed the following members to serve on the Joint Sessional Committee on the part of the Council - Mr Duigan, Ms Forrest, Mr Harriss and Mr Willie - and further agrees to the time and place for holding the first meeting of the said Committee.

C Farrell
President, Legislative Council
19 August 2022

STADIUMS TASMANIA AMENDMENT (TRANSFERS) BILL 2022 (No. 39)

First Reading

Bill presented by Mr Street and read the first time.

MOTION

Leave to Move Motion without Notice - Motion Negatived

[11.17 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Speaker, I seek leave to move -

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended to debate the following motion:

That the House calls on the Premier to update the House on the progress of the closure and replacement of Ashley Youth Detention Centre.

Mr Speaker, the reason we are moving the standing orders be suspended is because twice this morning we gave the Premier and the minister an opportunity to provide a meaningful update to the House on progress towards the closure of the Ashley Youth Detention Centre.

In recent days, there have been witnesses come before the commission of inquiry who somehow have survived that place. There have been whistleblowers who worked at Ashley who have come forward with utterly harrowing stories. The commission of inquiry has heard evidence of an abusive culture amongst some staff. Yesterday in evidence I sat there and listened to it. We heard about staff who stood by and watched while a vulnerable child was beaten senseless. We have heard evidence of other staff who have enabled and covered up the violent sexual assaults of children by older detainees, and we know this because of the whistleblowers who have come forward.

We also heard in evidence late last week of an apparent bureaucratic culture of cover-up and secrecy. It reinforces the need again for this state to have an offence of misconduct in public office. We are the only jurisdiction in the country that does not.

Ashley Youth Detention Centre has been torturing children for a century. The calls for its closure have been getting louder and louder and finally last year we had a premier who had the guts to respond and announce that Ashley would be closed within three years, but we heard through evidence at the inquiry from Pam Honan, the Director of Youth Custodial Services, that there has been glacial progress on Ashley's closure. We hear from the minister today, oh terrific - they have appointed the chair of a steering committee on reform and this minister, who dithers consistently in his portfolios, is waiting for an options paper. It is possible to deal with alternative youth justice options while you are actively closing Ashley Youth Detention Centre.

What I heard this morning is excuse-making for a deadline that seems unlikely to be met, which means there will be children in that house of horrors longer than they need to be and longer than Tasmanians were promised they would be.

We need timelines. We need to know if sites have been identified. We need to know if designs have been finalised. It sounds to us like this minister who dithered on the need to close Ashley for years for political reasons is dithering again.

I cannot let this opportunity go by not to take on the Labor Opposition for failing children and young people today. Your questions today were pathetic and political. Have you not been watching the commission of inquiry? Have you not been paying attention? If you watch the commission of inquiry, you come in here as a representative and you represent those children and young people. We got that garbage out of Labor this morning. You can groan all you want but you failed those children today, just as you failed nurses and firefighters last week. Thank heavens Mr O'Byrne is in here to ask questions on behalf of union members.

What we want to hear from this minister and this Premier is a commitment to closure within two years, a response to the calls from Amnesty International and UNICEF Australia to close Ashley now.

We want to understand why they are still dithering on an options paper when sites could have been identified in the past year. We know from evidence before the inquiry that even today it is a bold claim to say that Ashley is a safe place for children. Counsel assisting the commission Rachel Ellyard has said:

Rather than it being about monsters entering an institution that was otherwise serving the interests of children, here you may find that it is Ashley that is the monster.

It is inherently unsafe for children and has defeated every attempt thus far that has been made to make it safer.

As Ms Ellyard acknowledged, this kind of harrowing evidence we heard is not new. She said:

The accounts from detainees who were at Ashley in 2000 are distressingly similar to those who were there a year ago. As shocking as the evidence is, none of it should be a surprise to the Government, none of the evidence should surprise those who worked at Ashley or have been alert to the reports or reviews that have been prepared over the last two decades. Yet not enough had been done about it.

Not good enough. There are vulnerable children right now in Ashley and because of this Government's dithering and failure to commit to early closure, there will be more vulnerable children put in the Ashley Youth Detention Centre.

The Premier and the minister owe it to those children, their families and the people of Tasmania, who were promised that place would be closed within three years a year ago, to be very clear and upfront about whether the deadline will be met. What I heard from the minister today was that it will not be met. What we heard from Pam Honan last Friday is that it will be almost miraculous for it to be met, given how little progress has been made.

We are not talking about politics here. We are talking about vulnerable children and young people who have been let down over generations and are still being let down.

Mr SPEAKER - The member's time has expired. I remind the House that we are talking about the seeking of leave to suspend standing orders rather than the motion.

[11.24 a.m.]

Mr STREET (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Mr Speaker, as directed, I will not talk to the substance of Ms O'Connor's motion. I will simply address the seeking of leave and say that the Government will not be supporting it. We have outlined on the blue what the orders of the day are for today and we plan to stick to it. I would say to Ms O'Connor that there is private members' time available to you tomorrow for a substantive debate on this issue. If that is what you choose to do, the Government will not be supporting the seeking of leave.

Ms O'Connor - Is that your defence?

Mr WINTER (Franklin) - It is an interesting defence. Mr Speaker, the Opposition always supports the seeking of leave and we will in this case. We have been watching the commission of inquiry with a great deal of concern for the welfare of detainees, former and current and potentially future. The seeking of leave is important so that we can give the opportunity to the Government to provide answers to the questions asked by the Greens today.

Both questions could have been easily answered. The question seemed quite clear and simple: are you going to stick to your deadline on the closure of Ashley? I did not hear a coherent answer from either the Premier or the minister. That is why we are having to debate the seeking of leave, to try to solicit some answers from the Government which they were not able to provide to us earlier today. Perhaps, with the benefit of additional time, they might be able to update the House on a very important matter.

Ms O'Connor, I want to address your obsession with the Opposition and your weird desire to choose what questions Labor might ask every morning. Last session was COVID-19; if we did not ask every question about COVID-19, we did not care about it. This time it is about Ashley. Whatever question the Leader of the Greens wants asked, it is as though she believes the Labor Opposition should follow to her beck and call and do whatever she decides that morning. That is not how this place operates. The Greens have their priorities and we have our priorities.

Our priorities are very clear for Tasmanians. It is around the cost of living; it is around energy prices. These are important priorities for Tasmanians. It does not mean to say that because we do not ask a question about something one morning that we do not care about it. We care about a whole raft of issues. This Government is failing on the basics every day. It is not getting the basics right. We only have seven questions per morning; we cannot ask about every concern that we have because we have so many.

We support the seeking of leave, as I said. The questions the Greens are asking are legitimate and they should be answered by the Government.

Ms O'Connor - Are we going to have any member of Government speak to this?

Mr Ferguson - Yes, our Leader of the House.

Ms O'Connor - He just said you will not be supporting it. He did not go to the substance.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. The member for Franklin has the call.

[11.28 a.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, we are very concerned at the response from the Premier and the minister this morning. I do not know about other members but it seems that they have not been watching as closely as Ms O'Connor and I have to the harrowing testimony that has been presented every single day to the inquiry -

A member - That is not a fair reflection, Dr Woodruff.

Dr WOODRUFF - Okay: some of the members who have spoken. Members who have watched would be galvanised by the need for urgent action on this matter. When criminologist Robert White gave his testimony it was that he would raze Ashley to the ground tomorrow. He recommended in 2011 that it was not fit for children. He said, 'We need to get beyond calling it a detention centre; it really is a prison'. He talked about the culture of staff 'resistant to change who see their job as locking children up', that this is a centre which is there as bricks and mortar but is there also as a culture. That is what we are so deeply concerned about.

We understand the Premier's desire to get it right but more important than perfection is keeping the safety of those children paramount. A promise was made by this Government that Ashley would be closed in three years. This is the Government that refused to respond by the recommendations of the Noetic report. It ought to have been a first order of business for them when they came to government in 2014. There have been flags every month -

Mr SPEAKER - Order, I have to remind you that you are into the substantive debate. The argument you need to be putting is why we need to deal with this today. You have gone back to 2014.

Dr WOODRUFF - I believe every sentence I have said, Mr Speaker, has been about the urgency of hearing today, immediately, of the actual plans that have been put in place. We want to know if designs have been finalised. I am married to an architect. I know how long it takes to get projects off the ground. If we only have two years left in the three-year time frame, we need to understand what actions this minister is taking.

This minister has shown in every portfolio he had his hands on that he washes them afterwards and does nothing. There are no actions. He dithers. He fails to provide action. He has been given by the Premier, responsibility for some of the most vulnerable people in the state. How dare he come into this place and refuse to answer reasonable questions in the middle of a commission of inquiry about the actions that have been taken that we need to hear today - about whether sites have been identified; whether designs have been finalised.

We had an incredible display by the minister for Corrections in the appalling decision-making processes of this Government for the twice proposed northern prison site. We were promised that due diligence had been done on the Birralee Road site. What an absolute lot of garbage. Nothing like that had been done -

Mr SPEAKER - Order, do I need to remind you again that we are talking about the seeking of leave?

Dr WOODRUFF - We want to know today whether due diligence is being done. The evidence so far is that this Government is not capable of it. We have a minister who does not tell us whether the designs have been finalised, or whether a site has been identified, or whether a therapeutic model has been identified, or what the plan is to make sure that there are no young people locked up in that prison that ought to have been closed 100 years ago. It has been described by Professor White in the words of the other person who went in with him, as 'the worst institution that the other specialist had ever seen'.

There is no excuse to have children in there beyond three years. There has never been an excuse to keep them there that long. However, if we do not have an understanding of the concrete actions that the Government is taking, not just establishing committees, not just talkfests; if we have not had the evidence every single day of the culture of abuse, you do not turn those things around. Therefore, you have to throw it away and start it all over again.

We do not see a commitment from the Government that they are prepared to act with the urgency that is required. We do not have confidence in this minister that he has the ability to act with the urgency that is required. We expect the Premier to give us an indication that we ought to feel some confidence on behalf of the very young people and their families, who are in there today; on behalf of the victims/survivors who have given the most difficult traumatising testimony, being retraumatised; the staff who have also been traumatised; and the whistleblowers who tried and failed to stand up against the highly misogynistic culture, the blaming of young people, the appalling acts of violence, the punitive approach, and physical abuse being normalised.

The therapeutic model at Ashley is about power and control. It is not about providing children with a safe place and the care that they need, the treatment that they need so that they are able to understand what is happening in their life and get the support that they need to take responsibility and have a pathway to a future in the community, instead of a pathway of crime and Risdon.

[11.35 a.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition) - Mr Speaker, I would like the record to show that we did allow time for the government ministers to jump to speak to this seeking of leave motion before the House, and again reiterate our support for the seeking of leave.

The motion is very straightforward. I am quite surprised that the Premier and the Government have not taken the opportunity to get to their feet to update the House on the progress of the closure and replacement of Ashley Youth Detention Centre. It is a government policy, after all, is it not?

This is a premier who claims to want to lead a government that is transparent. Their lack of transparency about what is happening in the youth justice space, particularly Ashley Detention Centre, is the cause for a lot of concern. We have heard the evidence provided, through the commission of inquiry process, which the Labor Party has not sought to politicise.

On this occasion, I note the questions that were asked by the Leader of the Greens, and agree that there is a lack of detail that has been offered by the Government about the site, the timeline, and the design. They are important questions that go to government policy, a position the Government has already taken. I thought they would have jumped at the chance today to get up and provide some further explanation about it.

We are one year into a three-year time line to close the Ashley Youth Detention Centre, and there is a vacuum of information. It is right for people to be concerned. I point to evidence that was provided by the former commissioner for children, Mark Morrissey, who was very troubled by what he saw at the Ashley Youth Detention Centre. I will quote from what was reported in a media story where he said:

I received a phone call from a politician, and that politician's name was redacted.

That politician asked me to understand that any challenges to the current system would affect employment, and that it was a very important employer for the Deloraine district.

Effectively, that politician was asking me to back-off.

That was after Mr Morrissey had raised concerns about what was happening at the Ashley Youth Detention Centre. The media report goes on to say, in the line following that direct quote:

Mr Morrissey retired early.

Perhaps it is a coincidence that he retired early, or perhaps he just felt so disillusioned and so disappointed in the government of the day that he decided to step away from that important role.

It is right for us to be asking these types of questions, and to give the Government the opportunity to provide some transparency about the commitment they gave to close the Ashley Youth Detention Centre.

This is a Government that breaks promises. It has broken a promise about capping electricity prices.

Mr SPEAKER - Again, we have gone down the path of the substantive debate. This debate should be about the seeking of leave and why it is important to set aside the orders of the day in order to debate the issue right now. That is what we should be discussing.

Ms WHITE - Thank you, Mr Speaker, I appreciate that. It is a motion to seek leave to give the Government time to talk about its own policy. I support that. I thought the Government would have supported that too.

We are concerned that this is a government that has a track record of breaking its promises, of failing to get the basics right. It is struggling along day to day. This is an opportunity for them to come into this place, and for the Premier to do what he says he wants to do, and that is to lead a government of transparency and provide an update on government policy around the closure of the Ashley Youth Detention Centre. They have failed to do that.

There are three minutes left on this debate. I will take my seat and give the Government one more chance to rise and provide the update the House is looking for.

Mr SPEAKER - The question is that the seeking of leave be granted.

The House divided -

AYES 11

Ms Butler (Teller)
Ms Dow
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Johnston
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms O'Connor
Ms White
Mr Winter
Dr Woodruff

NOES 11

Mrs Alexander
Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Street
Mr Tucker
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Dr Broad

Ms Ogilvie

Mr SPEAKER - The result of the division is Ayes 11, Noes 11; therefore in accordance with standing order 167 I cast my vote with the Noes.

Motion negatived.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mental Health Services

[11.44 a.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) - Mr Speaker, I move -

That the House take note of the following matter: mental health services.

The area of the health system that I want to focus on today is around the provision of mental health services across the state but also the mental health and wellbeing of our paramedics across Tasmania. I find it interesting that the Premier has come in today and made an announcement about a new measure in mental health around career pathways and working with the university around research and leadership development in mental health across Tasmania.

I must say that after nearly a decade in government, it is a bit of a shock that the Premier and Health minister is only talking about this now because this is a systemic issue that has been ongoing for many years. This Government has failed to get the basics right when it comes to the provision of mental health services.

I also note the recent announcement around strategic regional partnerships. Health is an area where we would like to see more from this Government when it comes to partnerships with local government and regional communities, because right now regional Tasmanians are not getting access to the health services they require across their communities, and no more relevant an area is mental health service provision.

The Premier as the Health minister would be well aware of the concerns of the Circular Head community, the west coast community and the east coast. There simply is not the mental health support being provided in those local communities that there needs to be.

I was surprised at the Premier's announcement in the House during question time about mental health given the story in today's *Advocate* around a coronial investigation into the care that was provided to a young woman at the North West Regional Hospital. I would like the Premier to update the House on the actions that have been put in place following that investigation of that terrible event and to understand what measures this Government is putting in place to address those recommendations made by the coroner about a series of events and the care that was provided to that young woman.

I understand it is a very sensitive matter and I will not be going into the details of the coronial report but I do know that this Premier and Health minister very often talks about his experience being involved as a Lifeline counsellor over many years, and I understand that mental health is particular focus of his, so I want to understand what his legacy might be when it comes to the provision of mental health services across Tasmania.

This Government has had varied policies over many years when it comes to mental health services. We saw the introduction of PEN nurses and then we saw those nurses taken away. We have PACER being rolled out, but only in the south of the state. Why can that initiative not be brought forward to other parts of the state, given the success? I understand it will be starting next year in the north-west but if there is such great success with this program, why are we not looking to roll that out across other areas of the state?

There is a need for a different model of mental health care being provided, not only in the hospital setting but also across our communities. This Government is pretty good at making announcements. We saw that at the last state election around the announcement of the expansion of the Spencer Clinic which is due to occur in 2025. That is not long away and it would be good to understand from the Premier and Health minister how far advanced that is. It is all very well to be working strategically with the University of Tasmania around research, leadership positions and career pathways, but what we need right now is better coordination of services across the acute care system when it comes to mental health and better resourcing of our community mental health practitioners across the state.

If you read that coronial report, it talks about the importance of there being sound measures put in place, including good discharge planning for mental health patients across the state when they are discharged from an acute facility. Right now, Tasmanians are being let down by this Government when it comes to the provision of care across the community and mental health services. We need more staff right now. During Estimates we asked about that and were told we are about 350 mental health workers short of what is required across this state. We also need more beds. The people of the north-west coast cannot wait until 2025 for the expansion of the Spencer Clinic. There are no adolescent mental health beds in the

north-west of the state and there is a dire need for those beds. This is an opportunity for the Premier and Health minister to update the House on exactly what he is doing.

The last point I want to make during this contribution is around the mental health and wellbeing of our paramedics which is a longstanding issue we have been talking about in this place and across the community for a very long time. There does not seem to be a nimble or flexible response from this Government when it comes to better supporting our first responders across the state. You only have to look at the number of traumatic things that have happened with regard to ambulance ramping just recently, to think about the impact that must be having on the mental health and wellbeing of those on the frontline providing care and services to Tasmanians.

At the weekend I caught up with Dakota Wolf and his horse Coda at his property in Sheffield. He is a Tasmanian who took it upon himself to ride from Latrobe to Hobart to present letters from paramedics across the state about their mental health and wellbeing and the action that they wanted to see from this Government. I note through the media at the weekend, the Premier said that he had responded to all of the paramedics who had written to him. I understand that is not the case because I have spoken directly with some of them who have not received a response.

I ask that the Premier meet with Dakota and hear what he heard from our paramedics across the state. They are at breaking point. There was unprecedented industrial action in reaction to the issues that are ongoing with ramping and the lack of action by this state and about the number of their colleagues who are leaving, choosing not to be paramedics. The high suicide rates amongst our paramedics in Tasmania and across the country -

Time expired.

[11.51 a.m.]

Mr ROCKLIFF (Braddon - Minister for Mental Health and Wellbeing) - Mr Speaker, I thank the member for the matter of public importance. We are investing \$7.25 million every single day into our health system, \$11.2 billion over the course of the next four years, and continuing, as we have done, to increase the numbers of full-time equivalent staff across our health workforce, whether that be our paramedics in our mental health service, across our hospitals more broadly and in the mental health area, which is the subject of most of the member's contribution.

I am very pleased with the number of initiatives that we are rolling out. The Police, Ambulance and Clinician Early Response program was referred to earlier. The pilot has been very successful and we are commencing a pilot in the north-west in early 2023, which is the next phase in evolving our PACER to a statewide model, a similar approach we took to the Community Rapid Response Service model. I believe that commenced in the north and went to the north-west and the south, if my memory serves me correctly.

PACER involves police, ambulance and mental health services. We are looking at good results from that. It is designed to support people in the community with their care when they have a very serious mental health episode. My latest information is that 75 per cent of people that the PACER team attend to have their care provided in the community rather than in an emergency department, which clearly demonstrates the success of the program. Members

would be acutely aware that caring for people in their community is far better than caring for someone with a serious mental health episode in an emergency department.

A further two years of funding is provided for the Mental Health Reform Program to address priority areas - the rollout of adult acute care and continuing care models of service in the north and the north-west. The acute care team will provide treatment for individuals experiencing moderate to severe mental health symptoms or suicidal distress who have not any prior or recent contact with mental health service or are likely to need this intensity of service for short periods of time. The Continuing Care Program is designed to provide specialist case management care, coordination for individuals assessed as requiring an extended period of mental health treatment and care. This team will also provide short-term intensive treatment for existing clients. Funding will also continue to rollout for other reforms such as the progression of the Peacock Centre.

It was fantastic to visit the Peacock Centre the other day. It has been mired in tragedy through fires in 2016 and Christmas Eve last year. It was fantastic to hear people, contractor, subcontractors and project managers so involved and passionate about that project and raising a hand for mental illness and also writing a message about what mental health means for them. The awareness, particularly amongst younger people engaged in the contracting sector, was fantastic. People also spoke of their lived experience, lived experience if not for themselves but the lived experience of people for whom they care deeply. The Peacock Centre will be a wonderful addition to our services that we provide for mental health across the state. We look forward to the completion and implementation of those key services which will be, I know, much valued.

I speak often of the investments we are putting into health and mental health. I am very pleased with the investments we are making in adolescent mental health. That \$45 million of investment, that considerable reform project, is so needed and follows on from a very detailed warts-and-all report on how we can improve our adolescent mental health services across Tasmania.

Investment is really important but so is ensuring we have the right systems and reforms approach as well. I am very pleased with the introduction of the new Bedside Medication Management program. That is across all of our hospitals. It is designed to deliver a more efficient health system. It is a commitment of \$4.7 million over the next two years to support the initiative, which sees pharmacy technicians working on acute hospital wards to manage patient medications and free up our nurses and midwives to focus on patient care.

Under the current process, nursing and midwifery staff are responsible for ordering, transporting and counting patient medications on hospital wards. By introducing pharmacy technicians to oversee this process, we allow our highly qualified nurses and midwives to spend less time chasing up medications and more time doing what they do best and that is caring for patients and their families.

When I mention investment and I mention increasing FTE funding, I am also mindful of the fact I also need to mention where we are improving our system's secondary triage, an initiative I have mentioned often as well as bedside medication and our community and rapid response service.

[11.59 a.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Mr Speaker, before I go into my substantive contribution - and I thank the member for bringing it on - much of what the Health minister has just said sounds great but there is a significant disconnect between a program being announced and a program effectively working.

I draw his attention to the pressure there has been in hospitals with the new program around pharmacy medication distribution. There are not enough pharmacists and staff to do it. In theory it is fantastic but in practice it has some significant issues.

Maybe that goes to understanding generally what this Government keeps saying around health funding. They keep rolling out the numbers and the dollars and it sounds fantastic, yet, when you talk to staff, when you talk to people using a health service, we see a massive disconnect between lots of money and lots of plans. Fundamentally things are not getting any better. This speaks to a broader and more concerning problem.

Today I particularly want to touch on the issues around our paramedics. Last Thursday night, as our House was rising after being so hastily prorogued last month, so were the paramedics. As we were knocking off from our parliamentary week, they were taking industrial action to urge the Government to respond to their ongoing safety concerns and to call for fairer engagement with them on those crucial issues. They did not withdraw their labour or enact bans. Paramedics in the south finished their shifts on time, which was a massive thing, and they walked off the job. That was their industrial action. It was significant because they usually stay on. They always stay on. They have to stay on because they are not resourced enough to get the work done so they stay way after their shift is finished in order to make sure people are taken care of. They marched out of the Royal Hobart Hospital because the safety of their patients is being compromised by this poor resourcing and the Government's failure to work with them.

The Government says they are going to employ all these amazing numbers of people but we also know it is really hard to employ people in Tasmania when the wages and conditions are much better in other jurisdictions. They also marched because their own health is being compromised by those unmanageable workloads. Both the previous speakers spoke to the issue of mental health and that is a significant issue for our paramedics because of the distress that this Government seems oblivious to, the distress it causes then when they cannot do the job the way they know they need to, when they do not have enough staff to respond to calls, when they are ramped for hours, when they do not get the breaks they need, when they are working unnecessarily large amounts of overtime and are not getting the leave provisions that we know they desperately need.

The Government is aware of this. This is not a secret; there is an entire report into the culture and health and safety conditions for our paramedics. There is an entire plan by government on how they are going to respond to this and one of the fundamental ways of responding is to work better with the workforce. We are seeing, and it was demonstrated in the House today, the absolute disdain that our firefighters are being shown in relation to their agreements and the negotiations of those agreements. We have seen the Government responding to the very poor media they got when nurses walked out, but what we are seeing in all of that is a lack of respect that is being felt by our paramedics very much and it is intensifying, as are the worsening health conditions in our state under this Government.

The Auditor-General's report in 2019 found that ambulance ramping across four hospitals between 2012-13, when they were not in government, and 2018-19 had increased by a whopping 149 per cent! The duration of ramping increased with the offload delay exceeding the 15-minute target by 197 per cent and exceeding 30 minutes by 239 per cent. The Royal Hobart Hospital was bed-blocked for 93 per cent of the time between June 2018 and January 2019, and the LGH spent 70 per cent of their time over the same period at the highest level of escalation in a state of almost constant gridlock, with patient care severely compromised through all of these things. The rate of ED adverse events grew by 60 per cent between 2015 and 2018, with most instances occurring at the Royal Hobart Hospital and the LGH.

The Australasian College of Emergency Medicine in 2019 declared the LGH the worst hospital in the country for bed-block. The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report for 2021 said that up to 10 per cent of patients at the LGH spent more than 16 hours in the ED compared with eight hours at comparable hospitals around the nation. Whilst the Government was busy proroguing parliament to deal with their own internal instability and a fear of attending this place because their numbers were a bit short, imagine how hard it is when you are short of paramedics. Things look increasingly dire for Tasmanians.

During the time we were prorogued, on Saturday 24 July in the southern region, including the closed double branches, they had 10 of the normal 18 night-shift paramedics on duty, which resulted in no less than six ambulances being staffed with PTS employees as drivers. That was an unprecedented event with an unprecedented response. It was fantastic that staff turned up, but why was there not a business contingency plan? Why was there no proper communication and people put on staff all the way through?

We had a woman waiting for nine hours at the LGH; she was ramped for more than nine hours and then she passed away. According to the Government's own dashboard of June this year, 52 per cent of patients are not seen on time at the LGH. We are not seeing these things getting better with all the additional funding and numbers the Government is talking about, but things are progressively getting worse. This actually is quite terrifying.

Meanwhile, we have some issues around bargaining because this Government refuses to bargain fairly with its workplace. We know that they have been ordered to apologise for the way they conducted their campaign in 2018 when they treated workers with such disrespect. We know that the Government had committed to meet regularly to get an agreement in place by September of this year with its public sector workforce but they have not bothered to turn up. By this time, by September, we should have had four meetings, we should have had the employer's log of claims, we should have had absolute progress in all of these things, but this Government is ignoring its workforce.

In relation to our paramedics, there is a meeting set on Friday and ambulance staff will be in attendance. The question for this Government is whether there will actually be an offer on the table, or will this Government continue to waste more of our ambulance staff and paramedics' very scarce and valuable time while they continue to disrespect them, the work they do and the community they support?

Time expired.

[12.06 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, we have now had regular rolling industrial action from a number of unions in Tasmania and they are expressing a pent-up feeling of desperation at repeatedly not being listened to. It started well before the state election last year, when we stood with nurses from the LGH as they protested outside the hospital at the situation in the emergency department and they were at that time in industrial action because of the staffing ratios in the hospital that were intolerable for staff and worse, creating health risks for patients in the LGH.

Here we are nearly 18 months later and there is no change and in fact the wheels are falling off. They are falling off in hospitals and in Ambulance Tasmania. I sincerely hope that that is literally not the case. However, what we are seeing is well captured by the new president of the AMA in Australia, Professor Steve Robson. He tweeted a couple of days ago:

There are no ambulances because they are all parked outside emergencies with patients in the back because the place is in logjam and people cannot go to the wards because all the staff have COVID and there are no places in the community to discharge them to. NOBODY SAW THIS COMING.

Mr Speaker, that last phrase was said with obvious irony. He wrote that in incredible frustration in all caps, which is not the usual method of communication of the AMA president. It goes to show and I am very glad that we have in the AMA and in Tasmania as leaders in a number of our professional bodies and unions, people with real courage to stand up and ask what is happening.

What is happening is a couple of decades of a particular neoliberal approach to shrinking the size of public-funded services and outsourcing investment into the private sector. On top of that, we have had serial underfunding, budget on budget, in Tasmania for the health service, the hospitals and Ambulance Tasmania, despite the clear warnings we have heard for years now from both the ambulance professional body and the ANMF of the real-life consequences of that. Into this space we have also had COVID-19 and this Government, this Premier, this Health minister has exacerbated the situation by refusing to take the sorts of preventative actions which could depress or slow down the number of people who are becoming infected, and more worryingly reinfected, with COVID. What we have every single day is hospital wards, surgeries, discharge areas, aged-care places, cleaners and people who provide food for people with disabilities who are living in their homes, people who ought to be in psychiatric wards or community mental health services, are getting COVID-19. They are passing it on to their colleagues. We know from the testimony of people who are working in emergency departments that huge numbers of people are simply not able to turn up to work. This is not something that is going to go away.

Despite the many conversations I have had in good faith, as an epidemiologist and the health portfolio holder, with the Director of Public Health and the Premier and Minister for Health, the Premier failed to comprehend the impact of COVID-19 reinfection and the reality of long COVID. Professor Nancy Baxter made a comment today that long COVID will be an enduring major public health complication that we failed to address in a timely and aggressive manner. She said we need to invest in combating it. That is obvious but it is good to hear these strong words from independent epidemiologists and public health officials.

It is also good to understand that we have some tools at hand to help hard-working nurses and ambulance staff, people who are working in front-facing services everywhere. That is, at minimum, mandating mask-wearing in those places the Premier, the Minister for Health, has removed, requiring ventilation systems to be in place and that people entering those spaces wear masks. Without that, we have a situation destined to continue to unfold. We have too-low vaccination rates and we are continuing in an unprotected way.

We have industrial action that is entirely understandable and it will not stop until the Premier realises he has to address the underlying failed safe workplace conditions that nursing staff and other health professionals have to turn up to every single day. He has to recognise the intolerable mental health burden on highly trained paramedics who are sitting ramped for hours or overnight, unable to attend people who are desperate and urgent. It requires financial resources and it requires a change of attitude about our COVID-19 response so that we have a collective approach again. We wear masks, we ventilate and we look after other people.

Time expired.

[12.13 p.m.]

Mrs ALEXANDER (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I rise to talk about the very important issue of health. I will go into the various commitments, what has been put in place, what is in motion and the future plan in order to address this very important area for our community but before that, I will broaden the scope of how we look at health and the impact of policies in general over the social determinants of health.

Social determinants of health are extremely important in any community. Recently I looked at a report by the World Health Organisation and they have identified that social determinants of health can be more important than health care or lifestyle choices in influencing the health outcomes of communities. The report said numerous studies suggest that social determinants of health account for 30 per cent to 55 per cent of health outcomes. It estimates that the contribution of sectors outside health to population health outcomes exceeds the contribution from the actual health sector.

I make the point that when we look at health and ask health questions, we need to take into account the broader context of how health is being approached. In identifying the specific issues fundamental to a healthy community and delivering good health outcomes, we also need to look at education, unemployment, food security, housing, early childhood development and social inclusion. They are all contributing factors to health outcomes for communities.

As a government, we are committed to growing the mental health workforce. It has been identified especially over the last two years in the context of COVID-19 isolation and everything that has contributed to increasing the acuity of mental health situations.

In the last four financial years, we have seen an increase of just over 38.5 full-time equivalents in Statewide Mental Health Services. We will also see significant reform in the next few years arising from the Tasmanian Mental Health Reform Program, the alcohol and other drugs reform agenda, child and adolescent mental health reform and older persons mental health reform. Collectively, these reforms will have a significant impact on our current services and how we support our consumers into the future, including considerable growth in clinical positions which are fundamental to proper delivery.

We are very pleased to be expanding the mental health workforce. This is a critical investment to support the delivery of quality services and ensure Tasmanians have access to the treatment and care they need, specifically, the dignity of care involved with mental health issues. As we know, that particular part of treatment has to be approached in a very dignified way.

Statewide Mental Health Services continues to explore options to expedite the recruitment process to ensure services are maintained and the reliance on agency staff and locums is minimised. This includes the introduction of several development positions such as assistant in nursing, and transition to practice and entry-level positions for allied health professionals. Transition to practice supports new graduate nurses into Statewide Mental Health Services and aims to support nurses to go on and complete their postgraduate diploma of mental health nursing via the provision of fully sponsored and supported training. The number of positions under this program across the state has been increased from 24 to 49 positions in 2022, which is more than doubling previous numbers. The service also supports student placement for social work, psychology, medical and nursing.

A new market retention allowance has also been approved for all psychiatrists who are not already getting an allowance. There is a dedicated staff member within the Mental Health Reform Program who works exclusively on recruitment and can provide extra assistance to interstate and international inquiries.

We are also excited to be supporting the growth of the mental health lived experience workforce, which is paramount. The appointment of the mental health peer workforce coordinator is a joint initiative with Primary Health Tasmania. It reflects the importance of ongoing collaboration across the broader mental health sector to create an integrated mental health system. There is no point in creating pockets of support if the system is not integrated, especially when it comes to mental health.

The coordinator, based at the Mental Health Council of Tasmania, is working to implement actions under the Peer Workforce Development Strategy and establish Tasmania's youth peer worker model. Peer workers with personal lived experiences hold an important level of knowledge and understanding as they provide advice and hope to both consumers and carers on their own mental health journeys. Peer workers assist in breaking down stigma and provide a person-centred focus on service and systems improvement. The focus on a person-centred idea is paramount. As I mentioned, dignity of care goes hand-in-hand with the person-centred focus.

Consumer peer workers and family care peer workers have been employed at all community mental health services across the state since 2018. In July 2022 these positions were made permanent in recognition of the vital role they play. Importantly, a key action of the Rethink 2020 implementation plan is to develop a joint workforce development strategy with public, private, primary and community sectors, along with education and training providers. This work commenced in 2022.

Time expired.

Matter noted.

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

Second Reading

Resumed from 17 August 2022 (page 118).

Recognition Of Vistors

Mr SPEAKER - As you are coming to the lectern, minister, I indicate to the House that in the Gallery we have members who participated in the Frank MacDonald Memorial Prize. Welcome to the Chamber.

Members - Hear, hear.

[12.21 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Environment and Climate Change) - Welcome and congratulations to those students on being selected. Everyone I have spoken to who has been part of that experience says that it has changed their lives, so enjoy it.

Mr Speaker, I thank all speakers for their contributions through our second reading debate on this bill. I welcome the support of Labor and the Greens for the bill. I will work through a range of matters that have been raised in the debate and I also need to correct some inaccuracies in earlier contributions.

First, some important background. This bill has been developed through a rigorous process over nearly two years which included detailed emissions and economic modelling, an independent review, and extensive consultation with businesses, industry, scientific and research groups, community and other stakeholders. To say that the Government has been dragging its feet or doing a rushed job - and I think both were levelled at us - is simply not true. I will refer to this extensive body of work through the remainder of my contribution because it answers many questions that have been raised and it underpins the policy decisions and the choices the Government has taken and included in this bill.

I will work through the key issues that have been raised in the following order.

First, I will address the 2030 statewide target and the issue of sector targets, proposals for additional governance and oversight structures, some of those inaccuracies that were mentioned that I need to correct, issues around a just transition and vulnerable Tasmanians, time frames and consultation requirements and the risk assessment and climate futures work.

I have taken the comments of other members on board and there are some proposed changes that the Government will consider adopting to improve the bill.

However, there are a few things we need to clear up. The first of those is the 2030 statewide target. This bill legislates a statewide target of net zero emissions or lower from 2030. This will be the most ambitious legislated emissions reduction target in Australia and one of the most ambitious in the world. The 2030 statewide target was recommended by Jacobs

in its 2020 independent review of our act and endorsed by the Government last year in its response to that review, based on the independent review's recommendations, open and targeted consultation with business, industry and the community since February 2021, the outcomes of the Tasmanian emissions pathway review and corresponding economic analysis to determine the impact of a more ambitious target on jobs and growth for Tasmania, consideration of the bushfire risk to our existing emissions profile and an internationally agreed reporting framework under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol.

Tasmania's net emissions are currently minus 3.73 megatonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents, 121 per cent below 1990 levels. The Tasmanian emissions pathway review clearly shows that as our economy and population grow, our emissions are gradually increasing. The pathway review clearly found that if we do not take action to reduce emissions, Tasmania is likely to become a net-positive greenhouse gas emitter again from about 2030, in years when a major bushfire is modelled. We need to focus on flattening our emissions curve to ensure we avoid net-positive emissions at 2030 and thereafter. That is why our target is net zero emissions or lower from 2030. The 2030 date and time frame is not arbitrary. It is clearly identified in the modelling as a tipping point that we can avoid through targeted action.

I note that other speakers in this debate have called for a target of net zero emissions by 2023, next year, saying that the 2030 target lacks ambition, but there are many problems with this. The main one is that the modelling shows we will achieve this target next year by doing precisely nothing. It is already locked in. In 2023 our emissions will be increasing but still negative overall, as they have been for the last seven years, and there will be no longer-term target to drive further emissions reduction beyond that.

A target needs to be ambitious but feasible and there has to be a reason for achieving it. For the reasons I have outlined, a 2023 target is pointless. Our target for 2030, by contrast, is about Tasmania avoiding becoming a net emitter of greenhouse gases and that is worth achieving. It is important that we re-establish that because this target is the centrepiece of this bill and it is going to drive our action on climate change for longer than the four months it is going to take us to get to 2023, where our emissions are already known to be net-negative.

I also note calls from some in the debate for legislated sector targets. The independent review did not recommend sector targets. It recommended instead a whole-of-economy target which provides a balanced and flexible approach to emissions reduction, noting that different sectors will have different options to reduce emissions and some will require more time and support and new technology than others. This is an important principle in the approach we are taking. This should not be about punishing our economy or individual industries and sectors for their emissions. It should be about working with them, working as Team Tasmania, to identify any emissions that we can reduce or replace with new technologies that will lower our overall emissions profile. It does not have to be the same percentage for every industry or sector out there because they are all different and some will have opportunities to make big strides in what they do with available technology with a little help from government if they need to. Others will not have levers to pull to change their emissions within the next few years and we are going to have to work with them to find those solutions.

Setting blind sector targets across the board to penalise those industries that have been built on technologies that include emissions is counterproductive. It puts us at war with our own economy and we should be working with it to find solutions. Mr O'Byrne in the debate

last week acknowledged industry is already on this journey, and as I laid out in my speech, many of our significant sectors already have emissions reduction targets as ambitious or more ambitious than the one we are proposing. We want to work with them, to get into harness alongside them and reduce emissions for Tasmania, working with those who own and control those emissions, not standing back as a regulator and laying down the law on them and proposing or implying some form of penalty for them if they do not meet our numbers.

We want to work with our industry sectors to reduce emissions wherever they can be found in the short term and in the longer term as well. That does not mean hard sector targets but an approach that says we will be driven by where the gains can be made most quickly and easily and we will also work alongside our industry partners to make progress there.

Labor and the Greens have raised this and Climate Tasmania also raised this in discussions with us. However, I need to ensure that we are on track and doing things we can see are going to make a difference in the emissions in our economy through these emissions reduction plans we will be developing with each sector, and we are sympathetic to that view. We are absolutely focused on reducing emissions and meeting our target. What that means is that the action that we build into our emissions reduction and resilience plans and our overall climate action plan for Tasmania has to have purpose to it. We should be able to have in that, statements about what the objectives of the activities for emissions outcomes should be. They are not going to be the same in every case.

For example, we have recently invested \$6 million with two different organisations - one in the north, one in the south of the state - to establish new industrial in-vessel composting systems to take organic waste that would have otherwise gone to landfill and instead turn it into a valuable carbon-rich commodity that we can cycle back into our agricultural systems and into our soils. We know how many tonnes of organic waste that will divert from landfill. We know how many tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents in methane would be created if it was in landfill. Therefore, we can say that with this activity we can estimate what the benefit will be in terms of emissions reduction. That is one area in our plans where we can provide that detail and we need to be able to talk about that in the plans that we put down.

On the other hand, we as a government are also investing now. Minister Jo Palmer has led our investing with Tasmanian companies that are working on the development of new feed supplements for ruminant livestock that have been shown in laboratory conditions to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases in their belches as part of their digestive system. We need that technology to be able to reduce the emissions profile of our livestock industries - our dairy industry, our red meat industry, our sheep and others - but we are not there yet. Our investment of some several hundred thousand dollars is a good investment but we cannot yet put a number on how many tonnes of emissions that is going to solve.

Once it is developed and once it is commercialised and it is rolling out, we will know what the emissions liability of the target sector is and what level of penetration we might seek into that through assisting the uptake of that technology. For now, that is the sort of investment that we need to make, with a longer-term objective but we are not going to be able to quantify an emission outcome from that action in our plan at this stage.

They are some of the reasons why we will not be adopting a strict numerical estimate of emissions reduction for every target, every emissions reduction plan or every entry in our climate action plan because we are not able to. We accept the premise and we want to be

purposeful. We will have statements around those activities explaining what the intentions are and how they contribute to our overall objectives.

Those plans will be tabled in parliament and, therefore, to the public as well, so that everyone can see what we are doing and why. There will be transparency and accountability in the Government's actions and all members here will have the information they need to ask questions and to scrutinise that.

I will briefly go to the issue of independent oversight and proposals for additional governance-type models to oversee the implementation of this bill, this target and our various plans and actions in reporting. There has been a proposal for the establishment of a climate change advisory council. There have also been discussions about a parliamentary standing committee and I believe also an independent commission to oversee the transition and this work.

I referred in my second reading contribution to our intentions to establish a climate change reference group, not as part of the legislation but as part of being part of a community of interest of leaders in our community who are all interested in and hold knowledge about climate change, what we need to be doing, and what is happening elsewhere. We are proposing that, as a forum for information sharing so that we are getting feedback on our strategies, we are getting input from others who are working in different spheres. We see that as a communication networking and information-sharing forum, not a technical advisory forum or a governance structure that makes decisions set out with powers in this legislation.

Labor and the Greens have proposed various advisory council-type models. This is the sort of thing we have had before. I was on a climate action council several years ago and I enjoyed that work very much and learnt a lot from it. However, I have read the submission from Climate Tasmania which talks about the 'churn of policy' in this area and that there have been multiple advisory councils, action councils, reports commissioned over the years detailing again and again what the challenge is before us in terms of our changing climate, the shape of our economy and the actions that need taking. Their problem is, that has never led to changes that have shifted the dial, changed the curve of our emissions. Today we are on a trajectory to be net positive emitters again in 2030 if we do not take action now.

I sympathise with them. I have been around those tables. They have been made up of people with good knowledge of climate science and the community that we operate in. There have been six or eight people around a table. There has been expertise brought to the table. One of the things that has been missing is people who are working in the industries that produce the emissions. Many experts can tell us what the problem is and know that in more and more infinite detail, write it all down and how urgent it is.

The people we have not had at the table are the people who run the industries that create the emissions, who control what happens. They are the people we need to be dealing with now. They are the people who I want to have in a room to work with. We will be doing that to populate each of our emissions reduction and resilience plans, sector by sector across our economy, sitting down with people who are in peak bodies but also who own fleets of trucks, who own smelters, who drive buses, who know what the technology options are and what it is going to take to get them into their business so that they can start reducing emissions.

This is the work we need to get down to now. We cannot waste any more time re-understanding the problem. We need to get straight on with finding these emissions and reducing them wherever they are, working with everybody who can make a difference. That is why we do not want to spend a lot of the Government's time and resources, and my fantastic retro-fit team on climate, setting up and supporting lots more new formal governance structures and decision-making process. The people that Labor and the Greens have suggested we should have in the room are going to tell us what we know. They are great people. There is always more that we can learn. The gap has been making a change in the emissions.

That is where I think our energy needs to be. Our Government wants to focus our efforts on finding those businesses and industries and hunting down the technology, the science, to solve those problems. We would argue we do not need to invite more climate scientists to the table to solve these problems. They have already performed their service in teaching us what the problems are.

The people we need, the research and science that we need, is not so much on the challenge of understanding our climate more, it is about understanding what makes methane come out of cattle and how we change that. It is about understanding what is required to move from industrial processes that produce large quantities of carbon dioxide through what they burn or what they react to, and replacing it with other technologies, and how we influence the investment decisions of global companies that have a footprint here to make this the place where they invest in the next generation of technology so they can meet their corporate targets for emissions reduction and we can be the poster child for where you make zero-emissions aluminium and steel. They are the sorts of things we need to crack. That is the science and technology, and the people we need to be in the room with if Tasmania is going to be the leader it can be, using our renewable energy, using the hydrogen we can produce from it, and how we can replace emissions-intensive operations with new ones.

That is what has been missing from the efforts before, the reports, the advisory councils and the government policy approaches to dealing with these things. They did a lot of good but we want to take a different road which is focused on emissions and the changes required in those sectors and in our community and economy to deliver them on the ground so that we can lead, so that we can meet our 2030 targets.

Among those, there has been reference to the need for a parliamentary standing committee. There have been a couple of versions of that in the proposed amendments. We do not support the establishment of a new parliamentary standing committee to deal with this topic of climate change. No other state or territory jurisdiction in Australia that we have found has a parliamentary committee structure to deal with this issue. I also note that in Tasmania we do not have special parliamentary standing committees on health or on other areas where we have an interest shared across the Chamber, across our Houses of parliament to look into these matters as a standing arrangement.

We argue that this is not required because in our bill we propose that we treat the whole parliament of elected representatives as the committee, as the scrutiny body for our work on climate change. The bill includes additional stronger transparency and accountability through reporting to the parliament on our Climate Change Action Plan, our Climate Change Risk Assessment, our Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans, our annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report and our annual Climate Activity Statement. All these are documents that, in their cycle, are tabled in this parliament for the scrutiny of all members and the public. On

tabling, they become public. Using the whole parliament gives the highest level of scrutiny, transparency and accountability because it affects everyone, not a select group of people who will receive reports in another room, away from the public gaze and out-of-sight, out-of-mind to some extent for the parliament as a whole.

We want to be able to provide all this information directly to the parliament. How the parliament manages that work is a matter for the parliament. We do not seek to impede that. We do not want to tell the parliament in our bill, in our legislation, how and who should be doing that. This will be something we use to inform and account to and subject ourselves to the scrutiny of the whole of the parliament on those annual cycles and longer cycles for some of those reports.

We have added a substantial program of reporting to the parliament and scrutiny by the parliament in our bill. That is in the interests of transparency and governance as well. Also, there is a legislative requirement for an independent review of this act to be carried out every four years. This bill does not change that requirement but it provides another opportunity for the parliament to consider subsequent amendments and to scrutinise the operations of the bill in the light of this being a rapidly changing field, both in terms of the science, the politics and community interest of climate change. It has a short cycle as legislation for review and updating as well.

I will address some inaccuracies in members' contributions. These would not have occurred if members had been given the opportunity to receive and scrutinise the most up-to-date information on climate policy and data. This highlights the importance of our proposal to bring this information to all members of parliament to keep everyone informed.

For example, Tasmania's greenhouse gas emissions for 2020, which is the latest data we have, was released on 9 June as part of the Australian Government's *State and Territory Greenhouse Gas Inventories 2020*. I tabled the 2020 greenhouse gas emissions report in both Houses of parliament last week. That data shows that Tasmania recorded net zero emissions for the last seven years in a row, not five, as mentioned by Dr Woodruff, and that our net emissions in 2020 are nearly 120 per cent lower than in 1990. This report is very important. It is the baseline information from which decisions can be made because if you do not know where the emissions are coming from, you cannot reduce them. It is going to be an important resource as we roll into the development of our next climate change action plan and our emissions reduction and resilience plans. However, the Greens were reporting inaccurate and out-of-date emissions data in their contributions and made some inaccurate comments on the bill's development in light of that.

The Leader of the Opposition questioned some changes to one of the introductory paragraphs in my second reading speech, changed from the original speech tabled with the bill. In my speech, I noted the effective decoupling of economic growth and employment from emissions since 1990. The November 2021 draft speech compared employment as it was then with employment in 1990, in which over 60 000 jobs had been created. Readers who are paying attention will note that my revised speech last week referred to the period from 1990 to 2020, which is the most recent year in which we have emissions data. Over this 30-year period, more than 50 000 jobs have been created. I want to reassure the Leader of the Opposition that rather than representing a loss of 10 000 jobs across the economy, as she put it, this is the complete opposite of what she said. Around 10 000 jobs have been added over the past two years.

The Greens and Labor have been referring to outdated data in their contributions. It was said in here that the discrepancy and emissions figures between my original speech and the revised speech was evidence of the need for independent oversight. It was not, though. I was using the most up-to-date data and ensuring that my speeches reflected that. Rather than evidence for the need for independent oversight, because Ms White is concerned I am being tricky, instead it demonstrates the importance of our approach to involve the whole parliament in climate change oversight and to do it in full public view: more open, transparent and accountable.

We do not support the need for lots more machinery of government sitting over this. We want all the resources we can to be directed to hunting down emissions and opportunities for reducing them in our economy, and reporting regularly and thoroughly to the Tasmanian people and parliament on what we are doing and where we are headed next.

There were strong contributions from Labor, in particular, on the principle of just transition. I thank the members for introducing that in detail. Ms O'Byrne spoke with clarity about the principles of just transition, and why and where it is important. She used the example of Collie in Western Australia - a place that I know - a coal-mining town with, I understand, coal-fired power in it, and the massive structural adjustment happening in that economy and community as a result of decisions regarding the future of that industry in that area and the principle of just transition and managing the impacts and ripples of that magnitude of structural change in a community and economy. The point was well made and Ms O'Byrne and Ms White spoke to it eloquently.

I have spent time trying to understand where that fits in, in the context of this bill, because we are not planning to close industries down, or step in and intervene.

Dr Woodruff - Why not? You need to close down the native forest logging industry. That is the top polluter of emissions.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr JAENSCH - What we have here is that the Greens want to shut industries down.

Dr Woodruff - The native forest logging industry? You bet.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr JAENSCH - On this issue, the matter that Labor has raised is to be careful of how much change you make because of the effects it will have on people in their normal lives and jobs. We are sympathetic to that but we are not proposing to do that. If the Greens were running this and they were going to come in and start shutting industries down, yes, you would need it and we would be very much supportive.

Dr Woodruff - The native forest logging industry?

Mr JAENSCH - Dr Woodruff raised it. Last time Labor and the Greens were working together, they shut down an industry and did not do just transition.

Dr Woodruff - Come off it. The hundreds of millions of dollars gone to the mendicant native forest logging industry, the subsidies -

Mr SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff, order.

Dr Broad - Hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Dr Woodruff - a billion dollars over a decade.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. If the members interjecting wish to leave, they can. Otherwise if they continue I will throw them out.

Mr JAENSCH - We are not in the business of closing industries down, Mr Speaker. We want to work with Tasmania's industries to grow our economy in ways that also reduce our emissions. Independent economic analysis done by Victoria University last year clearly demonstrates that all industry divisions in Tasmania are expected to see growth and none is expected to have lower employment in 2050 under the pathways laid out that have informed this bill compared to business as usual. In fact, the analysis suggests that the agriculture, forestry and fishing industries are estimated to experience the largest impact, with real value added in 2050 estimated to be nearly \$250 million higher than business as usual.

There are also significant economic opportunities in the transition to a lower emissions economy which will create further economic growth and higher employment, for example, in our renewable energy and nascent green hydrogen sectors. It should be noted that we are investing and Minister Ellis is investing in the skills base for those industries right now, so we will be looking for more people for those new opportunities as part of our low-emissions economy in the future and, by working with those industries directly on their opportunities to drive these changes, provide more opportunities for Tasmanians to work and for their communities to be supported. We are not creating a situation in which we are going to need an emergency structural adjustment package response because we are not closing down industries. If anything, we are developing new ones and new value that will benefit Tasmanians.

As Ms O'Byrne mentioned when she was talking about our Pacific Island nations, it is unjust for us not to be acting on climate change and making changes. The vulnerable will suffer from the effects of climate change if we do not do something about it, so we believe in taking action on climate change but practical action that reduces emissions and drives adaptation so that we can live with the climate change we are going to have and we help the globe to avoid the worst impacts of the climate change we could have if we did nothing.

That is the tram we are on. It is our absolute focus to meet our target to avoid becoming net-positive emitters again, and this is the benefit - we can continue to support industries to transition to low-emissions alternatives in a measured and planned way without the need to shut them down arbitrarily. We want to be collaborative, not punitive. We need to avoid shocks in our economy and ensure there is sensible structural adjustment where it is required. That can be driven by a whole range of factors in our economy, so we are not hostile to the idea of just transition, we simply do not believe that this bill and our approach to moving to a

low emissions economy is going to create those conditions and this bill is not the place to be introducing those instruments or tools to manage change.

I will quickly respond to Ms O'Connor's questions about risk assessment and the updated Climate Futures data. To provide further information to aid the transition for our sectors in the community, section 5(b) of the bill establishes a requirement for the minister to prepare a statewide climate change risk assessment every five years. It is intended that the risk assessment will assist the Government to prioritise actions to adapt to the impacts of climate change, including through future climate change action plans. It legislates a requirement for the minister to take the following matters into account when developing the assessment: the latest available data and science on the projected impact of climate change in Tasmania; consideration of the economic, social and environmental implications of climate change and assessment of associated risks to Tasmanian communities' natural environments and ecosystems and economic activity; the impact of climate change on future generations; and any other matters that the minister considers relevant.

I agree with the Leader of the Greens that Climate Futures for Tasmania is the most important source of downscale climate change projections for Tasmania. Climate Futures was developed in 2010 and provided the first fine-scale climate information for Tasmania. At the time it was nation-leading and still provides insights for today.

I am pleased to advise Ms O'Connor that I intend to update and revise this work as part of our next climate change action plan. The work has until now been dependent on updated projections from the IPCC's sixth assessment cycle which is now occurring, so stand by for that work to be updated to inform our risk assessment.

In closing, as mentioned earlier in my speech, in regard to consultation we have agreed with the Commissioner for Children and Young People and a chorus of others who have asked us to ensure that children and young people have a voice in the consultation on our plans for the future. We have agreed to adopt children and young people as a sector of our community we will make special provisions for so we hear their voices. I look forward to speaking through that amendment later on.

There were a number of amendments proposed regarding the timing of our various reports and plans. I have already committed the Government to our first action plan being developed within six months of the passage of the bill and our emissions reduction and resilience plans within two years. I also commit to delivering a transport emissions reduction and resilience plan within 12 months and to delivering the first risk assessment within two years of the passage of the bill. We do not agree to changes to the proposed five-yearly review cycle. Five years is the IPCC review cycle and we want to align with that and provide certainty for industries and communities to plan and invest rather than being in constant review of plans and we need the time for initiatives that have started to run their course.

I am very grateful for the positive support from Labor and the Greens for this bill. We have listened to the issues they have raised.

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

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

Second Reading

Resumed from above.

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Environment and Climate Change) - Mr Speaker, I thank colleagues for their contributions to the second reading debate.

In summing up, Tasmania is in a unique position. Our temperate climate, diverse landscapes and land uses, and the ingenuity of our people position us to experience less severe direct impacts of already unavoidable climate change than other parts of the world, including our near Pacific island neighbours, who were referenced in this debate.

We have our endowment of sustainably managed forest estate, multi-generational investment in renewable energy resources, the potential to continue to manage our landscapes and build on our assets, and potential in renewable energy generation. This, together with the unique Tasmanian 'can do' spirit, positions us better than most places in the world to adapt to and become resilient to the impacts of climate change that we will have regardless.

This will also contribute significantly to reducing our state's, our nation's and the world's emissions through the development of new technologies and leveraging our advantages, particularly in the areas of renewable energy, the production of green hydrogen and its capacity to not only support our electricity needs in the future but to replace other fuels and enable other technologies that can transform our economy to a new low-emissions level.

Bill read the second time.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Homes Tasmania Bill 2022

The Speaker read the following message from Her Excellency the Governor:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 38 of the Constitution Act 1934 (25 Geo. V No. 94), the Governor recommends to the House of Assembly the payment out of the Public Account of such sums of monies as may be necessary for the purposes specified in section 71(3) and section 72(4) of the Homes Tasmania Bill 2022.

B. Baker
Governor
Government House, Hobart

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

In Committee

[2.34 p.m.]

Madam CHAIR - Members would be aware that 59 proposed amendments have been circulated from each of the three parties. The Chair is unable to anticipate which of those amendments might be agreed to by the committee. Bearing that in mind, it is important that the amendments be dealt with as they appear in the bill.

The Table has circulated a document combining all the amendments received. These have been numbered and each amendment will be dealt with in that order. As far as the amendments are concerned, the call will be allocated in the order that the amendments appear. Members wishing to speak on any clause itself will not be disadvantaged. In fact, this proposed procedure may be advantageous to members, depending on timing.

Given the complicated nature of the proceedings, I ask for your cooperation and patience as it is essential that the bill is properly marked up with any amendments prior to its reporting to the House.

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 -

Section 3 amended (Interpretation)

Dr WOODRUFF - Chair, I am assuming that the conversation with the Clerk indicated that we had an amendment earlier in the bill than Labor's, so I will speak to that. Thank you and I thank the Leader of the Opposition.

We have circulated all our amendments to the relevant members taking carriage of the bill, and the minister. We did this when this bill was first scheduled to be on the notice paper to be debated a couple of weeks ago. This is a late amendment we circulated yesterday.

We are seeking to amend page 4, clause 4, paragraph (a) the definition of 'anthropogenic emissions'.

Leave out everything after 'human'

Insert instead 'activities;'.

The definition of anthropogenic emissions, which is a new definition inserted into the bill, reads at the moment:

anthropogenic emissions means emissions of greenhouse gases, precursors of greenhouse gases and aerosols caused by human activities, including the following ...

It lists a range of things including the burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, land use and land-use changes, livestock production, fertilisation, waste management and industrial processes.

We are moving this amendment because we believe there are problems with the list. It is incomplete. A number of the parts are very complicated and the terms are imprecise or inadequate in the scope of what they are defining. It is not clearly defined. For example, in (b) deforestation, how is that defined? Deforestation is used as a legal, precise climate science term as agreed to under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It is often used in everyday language to mean something quite different. We are concerned that the list of definitions here, specifically deforestation, does not refer to the actual range of human activities that cause greenhouse gas emissions in Tasmania. For example, does the term 'deforestation' include forestry clear-fell and burning that is then rezoned as a monocultural plantation of some type?

We are also concerned that there is no reference to biomass burning in this list; it has 'the burning of fossil fuels' or biomass. That is a concern because biomass burning creates emissions and may or may not be used as the result of a native forest clear-fell and burning from so-called Sustainable Timber Tasmania. It is not clear to us why there is this list. The fact that it is incomplete means that we tried to amend it. We spent some time rewriting and creating new definitions, but it seems to me as somebody who worked in a previous life as a climate scientist, that the best thing to do is to put a full-stop at the end of 'human activities'.

We are concerned about anthropogenic emissions. The term 'anthropogenic' - from the Greek - means human-produced emissions and that is all we are concerned about. We do not need to have a shopping list which imprecisely defines some things and does not reflect the reality of other things. It puts a weighting on these particular things. In five years' time we might find that the weighting we have, which gives a priority of sorts to those areas, may not reflect the insidious escape of emissions from other areas that we urgently need to attend to.

We think, looking into the future, this bill would be better preparing us if we simply left the shopping list out and attended ourselves to the reality that we have finally in Australia caught up with the science of 30 years ago, which is very clear that it is the human production of greenhouse gases that is creating the runaway climate change and the heating of the climate system we have to deal with.

Ms WHITE - I thank Dr Woodruff for the explanation for this amendment as put forward; it makes sense. I was thinking how else it might be altered to potentially say 'including but not limited to the following', but to just put a full-stop after 'activities' means that as new evidence emerges you can make adjustments accordingly. I believe that is sensible and we will be supporting the amendment.

Mr JAENSCH - My advice is that in this case and throughout the document - and I think we will pick this up in other amendments to the bill - where possible we have directly used definitions as used in other references. In this case the IPCC's definition has been reproduced here. I note that the list is not exclusive, it is including, so the text preceding the list that you refer to in your amendment, 'caused by human activities', including the following and then it goes into items (a) through (g). Our preference would be to maintain the list faithful to the IPCC's use of the definition and its glossaries, noting that it does not preclude other anthropogenic sources of emissions. On that basis we do not support the amendment.

Dr WOODRUFF - Thank you, minister, but we do not agree. You have not attended to the couple of examples I gave about biomass we can burn that are highly efficient burners. There are not efficient burners. The burning of biomass itself involves the removal of carbon

stores in some form or another so it is of concern that there is an absence in the list of biomass. I am not sure what you are saying in relation to the IPCC but from my understanding there are multiple lists in multiple parts. The IPCC is an evolving document. It is changing every day with rapidity. Like our increasing temperatures, we are seeing this sort of science changing every day. The list you are talking about is not a list in legislation. It is not intended to be used for that purpose. There are many lists that would reference possible anthropogenic emissions that the IPCC has produced but they are not designed to go into legislation.

What we have here is something which, by nature of giving a list, gives priority to certain things and deprioritises other things, so we think it is important to stick with the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Ms WHITE - This amendment adds a definition to the Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill about what a fair and equitable transition means. I move -

That clause 4 on page 6, after paragraph (a) be amended by inserting the following paragraph:

- (ab) by inserting the following definition after the definition of *emissions offset programs*:

"fair and equitable transition" means a transition towards a low-carbon economy that is just and fair and maximises opportunities for decent jobs, economic prosperity and social inclusion;

One of the key objectives the Labor Party had when considering this bill was whether it protected those who are most vulnerable and whether it took appropriate action on climate change, and also that there were provisions for a just transition. I note the minister's remarks when he was summing up that he is not planning to shut industries down. However, I think he misses the point so I will try to explain our amendments in the hope that you can understand the intent behind them. It could be to protect against a scenario like that but it is not included for that reason. The climate is already changing. It is having significant impact on our community and economy today and there are communities across Tasmania that are already dealing with those consequences.

The inclusion of a provision to define a 'just transition' and then further amendments we will seek to move about how they may be reflected in the objectives of the act, and consideration by government when making decisions, is to ensure that people who are impacted are supported through the leadership of government in a coordinated and organised way to make that transition in a way that is most fair to them and does not burden them in a disproportionate way and ensures that we look after communities.

One example you could offer in Tasmania is the community of Fingal, where there is an operational coal mine that has been mining for some time. It is my understanding that without further investment at that site that resource will soon come to an end. If they are not able to expand that mine's operation for new seams of coal, that will eventually close. In addition to that, the customers for that product are actively looking to replace coal with alternative fuels

that are better for our environment. There will come a point in time when the Fingal coal mine closes down and that will have a significant impact on the community in that region.

The embedding of a definition of a 'just transition' and also an objective in this act that we ensure we have a process to support communities and an economic transition when there is a change. It is simply about making sure appropriate structures and leadership are in place to support the transition to occur. It might be responsive in an instance like the one I just described, not necessarily proactively shutting down an industry as you described, minister. That is a simplistic and unfortunately political way to look at this.

This is about making sure we support communities with the adaptation that is going to be necessary as we further decarbonise our economy. From talking to the local government sector, I know they are particularly interested in making sure that robust frameworks are in place to support the work they need to do to support communities as these transitions occur, whether it is because of industries changing or because of the impact on climate change on our environment and what that means for their provision of services locally and the way communities live in Tasmania.

I urge you to reconsider your earlier statements about whether it is the appropriate bill to include provisions around a just transition. The question I have for you is: if you are not going to include provisions for a just transition in a climate change bill, where on earth do you put them? This is the appropriate place for them to be included. It is the same way other jurisdictions across the country have included these provisions in their own climate change acts in the discussion that is happening federally. The words I put forward in the amendments I will be moving later are taken from climate bills that have been produced in the federal parliament.

We need to be looking to other jurisdictions to understand how we can adopt best practice in Tasmania. The Government cannot put its head in the sand and ignore the reality that industries are already changing. We need to support that transition to occur in a fair and equitable way, making sure it is inclusive and that the most vulnerable are not disproportionately impacted. This bill is the right place to make sure we have that structure, so that when we are talking to communities, industries and local government about how climate is affecting Tasmania, they know there is a clear road map for them to follow with the Government leading the way. At the moment, they feel a little bit like they are making it up as they go. I want us to be able to address that. That is the reason for this amendment.

Mr JAENSCH - This was discussed in the earlier part of the debate. Again, I am not hostile at all to the principle and the overall intent of the words that are proposed. However, I do believe this is not the right legislation to embed these principles.

You made reference to coal in Fingal and the statement that without further investment at that site the operations may wind up in the future. Industries change and we have seen that across our state at various times due to changes in markets and changes in parent companies. When Caterpillar's operations were moved by its global parent company away from Burnie, a significant structural adjustment process was undertaken there. Ms Dow was part of that. The state government worked with the local government and others to ensure a smooth transition for the workforce and the community in that area and its supply chain network which is extensive in that part of the world.

That had nothing to do with climate change or an emissions target. There is a range of forces that can bring about change in communities and local economies. In the past, it has been the policy of successive governments to have our skills response units and various other bespoke arrangements brought quickly together to cushion those blows and to assist those communities to make the changes. My community on the north-west coast, around Burnie, knows as much about that as anybody in Tasmania ever has. It is something we do already as part of policy. It is not a situation that this bill will uniquely drive or increase the risk of. Through our economic analysis all the initiatives that are proposed to make changes have a net benefit to our economy and growth in many areas and industries if they pursue the recommended pathways.

Again, I am not hostile to the idea but I do not think this bill is the right place for it. Certainly, for any communities or industries that are struck with sudden change and need assistance for a smooth transition to make sure people are not left behind, that is what Tasmanian governments have always done. I think this bill does not need to build in that legislated response provision. This is not going to drive increased occurrence of that situation, compared to a range of other factors, including global climate change itself, which is not something that this bill can direct so we do not support the amendment.

Dr WOODRUFF - We strongly support this amendment. The fact that the minister thinks it does not need to be in this bill is concerning and unfortunately telling. This is a really core part of the transition that we need to have. We need to bring everybody along with us. We need to have a just and fair transition. That means supporting workers and their communities in the industries that will need to close. We cannot sugar-coat it. We need some industries to wither and die on the vine. At the federal level that is coal and gas and oil. They have to end as soon as possible because their very activities have brought us to the place that we are - aided and abetted by governments, communities, consumers and businesses that buy the product. The point is we have to stop it at the source and we have to do that in Tasmania.

The fact is that we need to do that in Tasmania. We need to end native forest logging. We have to do that. It will not be here with us for many years to come. The sooner it has gone the better for the planet, which is the point. That means we have to be attentive today to what those communities and what those individual workers and their families need for a transition to a sustainable form of employment, to one that the community wants to support and that provides meaningful employment into the future.

We believe that we have to force polluters to pay at the federal level. We believe that there has to be a price on carbon and there has to be a levy on climate pollution that we export. In Tasmania we have to end the possibility of any gas or thermal coal mining. The Government has left that door open and it needs to be closed.

The minister talked about the possibility of growth in the future for industries. I make the point that we have to re-think the notion of growth. We have to re-think the notion that every business just by virtue of being in the marketplace has a right to undertake its activities. If they are carbon-emitting activities, and we are at a point where we can no longer absorb any additional carbon, we will have to end that form of industry and we will have to collectively incentivise, support and generate new forms of meaningful activity for everybody. That is the bottom line. We support the process where it is not just governments talking to industry about what suits their needs but that we require governments to be on the front foot looking after these communities, many of whom are the poorest communities in Tasmania, regional

communities where some extractive industries are occurring and native forest logging is occurring in and around regional communities. These are the communities that need to be supported with plans for the future.

Ms WHITE - I am disappointed in your response to the amendment, minister. I want to ask a question. This bill develops sector-based emissions, reduction and resilience plans for each of the following sectors: energy, transport, industrial processes and product use, agriculture, land use and land use change, and forestry waste and any other sector or subsector that you so decree as the minister. The point of developing this emission reductions and resilience plans must support greenhouse gas emissions reductions, the transition to a low emissions economy and resilience to climate-related risks. If you are telling me that these plans will be developed and they will meet these objectives but then you have no intention of doing anything with them, then sure, do not worry about including provision for a just transition and definition of that in this climate bill.

I argue that what we are debating is fundamentally about how we support these sectors to reduce their carbon emissions requires them to make transitions. There will be adjustments. Your own bill says that there will be transition to a low emissions economy. There needs to be acknowledgement by you that there are workers who support our economy; they are the economy and they need to be supported with this transition.

There are communities that will be impacted so it is not appropriate for you to dismiss it and say it is not a right spot for a definition of a just transition to be in this bill when your very bill is about transitioning these sectors to a low emissions economy. It is exactly the right place to have it to provide protections for workers and for communities.

How do you suppose these sectors are going to achieve the outcomes as outlined in this bill if you do not also think about the people and the communities who are going to be required to make these changes? People are not mentioned in your bill. It is a serious oversight.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you, everybody. I know a fair bit about communities making their way through change and transition. The point is that happens due to a range of factors. How governments support them through that has been a matter of experience for Tasmania. We have done it before. I am sure that we will do it again in response to any range of matters that can about sudden change in our communities and our economy.

The Labor and the Greens in their contributions, particularly the Greens, are foreshadowing that their version of transition in climate change is all about closing down businesses and industries. The Greens are being explicit about it. Labor is indicating that it is inevitable.

When you look at our economic analysis and the pathway reports for emissions reduction activities, the 16 in particular that will form the basis of our transition are overwhelmingly positive change for Tasmania. That is why we are in the box seat to drive change that is good for the atmosphere and emissions reduction and good for the Tasmanian economy. That is a unique set of circumstances. We need to squeeze every value we can out of that for Tasmania so that we can be leaders in addressing climate change in ways that make Tasmania more successful and prosperous with more opportunities for our people.

We do not need this bill to be seen as a recipe for creating significant negative economic and social disruption in our state. That is not what it is going to achieve. There are other areas of government activity and things totally unrelated to greenhouse gas emissions where the principles that you have talked about are alive and well. They are working well. They are brought to bear on solving problems for Tasmanians when they occur. I do not believe that this is the right place for us to be restating them.

In the development of our whole-of-government policy we committed to adopt a series of guiding principles that was recommended in the independent review of our legislation. We will build into our whole-of-government policy framework the following set of climate change guiding principles:

- (1) the sustainable development and social equity.
- (2) transparency in reporting.
- (3) a science-based approach.
- (4) integrated decision making.
- (5) risk management.
- (6) community engagement.
- (7) complementarity of those principles.

Your sustainable development social equity principle is referenced there in the whole-of-government policy framework that will guide government decision-making as it relates to climate change. There is an acknowledgement of that issue of justice or equity embedded in that principle.

Regarding the legislation itself, for the reasons I have outlined, I do not believe that we need a definition. I know that there are other amendments proposed which insert the just transition principles in other parts of the bill which we will not be supporting either.

Ms WHITE - Minister, I think that you and I are not that far apart. I do not disagree with the observations you have made about the opportunities for Tasmania as we continue to decarbonise and take advantage of the brand that we have as a state. Perhaps you have misinterpreted the amendment and only perceive it to be in response to the potential negative impacts. The amendment I drafted on behalf of the Labor Party and brought forward means - I will read it again:

A fair and equitable transition means a transition towards a low-carbon economy that is just and fair and maximises opportunities for decent jobs, economic prosperity and social inclusion.

You and I are on the same page here. I hoped we could have included a definition like this. You have the sectors here where you are going to be working. In the first 12 months, the transport sector will be delivering their plan, and in 24 months the remainder of the sectors will be delivering theirs. I hope they are going to propose the state does something and not just be a planning table in the parliament and then put a press release out about it.

How do we take advantage of those opportunities? How do we provide training in how to provide maintenance on hydrogen fuel cells that are going to power the trucks that run up and down the highway? How do we provide a skills pathway? How do we look at how we tap

into those opportunities? How do we provide decent jobs for people, so that we realise those benefits of being a low carbon jurisdiction?

I do not agree with what the Greens have said. They have a particular view about this. On behalf of the Labor Party I am talking about how we make sure people, our community and workers get the best opportunities to maximise their potential and our state's potential, both socially and economically.

I note that you have talked about the policy the Government is developing. It is part of the guidelines, I think is how you described it. We want it to be the law that we act in a way that is fair and equitable in making decisions about how Tasmania progresses towards achieving the targets that are set out in this bill. I hope you agree with that because I think that you and I are not too far apart on this. It is not just about taking a pessimistic view. Whilst we need to be very mindful that climate change will have a significant disadvantage to some people in industries in Tasmania too, there are also opportunities. Do not look at this amendment through that prism. Think about it as addressing the opportunities we have to maximise social and economic inclusion and prosperity and make sure there are decent jobs for people in the sectors where those plans are going to be developed. I am assuming those plans will have objectives to be met within certain time frames to transition away from the emissions profile that has been forecast. That will impact those industries and those jobs. How do we support people through that? That is what we are trying to achieve here.

Mr JAENSCH - I will not prolong the debate. Based on that latest description, I agree with the Leader of Opposition that we are not that far apart in our understanding of what we are looking for here. However, I still do not agree to the inclusion of the definition in this part of the bill as described. Let the record show that we are not that far apart in what are our ambitions are for Tasmania out of this.

The Committee divided -

AYES 11

Dr Broad
Ms Dow
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Johnston
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms O'Connor
Ms White
Mr Winter
Dr Woodruff (Teller)

NOES 11

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Tucker
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Ms Butler

Ms Ogilvie

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - The result of the division being 11 Ayes and 11 Noes, in accordance with standing order 257, I cast my vote with the Noes.

Amendment negatived.

[3.18 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF - Madam Deputy Chair, we have two amendments to paragraph (b) of clause 4. The first includes a new paragraph (h) in the definition of 'greenhouse gas emissions'. Page 6, clause 4, paragraph (b):

I move -

That clause 4, paragraph (b) be amended by:

Leave out the paragraph

Insert instead the following paragraph:

- (b) by omitting the definition of *greenhouse gas emissions* and substituting the following definitions:

greenhouse gas emissions means emissions of -

(a) carbon dioxide; or

(b) methane; or

(c) nitrous oxide; or

(d) hydrofluorocarbons; or

(e) perfluorocarbons; or

(f) sulfur hexafluoride; or

(g) gases prescribed by the regulations; or

(h) gases prescribed by regulations under the *National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act 2007* of the Commonwealth to be a greenhouse gas for the purposes of section 7A(1)(g) of that Act;

Greenhouse Gas Inventory means the Australian National Greenhouse Accounts: State and Territory Greenhouse Gas Inventories published by the Commonwealth Government.

guiding principles to inform climate action means the guiding principle set out in Schedule 3 to this Act;

This new paragraph we have added reflects recommendation 3 of the University of Tasmania's Tasmanian policy exchange submission, which argued very strongly that it is needed to ensure we are aligned with the national framework. The principle act defines greenhouse gas emissions as emissions of six specific gases as well as 'gases prescribed by the regulations.' This language needs to reflect the fact that a multitude of gases contribute to the greenhouse effect and this definition we are proposing aligns us with the approach in the Australian Capital Territory legislation.

In addition, the words 'and regulations made under the National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act 2007 of the Commonwealth' are so that this definition of greenhouse gases is determined by reference to the national framework and any changes that might be made at that level. This definition would align us with the Victorians who have introduced that in their legislation.

The second definition in paragraph (b) introduces guiding principles to inform climate action. These provisions were proposed by the independent Jacobs review when they did that work in 2021 and were widely supported by a range of individuals and groups who made submissions during the consultation process for this bill. The Jacobs review recommended a set of guiding principles that:

... establish a set of expectations for relevant Government action on climate change, including the development of mitigation and adaptation, strategies and relevant policies.

Prior to the bill's consultation, UTAS's April blueprint for a climate-positive Tasmania made a very strong case for why we need to have guiding principles and Victoria's Climate Change Act 2017 that I referred to just a moment ago also includes principles that must be taken into account in government policy, programs or processes - the decision making about those things where they are relevant.

The minister and the Government have not accepted the recommendations from the Jacobs review or UTAS on this matter. The minister has decided to develop guiding principles in a policy framework that provide, as he says, 'flexibility in the Government's future climate action.' We consider this to be a much weaker response and out of step with the best climate legislation and the expectations of people in the community who are informed and provided submissions in this area. It does not send a strong signal that the Government is serious about urgent and rapid climate action. What we have in front of us in this act is the most wafer-thin piece of climate change action legislation I have ever seen. Who knows, it might be one of the thinnest pieces of legislation on this matter.

We have a minister and a government that are purporting to have world-class legislation and ambition and it is simply not reflected in the bill. This bill provides a woefully minimal hard commitment to act on what is clearly the gravest threat that we have as a state. We need to have guiding principles even more than ever in this bill because they provide support, guidance and direction to ministerial and government decision-making.

Our amendment which refers to schedule 3 and the guiding principles we will come to at a later part of the debate on this bill, but it is relevant for people who are watching to understand what we are talking about. The new schedule 3 we are proposing contains the principles that were outlined by the University of Tasmania academics in their Towards a Climate-Positive

Tasmania. They are no harm, equity, leadership and collaboration, accountability and integrity in carbon accounting.

There is quite a lot of detail in the schedule in relation to those to explain them. I will go through that now. 'No harm' means, where possible, that new policies should not increase emissions or exposure to climate impacts and at the same time should promote innovation and economic competitiveness. 'Equity' means the provision of intra- and intergenerational and distributive equity that should be paramount, with all care taken to minimise financial burdens associated with emissions reduction on low-income households and communities. The 'leadership and collaboration' principle is that Tasmania should lead on climate policy and action, both through providing a climate-positive example and by contributing to technical and policy innovation that showcases how to reduce emissions across Australia and beyond.

The principle of accountability is that outcomes of decisions and actions should be measurable and reported. All significant emissions should be recorded in the correct category of the state and territory greenhouse gas inventories. The final principle is integrity in carbon accounting. Offsets and credits to reduce the balance of greenhouse gas emissions should only be used if they are removing greenhouse gas emissions that would not otherwise have been removed and they should sequester those greenhouse gas emissions permanently.

I and other people who have made those recommendations understand very well the urgency with which we need to act and therefore these guiding principles that will provide direction to ministers and to decision-making processes across the whole of government, all agencies, are critical.

We have other amendments we have distributed that will introduce provisions that require people who are performing a function or exercising a power under the act to further these guiding principles to inform their climate actions, and other amendments that require the Government to incorporate climate change considerations across all decision-making, having regard to the objects of this act and the guiding principles to inform climate action. In summary, we think the objects of this act are not in any way enough information to guide the decision-making of government for this most important matter of action and these principles go some way to addressing that.

Time expired.

Mr JAENSCH - I note there are two amendments in that bundle. The Greens' first amendment is an amendment to the principal act relating to the definition of greenhouse gas emissions. The advice I have is that the list of gases in the act is, at this point, consistent with those in the principal act. The inclusion of (h) does not make a material difference at this point but could help to future-proof the principal act if the greenhouse gases are reviewed under Commonwealth legislation in the future, so it makes it consequential. We pick up any changes that are brought about through changes to the Commonwealth legislation so, on that basis, we support the first of the amendments in terms of the amended definition of greenhouse gas emissions.

The second amendment proposed - I do not know what the rules are about dealing with these as a job lot but I will keep going, as you did. In terms of the guiding principles and definitions for those, I will refer, as I did in an earlier contribution, to the discussion of a set of guiding principles recommended through the independent review of the act. It is our intent to

embed these in the whole-of-government policy framework to guide government decision-making and for consideration in relevant policies, plans and strategies. Those seven principles are:

- (1) sustainable development and social equity
- (2) transparency and reporting
- (3) science-based approach
- (4) integrated decision-making
- (5) risk management
- (6) community engagement
- (7) complementarity.

There is a blurb against each one of those which can be referenced in our source document from the report of the review.

Those are the principles we have chosen to adopt. There are some parallels in the work that has been done by the university and others but we engaged an independent process and there was consultation on that at the time. At this stage, we will stick with those as guiding principles, not to be part of legislation but to be adopted in our whole-of-government policy approach. The second amendment is not supported. However, the first amendment regarding greenhouse gas emissions definition is supported.

Ms WHITE - Minister, I have a question about the guiding principles. I note the ones read in by the member for Franklin, Dr Woodruff, were informed through the University of Tasmania. They are different from the ones identified by Jacobs in their independent review of the act. You have just outlined the seven recommended through that review. Recommendation 3 was also very clear in that the act be amended to include a set of principles such as the following, which you have accepted but you are not going to include in the act. Why will you not be amending the act to include those principles, as per the recommendation?

Mr JAENSCH - The very clear advice we received is that the nature of these principles, the complexity of climate change issues and the rapidly changing nature of the science and fields, and policy environments meant that embedding these in policy was preferred to embedding them in legislation. That way they could be revisited and amended from time to time, and evolve to meet changing practice nationally and internationally, rather than returning to the legislation each time to amend them.

Dr WOODRUFF - I seek the guidance of the Clerk at this point. I introduced those two amendments together but I am keen for the Government to be able to support the first part, the introduction of the definition of greenhouse gas emissions and to separate the second definition we are proposing - guiding principles to inform climate action. Could the Clerk provide some advice about how, at this point, we could proceed with a position on the first of those definitions?

CHAIR - Minister, is there anything proposed from you to amend the amendment?

Mr JAENSCH - It is my belief that my officials are preparing a written amendment to the amendment.

Ms WHITE - You could withdraw your amendment and move it without that last part.

Dr WOODRUFF - I would like to do that and introduce that as the next amendment. Can I do that at this point?

CHAIR - If you amend it by deleting those, you cannot re-move it.

Dr WOODRUFF - Minister, are you considering moving an amendment to this?

Mr JAENSCH - I believe so, if that is what is being drafted for me right now so that I can table that and it should do what we need.

Dr WOODRUFF - Thanks, I had not considered that. When is it coming?

Mr JAENSCH - I will give them a wave in a minute and go and pick up the piece of paper.

Dr WOODRUFF - While we are waiting, you did not address the matter about the gaps in the principles recommended by Jacobs and those recommended in the University of Tasmania's submission. Can you please tell us why you did not take the ones you preferred and added the University of Tasmania's principles to fill in the gaps?

There are some very important gaps. There is nothing in the list of principles you read out, I believe, that refers to doing no harm or to equity, and possibly also to leadership and collaboration. Specifically doing no harm and equity are incredibly important principles. They are universal guiding principles in leading climate change action plans and legislation in other jurisdictions.

Doing no harm is the basis of action to remove greenhouse emissions because we do not want to create unintended effects that we can avoid. We disagree with you not wanting to put them in legislation but could you speak to why you did not add those extra ones in addition to the ones you already have on that list?

Mr JAENSCH - There is no single perfect set of principles. This is a fairly subjective process at the best of times and we appreciate the input of the university and the consideration of these matters. We have, however, decided to stay with the principles to guide climate action as recommended by Jacobs in their review of the act.

For the benefit of the record, I will read those in their entirety so that future readers can see what the intent is of those principles we intend to adopt in our whole-of-government policy framework. The set of principles to guide climate action that will be guiding this government are:

(1) Sustainable development and social equity

Climate action, and any government action that has a direct impact on climate change mitigation or adaptation efforts, should provide benefit to both current and future generations of Tasmanians. In particular, vulnerable communities and First Nations practices should occur.

(2) Transparency and reporting

Reporting on climate action should be timely, transparent and accurate and made available to the public.

(3) Science-based approach

Climate action taken should be scientifically substantiated and align with limiting global warming to no more than 1.5°C above preindustrial levels.

(4) Integrated decision-making

Decision-making on climate action is integrated, addressing environmental, social and economic considerations over short-, medium-, and long-term timeframes.

(5) Risk management

Climate action adequately reflects assessed risks, and risks of action and inaction are addressed.

(6) Community Engagement

Proposed climate action takes into account the views of interested and relevant members of the community through appropriate engagement.

(7) Complementarity

Climate action should reflect an appropriate level of cohesion with relevant State, national, and international climate change developments.

These are the principles developed through a specific independent analysis of a review of our legislation. This set of principles has been taken through a public process as well. They are the ones that we want to embed in our whole-of-government framework. Noting that, adopting them as policy in a whole-of-government framework also means that over time, with good reason they can also evolve to remain relevant and contemporary. That is the purpose of adopting them in policy rather than in legislation.

Chair, the suggestion is that in terms of the two-part amendment that you put forward, Dr Woodruff, that I move an amendment to that amendment to delete the following paragraph from the proposed amendment:

'guiding principles to inform climate action means the guiding principles set out in Schedule 3 to this Act;'

That leaves the first part of your amendment, Dr Woodruff, which we can agree to.

Dr Woodruff - Yes.

Ms O'Connor - Very good.

Mr JAENSCH - Are you happy for me to move that amendment? There are three parts to the amendment. Tell me what to do, Clerk. So, I have moved that, okay. I have moved the amendment to the amendment.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Ms WHITE - Thank you, Chair. I move a further amendment to clause 4. I will read the amendment out.

After paragraph (b),

Insert the following paragraph:

(ba) by inserting the following definition after the definition of *greenhouse gas emissions*:

"Joint Standing Committee" means the Joint Standing Committee for Climate Change established under section 4B of this Act;

Chair, this is to create a definition of what the 'Joint Standing Committee' means. Obviously, the parliament has not agreed to establishing a joint standing committee. That is something we will be seeking to introduce further in the bill. The argument for a joint standing committee is sound. If you take a look at the submissions that we have received, there were consistent recommendations that there be independent oversight of the Climate Change Act.

The view that the Labor Party has formed, and I note the Greens have a similar amendment, is for the creation of a joint standing committee of parliament. I note in the minister's remarks, when he was summing up on the bill, he said there was no other jurisdiction that had an oversight committee, such as a joint House committee.

He also made arguments against an independent authority or any other oversight body but there are examples of those in other jurisdictions. You cannot have it both ways, minister. You cannot use the logic of saying 'there is nothing like this in other jurisdictions, therefore we cannot have it here and therefore you cannot have a joint House committee', but at the same time say, 'you cannot have any other kind of independent oversight either', because other jurisdictions do have that. It is flawed logic for you to apply that argument and reason that in this instance.

Our firm view is that this would operate in the same way as the Integrity Commission, as the integrity committee of parliament operates. It would be a joint House committee. It would work to support the operation of the act. It would also be able to look at the reports once tabled in the parliament.

I believe the minister drew an incorrect conclusion. I will give him the benefit of the doubt that he was doing that in a genuine way: that the committee would receive the reports before the parliament received the reports. I accept that would not be appropriate. The reports

need to be tabled in the parliament for everybody to see, but the joint House committee should then be able to look in detail at those reports to assess and evaluate progress, to provide some further scrutiny in a structured way with a joint House parliamentary committee. That would be appropriate. It would also make sure that the act is functioning in the way that it is intended.

I will not provide any further explanation. This is simply providing definition in the act of what the joint standing committee means, but it does not create the joint standing committee; there will be a further amendment moved to try to achieve that. This is simply about being consistent with the way the Integrity Commission Act is written because in that there is a definition of 'joint standing committee'. This was how the OPC drafted it for us and that is the reason for it being included in this amendment.

Dr WOODRUFF - We strongly support the establishment of a joint standing committee for climate change, as Labor has moved. This is a part of the safe climate bill that the Greens tabled last year and has re-tabled a number of times after proroguing since then. We believe it is imperative that we have a standing committee in parliament that is identified to have as a standing matter for the parliament to deliberate with both Houses on the most important issue of our time. This is and will be, for the rest of our lives, the single biggest driver of all changes that happen to our communities, our industries, our natural world and to everything that lives or does not thrive as a result of the heating of the climate.

We have to take this matter very seriously. We have to elevate it by giving a joint standing committee the responsibility of dealing with the critical issue of our day and making overarching decisions that appropriately have members of both places to represent the people of Tasmania who vote us in to make decisions on their behalf, and this is the most important decision we can make.

The minister said earlier that he did not think it was required because he is opening up the whole of parliament to the scrutiny of our actions on climate. I do not understand that argument. It seems like a circular argument because it sounds like a reason not to have a standing committee or a joint standing committee on anything, ever. The role of a joint standing committee can be to make recommendations to both Houses of specific actions that members need to deliberate and debate about.

It is appropriate to have a body running in the background that is responsible for connecting with the wider community, the scientific community, the business community, of the adaptation and resilience activities that are happening in Tasmania so that decisions and recommendations can be made to both Houses. We support this. I foreshadow that we have a similar joint standing committee in an amendment that we will bring in shortly.

Mr JAENSCH - I note that the amendment before us at the moment is about inserting a definition but the concept is one that is going to appear in other amendments. As foreshadowed in my second reading speech, we do not support the provision in this bill for a joint standing committee on climate. I will go over the reasons for that.

We note that no other jurisdiction in Australia has a parliamentary committee specifically for the purpose of climate change. We note that the new Commonwealth legislation does not have provision for a standing committee on climate change. I am also advised that our Tasmanian parliament does not have a committee on other aspects of significant policy interest, for example, educational health. We do not have a standing committee on other matters that

are arguably of critical interest, a standing arrangement. However, we do have embedded in this bill strengthened additional reporting transparency and accountability of our Government's action on climate change, including through the requirements to table in our parliament for the full parliament a climate change action plan, climate change risk assessment, emissions reduction and resilience plans, an annual greenhouse gas emissions report and an annual climate activity statement - all tabled in parliament for all members of parliament to consider and ask their questions and propose any actions in response to those.

How the parliament arranges itself to deal with that is a matter for the parliament and it can do what it wants. I think the mover of this amendment has not provided a compelling reason for there to be some members of each House of parliament to go away in a room specifically and be the ones who receive these documents and do the work on behalf of the parliament. Our view is that this is something which is important to everybody and the parliament as a whole will be receiving these reports and considering them. That is the appropriate road to take, given that we will be delivering to the parliament a steady stream of information and reports to consider, and this is the appropriate forum for it.

We see it as elevating climate change to bring it to the parliament as a whole, not to deliver it primarily to a subset of the parliament as a bit of work on the side. We will not be supporting the amendment.

Ms WHITE - I cannot just let that go. The minister is blatantly misrepresenting the intention of this amendment, or he misunderstands it. You have the amendment before you, describing how the joint standing committee would operate, certainly from the Labor Party's perspective. The functions of this joint standing committee are as follows: to have an ongoing role in monitoring, evaluating and reviewing the performance of the Government against the objectives of the act; to review the various reports produced under the act when they are presented to parliament - it is not saying they receive them first before anyone else in the parliament. It is ensuring that once they are presented to the parliament, the committee then takes a look at them and they provide public reports; to evaluate progress against the targets, with a view to the maintenance of net-zero greenhouse gas emissions; to review and report on appropriate independent oversight options for the act within two years; to provide guidance and advice relating to the objects of the act; to examine the annual report of the State Service agency to ensure compliance with the objects and principles set out in this act; and to report to parliament on matters relating to the act.

It is about the operations of the act. It is not about some members of the committee receiving a report before other members of the parliament. It is very clear that the parliament would receive those reports as soon as you tabled them. As soon as they were available to be publicly released the parliament would receive those, then the members of the committee would be able to look at them in more detail.

I also take objection to your point that if we wanted to establish standing committees for other things we should just go ahead and do it. This House previously did have standing committees that looked at matters that were to do with our community, our society, our economy. Your Government stopped doing that.

Mr Jaensch - This parliament.

Ms WHITE - Yes, because executive government, with the numbers on the benches, has the power. That is the problem with your approach to this. We are talking about a matter and an issue that goes beyond political terms. It is much greater than whoever is the government of the day and a joint House committee would provide that oversight as elected representatives of our community to be able to look in detail at the way the act is operating, whether it is fulfilling its objectives and whether the reports have tabled demonstrating progress towards meeting the target.

The challenge this parliament has is making sure we do justice to future generations, and having an independent oversight body, a parliamentary committee, which is what we are proposing to establish through this amendment definition to create that in this bill, is one way to achieve that. It goes beyond who the government of the day is. You have the numbers on that side of the House to either set up or abandon standing committees and that is exactly what you have done in the past.

I point to the submissions that have been received, particularly from Climate Tasmania, because I note in your summing up you said that they had not supported this. They explicitly did.

Mr Jaensch - I do not think I said that.

Ms WHITE - I will have a look back but you particularly made reference to Climate Tasmania's submission when arguing against members for independent oversight because their submission had apparently argued against that, implying that there had been churn and people going around and around. That is not true because they have explicitly argued for independent oversight and they have also explicitly argued for a parliamentary committee.

In their first submission to the climate change bill, a copy of which I have before me, was recommendation 4 which follows on from recommendation 3, which is the need for an independent expert advisory body. Recommendation 4 was to establish an ongoing parliamentary oversight mechanism, for example, a joint standing committee. In a brief for proposed amendments to the Climate Change (State Action) Bill that was circulated to all members of parliament on 8 August, Climate Tasmania, which is an independent science council, made a further recommendation 4, ongoing parliamentary oversight, in which they make a point that:

Addressing climate change requires frameworks that involve the whole community and remain effective across decades and across changes of government.

A parliamentary oversight mechanism would provide representation for communities and groups subject to particular climate-related impacts and would be a back-stop mechanism if there is systemic failure to address climate risks and opportunities.

They have not proposed specific mechanisms for this for two reasons: parliament itself is the best place to decide on the most effective mechanism and such mechanisms might not be legislated as part of the Climate Change Act; and they point out that the United Kingdom has a House of Lords Select Committee on the Environment and a Climate Change Committee. There is precedent for these types of oversight committees to look at how the act is operating and whether it is meeting the objectives set out in the bill. I note that they have made that

submission twice to you now, minister, and neither time has their submission or other submissions on this matter been considered by you in a way that sees it reflected in the bill, which is why we have moved this amendment.

Mr JAENSCH - Briefly, I note in the last section there reading from the Climate Tasmania submission there was reference to the parliament determining how it might organise itself around these matters. I also want to be clear that I do not think I did or intended to say that Climate Tasmania did not propose that there be a structure of this type, but rather reflecting that the presence or absence of oversight or independent forums of these kinds, I read in their submission that they had found that whilst we have had them in the past, they have not resulted in there being measurable changes in our emissions trajectory and therefore that issue of churn they related and 'here we go again' was the impression I had from my discussion with them, we needed to find a circuit breaker to get through and achieve things.

Our approach to that is to work as much as we can with emitters and industries to find a way forward, working with them directly rather than by adding more layers of governance and oversight and expert advice to explain to us what the problem is to be fixed and creating more elaborate reporting structures, to say that without actually talking with the people on the ground in industries. Our approach is to work directly with them. We support accountability to the parliament.

To pick up on another point Ms White raised, we have also built in a requirement for the bill to be independently reviewed every four years and that involves a process this parliament has a role in. We are proposing more reporting and transparency and more information delivered to this parliament so that parliament itself has that oversight and control of not only what is in this bill, in this act, but also to see how it is performing and to be able to make adjustments to the act every four years through that prescribed process. We will not be supporting the amendment.

Dr WOODRUFF - Can I clarify if we have a joint standing committee on the Parliamentary Library?

Mr Jaensch - Yes, it does great work.

Dr WOODRUFF - So you are saying that you think it is important for members' time in this and the other place to be spent addressing the important work of the parliament and the Parliamentary Library, but you do not think it is important for us to have a joint standing committee on climate change?

Maybe we should, with respect, ask the Premier to come in because this is really about leadership. This is about setting a standard. This is what being a global leader looks like. This is what countries that want ambition on climate action do, and it is not going to cost anything or be politically uncomfortable. When has a joint standing committee on anything been either of those things? They are slow, cumbersome, back-door, incredibly important mechanisms for people from both parties to deliberate on the sorts of issues Ms White outlined and very similar to the functions I will shortly outline from the Greens joint standing committee amendment.

We need to have the parliament's eyes on the most important issue of our time. It has nothing to do with that committee making decisions. It has nothing to do with that committee pre-empting or hiding or securing away information that members of this House do not have

access to. Not at all. It provides us with an opportunity to have the people who represent both Houses pay attention to the most important issue of our time and to call for reports, inquiries, investigations and the establishment of other committees in order to further the work and the commitment of the government of the day, of the opposition and the crossbench to doing everything we can to have rapid, urgent reduction of emissions and adaptation plans and resilience in place to guide us through some very difficult times.

I do not understand why you do not understand that this is a critical signal and a critical part of the functioning of a world-leading parliament on addressing rapid climate action.

Mr JAENSCH - To the readers of this *Hansard* transcript, I refer you to the contribution just made by Dr Woodruff. I agree with Dr Woodruff that we need to have the parliament's eyes on this most important priority issue, climate change. Our parliament needs to be addressing it. I disagree with her that the best mechanism for that is one she has described as a slow, cumbersome back-door committee process like the one we have for the Parliamentary Library. We do not support the motion.

[4.10 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR - That was a cheap shot.

Mr Jaensch - It is what was said.

Ms O'CONNOR - No, it was most definitely a cheap shot. You know Dr Woodruff and Ms White are on the money here, that in order for this parliament to be as effective as it needs to be to address climate change, we should have a structure and a process in place where we are actually working together so there can be collaborative conversations about the best approach, so that we can look for common ground, which is what people across this island want from us on climate. It is pig-headed and ultimately self-defeating, minister, not to accept this amendment, a version of which has been put forward to you by both the Opposition and the Greens.

Before you came into this parliament, we had a robust functioning committee system. We had joint standing committees on community development and on environment and waste. That was with a 25-seat House. They did some of the most robust, inclusive public engagement policy and legislative work in this parliament. It is an outstanding structure for dealing with something the size of global heating. I do not understand why there is such resistance to this. To the ordinary person, surely, having a structure in the parliament that includes both Houses and members from across politics, including independents, is an appropriate response to what we are dealing with, at least from the parliament's point of view. I am really disappointed that we have not had a show of leadership from the Premier on this. We have discussed with him the need for tripartisanship to the greatest extent possible on climate.

Dr Woodruff and I know we are not going to make you and your colleagues, or Ms White and her colleagues, move as fast as you need to on protecting our carbon stores in our native forest. However, there is a lot we could agree on. What a signal that would send to young people - young people who you know, because you have this portfolio, are frightened and grieving for a world they believed was coming that is not. A parliament like ours showing leadership in establishing a joint standing committee would send to those young people, people across the island, a strong message that this parliament is prepared to work together on climate

and this parliament will work to find common ground on solutions we can all support, so at least on climate we are not beating each other up all the time.

Minister, you are making a terrible mistake in not supporting the gist of either the Opposition or the Greens amendment here. This is not the last you will be hearing of us on this because we think that there is broad support for a structure like this in parliament. We think members from across the political parties and both Houses would want to be part of the solutions and collaborative work on climate action, whether it be bringing down our emissions or working with communities on adaptation and looking at the legal and regulatory framework that allows for scientific, nimble, inclusive responses.

It is a big mistake on your and the Premier's part not to engage on this one at the very least and agree it is something that the parliament is morally bound to do - work together on climate.

Mr CHAIR - The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 11

Dr Broad
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Johnston
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Connor
Ms White
Mr Winter
Dr Woodruff (Teller)

NOES 11

Mrs Alexander
Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Ms O'Byrne

Ms Ogilvie

Mr CHAIR - The result of the division there being 11 Ayes and 11 Noes, in accordance with standing order 257 I cast my vote with the Noes.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5 -

Section 4 substituted (4. Objects of Act)

[4.21.p.m]

Dr WOODRUFF - Our first amendment to clause 5, is on page 7.

Proposed new section 4, paragraph (a) subparagraph (i):

Leave out 'a target'.

Insert instead 'targets'

The purpose of that is to be able to replace a reference to 'a target' in part a with 'targets' so that we can reflect the introduction of further sectoral targets in our later amendments. I will speak to that now.

Minister, we desperately need urgent climate action. This bill ought to have declared that we are in a state of climate emergency. Recently, in 2021, 11 000 of the world's most expert scientists told us that we had until 2030 to make massive reductions in emissions or climate change - in their words - 'would become uncontrollable and the planet would become increasingly uninhabitable'.

It is very clear every tonne of carbon that we do not put into the atmosphere will reduce the amount of warming that is coming down the line. What we need to do is have a large degree of ambition on every single sector that is emitting carbon dioxide equivalent gasses. That was a very clear recommendation from the majority of people who made submissions, especially those, who were experts and academics in the field and who know what they are talking about in relation to the current and future impacts of climate heating that we are already seeing.

The UTAS submission, Climate Tasmania, the Independent Science Council, the Environmental Defender's Office all said that we need to have sector-specific emissions targets in this bill. That is for two reasons. I put to you first a reason that might be closest to your heart. That is, we have had a disastrous lack of certainty and guidance for businesses and organisations across the country for the last decade. We have had dark times at the federal level with a failure by successive energy ministers and Liberal governments of taking any strong action, any targets, any price on carbon to give businesses the certainty that they demand. There is no doubt, that businesses in Australia have been on the front foot. They have been doing the work of reducing emissions that the federal government should have stepped up to do.

I am sure there are some really great human beings who work in most of our businesses around the country but they are not doing it out of the bottom of their heart for goodness. They are doing it because of the business sense of being out ahead and having a climate stamp on their business that is comparable to what is required by other countries importing their goods or so that they can be competitive with other international companies.

We are working in a global market. We need to support the businesses that export into the global market. It is a real opportunity for us to remain, with a competitive edge, in this space. We have had that but we are shortly, or already, being overtaken by other states in Australia that have much stronger sectoral emissions targets than this bill proposes. It has none. We are being overtaken by other countries that are mandating sectoral emissions targets.

We are in a situation where we have had some very important and good work that has been done on emissions reduction by our major industrials, for example. They have done some excellent work to remain competitive in the international space over the last decade but that

work has been ad hoc from some companies. It has been driven in a stop-start way and they have been quite clear that they would be in a better situation from an international export and competition point of view if they were backed by a government's required target that would give them a fair playing field with every other business in the sector. Individual businesses within an industry are working in competition with other industries - other businesses in Tasmania, as well as overseas, so we need to be on a fair playing field.

The fairest playing field is the one that has the strongest targets that match what we need to be reducing in our total emissions by the end of 2030. Farmers for Climate Action made a very important submission. They said very clearly to the bill that Tasmanian farmers are already experiencing climate change and they will have to find ways to adapt to the rapidly changing climate:

Tasmania's agri-food sector - worth \$2.7 billion in 2017-18 - climate change risks eroding not only \$1.6 billion worth of food and fibre production but also the state's growing food export and agri-tourism industries and the health and wellbeing of the people who depend on them. The future of Tasmania's clean and green brand is thrown into doubt unless action is taken at all levels.

They know that we need ambitious targets to help them remain competitive in other markets and so, mind you, did the independent Jacobs Review. The Jacobs Review did not specifically recommend sectoral emissions targets. I believe that this review was operating within the frame of what was going to be acceptable to the ears of the Government.

Mr Jaensch - You are questioning their independence and expertise?

Dr WOODRUFF - No, I am just saying that you work within the frame of what you are able to move. On page 34 of the Jacobs Review it is very clear. They said:

Tasmania has progressed to varying extents on some of these actions -

In relation to emissions targets:

but the review considered this overall progress to be not as comparable to that of leading jurisdictions on climate change.

National and international development on climate change has included the adoption of approaches that have the potential for effective climate action in Tasmania, including

- Setting of ambitious economy-wide, interim, and sectoral emissions targets;
- Development of economy-wide and sector-based emissions reductions plans; ...

Jacobs' review is very clear that if we do not do this in Tasmania, we will fall behind. We are already falling behind. Every day that goes by we will be further behind. There is a rhetoric that we are world-leading. It is not matched by the reality of what is in this bill. We strongly support the need for sectoral emission targets and we back everything that has been said by the other submissions about the reason for it.

I just talked about emissions ambition and the benefits for the sector but, fundamentally, the reason we need to do it is because we have to do everything we can to bring every tonne of carbon out of the atmosphere. We have industries in Tasmania that have been substantially increasing their emissions. We know that the current way of accounting our greenhouse gases and the land-use change and forestry category hides the reality that other sectors are substantially increasing emissions. Unless we have targets for each sector, we cannot provide the focused incentives and structures required for them to reduce their emissions and keep Tasmania in line with what we need to be doing comparable to other parts of the world, to survive and flourish as a community and for Tasmanian businesses to be able to keep pace with their national and international competitors.

Mr JAENSCH - That was an interesting contribution in that Dr Woodruff acknowledged the work that many of our industries and businesses are already doing. I commend Dr Woodruff for also acknowledging the work that many of our major industrials have undertaken and are planning to reduce emissions and to achieve their own corporate and business-site targets. We want to support them to achieve those targets and to do better than they might have without our help and cooperation. That is what our emissions reduction and resilience sector-based plans are all about.

We have taken the advice and the recommendation from Jacobs to set an ambitious economy-wide target for Tasmania, supported by sector-based plans to get us there. It is reasonable that those plans will include and reference existing sector targets where they already exist, where they are owned by those businesses and those sectors, like the red meat livestock industry, which has its own target. The Cement, Concrete and Aggregates Association has targets, as well as some of the big industrials. There are lots of targets out there and we want to be able to support them, document them and work with them to achieve those targets.

Any targets embedded in the emissions reduction and resilience plans will not in themselves be legislated by being there. There is the capacity for us working with those sectors to identify new goals and objectives for what we want to do on emissions but those will not be legislated. What is legislated is that we have those plans as part of our structure going forward that support us having an ambitious whole-of-economy, whole-of-Tasmania target, singular, for our state.

I am interested that Dr Woodruff proposes that sector-based targets would provide certainty for industry. When I spoke to industry representatives, that is not what they said to me. They want us to be able to support the plans they have for their emissions reduction, they want to be able to work alongside government to make that as ambitious and as effective as possible to get there quicker. They are supportive of there being a Tasmania-wide emissions target but none of those industry sectors advocated to me for sector-by-sector legislated emissions targets, so we are not taking that approach.

We believe we can get the same or better result by supporting industry to do what it knows best about how to change the emissions profiles it owns and to use the resources of those industries and businesses, together with those of government, to get there quicker.

We do not support the amendment, which foreshadows the establishment of more targets under the legislation but we acknowledge that there may be multiple targets, including targets generated by sectors that exist now, within our emissions reduction and resilience plans. We do not support the amendment.

Ms WHITE - I appreciate the reason behind the amendment moved by the member for Franklin, Dr Woodruff, and have sympathy for it. Following extensive consultation we have undertaken across a range of industries and interest groups, Climate Tasmania and others, we will not be supporting this amendment, particularly because the Government has failed to legislate to put a clear objective in the bill for there to be a just and equitable transition.

I expect that if there were sectoral targets included in a new act, that the changes required to help decarbonise to achieve such targets would have an impact on particular industries and communities. Because the Government has refused to provide legal support in this bill for just and equitable transition, there is no protection for workers of the communities. That is of concern, so we cannot support this amendment.

Dr WOODRUFF - I am very distressed on behalf of all the people who made the submissions for whom this was a core recommendation to see not only the Government not accepting this direction but the Labor Party as well. The argument from both parties, essentially, is not that we do not really need to do everything we can to reduce emissions. There was no argument mounted about the reality of what is happening to people every day; the floods, the fires, the sea level rise: there was no question of the science. I do not hear any problem with the necessity to do everything we can to reduce emissions.

There is a parallel universe that both the Labor and the Liberal parties seem to be inhabiting where you think it is still possible to have a nice conversation with people, industry leaders or anyone else, and talk about what they would like to do.

Minister, you said that you talked with industry and they do not want to be pushed like that.

Mr Jaensch - I did not say that, though.

Dr WOODRUFF - It is your job to make hard decisions and I do not agree that we should support industries to achieve the targets they want, the targets you said it owns. Industry does not own their emissions - they generate them and they pollute the atmosphere. They externalise those emissions and they become our emissions. Our emissions are increasing the temperature of the climate, the biosphere and making it uninhabitable. It is happening really fast. Every single day the emissions coming from Tasmanian cars and industries, from agriculture, waste production, are adding tonnes of carbon into the atmosphere that will only go to one place. They will circulate around. They will end up heating the water somewhere in the Arctic or the Antarctic Circle. They will be part of creating the hottest part of the marine environment of the east coast of Australia. They will become part of creating the unstable air systems that means we end up with pyrolytic catastrophic bushfires that end up with stalled climate patterns that dump rain incessantly across half of Australia, including the predictions for this summer with La Niña, where the same level, if not more, rainfall has been predicted by the Bureau of Meteorology. Communities that have suffered already four times in the last handful of years of extreme flooding in New South Wales are projected to be exposed to it again.

That is not happening Tasmania, but do not convince yourself that we are going to be spared the catastrophic changes that scientists have predicted far too increasingly will happen, because we are on a trajectory for three degrees of warming. That is why there is no excuse to have a short-term counterproductive mindset which puts the convenience and comfort and

today's security and normalised operations ahead of doing everything we can to reduce emissions that are coming from every sector, not just major sectors.

Every single sector needs to have a lens. At the moment we are not doing that. We are resting on the idea that we have net zero which we have been at for the past seven years, but you are not proposing throughout this bill to increase any ambition in that.

Mr Jaensch - We are.

Dr WOODRUFF - No, you are not, because you are keeping that same target for 2030. This is part of a package. There is no ambition in the target that we set, the net zero target. You pushed it out to 2030 when it actually happened seven years ago and we have a lot of threats that are going to make it harder and harder to continue to achieve that target into the future, which is why we need to get started today with sector emissions targets, because each sector will need to play its part.

Once the land use change sector changes, emissions are not drawn down by the vast number of plantations that were planted in the late 2000s and early 2010s. Those plantation forests are not taking up the amount of carbon they were a decade and a half ago. They are slowing down. We have bushfires and we cannot possibly account for the amount of emissions coming from bushfires and when they are going to happen. We also have, most importantly, every single day, a government-funded mendicant native forest logging industry which over a year is emitting more emissions from the clear-felling, loss of carbon stores and draw-down and burning of the soil, than our transport sector. That is why we need to separate this out and we need to have targets appropriate to each sector.

We did not and are not proposing in this bill to set an amount. Many people felt that stronger targets ought to have been set in this bill. Where we have landed is a proposal which I will come to in a later amendment, where we leave that decision to the minister to be reported to parliament within 12 months and to get started today. Other states and countries are doing far more than we are because they recognise the urgency of the situation.

It is unbelievable that both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party do not understand. Minister, I remember you going to a forum that was held last year or the year before of people at the Menzies Research Institute, stakeholders who provided submissions, and you left the door open to being interested in sector targets. I remember speaking to people after that who said, 'We are so pleased the minister was interested. He was basically open. We talked about sector targets and we think he is open'. I was very doubtful at the time, but I thought let us just see if great things can happen. I am really sad to say to those people that great things did not happen on your watch, minister. I do not understand. There is no science and there is no reality in the decision you are making. It is just short-term, it is gutless and it is failing our young people and future generations.

Ms O'CONNOR - I will just say a few words after Dr Woodruff's excellent contribution. Again we are looking at a failure to lead, a failure of leadership. As Dr Woodruff said in her first contribution, if you introduce sectoral targets then you are giving certainty to industry. You are providing industry the climate regulatory and logistical framework within which the people of Tasmania, through this parliament, expect them to operate. I actually think it is insulting to our major industrials, a number of whom have invested in making their operations cleaner and more efficient, to say, 'Oh well, government has no role here in leadership. None

of these industry leaders want a sectoral target so we will do nothing because we never take on industry'. It is the same with the Liberals in their failure to regulate short-stay accommodation. They never take on property investors, never take on moneyed interests, not ever.

It is absolutely true and it reminds me of when we were pulling together Climate Smart Tasmania. Okay, it took me six months arguing in Cabinet and talking to major industrial CEOs, but they came to the table because they understood the government was prepared to be a partner with them, that they had a contribution to make that could be supported by their own workers and the community and the parliament.

Mr Jaensch - Still do.

Ms O'CONNOR - No, but what you are saying here is -

Mr Jaensch - You just want to close them down. Rosalie said so.

Dr Woodruff - I did not.

Ms O'CONNOR - that as the world catches fire, or people are drowning in floods the likes of which I have never seen before, you are saying it is all too hard to just put in a bit of a framework, which is an achievable framework, in four sectors. It is not the sectoral targets so much I think that is causing resistance internally to you, minister, and undoubtedly your Cabinet, it is that you do not want to take on the big industrials. That is an insult to them, in my view, because I think they would be prepared, as they were eight years ago, to come to the table if they knew it was a partnership. They respect that this parliament writes the rules, but not this minister, not this Government, not rules that are effective. They recognise they need leadership and they need certainty and they are not getting it from this Government.

Sitting Times

[4.49 p.m.]

Mr STREET (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Mr Chair, I move -

Pursuant to Sessional Order 18A, that for this day's sitting the House shall not stand adjourned at 6 o'clock and that the House continue to sit past 6 o'clock.

I talked to Mr Winter earlier this morning, Ms White. I hope he passed on the conversation I had with him. There is no intention from the Government to sit late into the night. We want the bill completed by the adjournment tomorrow night, so we will try to even out the two days so we do not sit late one night and adjourn at 6 o'clock tomorrow. We will probably adjourn around 7.30 p.m. or 8.00 p.m. tonight and then if we need extra time after 6.00 p.m. tomorrow night to finish it off we will sit until 8.00 p.m. then.

Motion agreed to.

Mr CHAIR - The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 3

Ms Johnston (Teller)
Ms O'Connor
Dr Woodruff

NOES 19

Mrs Alexander
Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Dr Broad
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Ms Finlay (Teller)
Ms Haddad
Mr Jaensch
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Wood
Mr Young

Amendment negatived.

Ms WHITE - I move a following further amendment. This amendment is to propose a new section 4, paragraph (a) after subparagraph (ii).

Insert the following subparagraph (iii):

- (iii) reporting and independent oversight of the progress made towards achieving Tasmania's emissions reduction target and other targets, including sector-based plans; and

The reason for this amendment is to give powers to the independent oversight body that we will also be seeking to establish. This clause of the bill is a descriptor of the objects of the act and outlines the objects of the act to support Tasmania to take action of climate change by providing for a range of different things, including reporting. There is provision already for reporting and parliamentary oversight which is already established in the bill.

This new amendment that I am proposing of behalf of the Labor Party is for there to be power for reporting an independent oversight of the progress made towards achieving Tasmania's emissions reduction target and other targets, including sector-based plans. This is to make it very clear that with the proposal we have to establish independent oversight. Obviously, we are hoping for parliamentary oversight but in form of a joint House committee. Further to that, we want to see established greater independent oversight, consistent with the submissions that have been made on this bill calling for independent oversight.

Also, it would help the minister because in his own second reading speech, which has been changed for the third time, the minister has created a climate change reference group.

This will have a range of responsibilities but it is not very clear what their powers are. They are not referred to by any name in this bill. They are not named specifically in this bill. It is simply a new addition to the second reading speech.

The inclusion of this amendment was intended by us to help clarify the powers of the independent oversight but it would also be quite helpful to the minister in clarifying the powers of the ministerial climate change reference group that he will seek to establish, making it very clear that they will have ability to report and provide that independent oversight of progress made towards achieving Tasmania's emissions reduction target and other targets including sector-based plans.

Whilst I recognise the minister said he will not be supporting our amendment that we plan to move around the establishment of independent oversight, I think he has a gap in our legislation about what the powers and functions of this new ministerial climate change reference group does. I suggest this would be helpful to you even if you do not support our future amendments.

Mr JAENSCH - The Government will not be supporting the amendment. The reason for that is that we have laid out our proposal to report directly to the parliament and to include new additional reporting and stronger transparency and accountability to Tasmanians through the parliament by requiring that as minister, I table in the parliament our climate change action plan, our climate change risk assessment, our emissions reduction and resilience plans, our annual greenhouse gas emissions report and our annual climate change activity statements. All members and all Tasmanians can see the science, the emissions, the projections, the responses to that in plans and our progress against that, both in terms of the activities undertaken and the greenhouse emissions and how they have responded to the action taken.

There is also a provision in the legislation for an independent review of the act to be carried out every four years. The bill does not amend that requirement; it stands. It is a short cycle for independent review of legislation. It recognises that it is a rapidly changing field and that the parliament has a role in ensuring that the direction given through the legislation remains relevant and contemporary.

We do not support the addition of further separate independent oversight of progress, not because we are afraid of scrutiny, otherwise we would not be tabling everything in the parliament. It is because there is no strong evidence that it is the lack of having a body like that which has held Tasmania back from achieving emissions reductions. What will achieve emissions reductions is the Government working with the people who create the emissions to produce less emissions. That is what we believe is the core and most important part of the framework we are setting for it - how well we engage with those who control the emissions to produce less emissions. No amount of additional oversight or science or advice on what the problem of climate change is, is going to change emissions by itself.

We need to be able to do that work. We want to shift the weight of our effort and resources to working with those who control the emissions to reduce the emissions. That is all that matters, and what the atmosphere cares about, is less emissions.

I understand that those who are not in government want more scrutiny and control of government's actions to deliver on that.

Ms O'Connor - You sound like Scott Morrison, steering the ship through the tempest of global heating while we watch from the shore.

CHAIR - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr JAENSCH - In the interests of urgent action and the best use of our resources, we believe the best effort is that we drive the work with industry, with emitters, to reduce emissions wherever we can and ensure that there is resilience and good planning for living with the unavoidable consequences of the climate change that is already locked in, while we do our bit to avoid the worst consequences of climate change through reducing emissions as much as we can. That is what our target is.

We do not support the amendment because it is associated with the establishment of additional structure, rather than additional work on the ground to deliver emissions reductions.

Dr WOODRUFF - We support this amendment because scrutiny and accountability are critical to a functioning democracy, and especially on this matter, more than any other area. It is so important that we have eyes on the work of the Government doing the important job of protecting future generations and people who live in Tasmania today. We support reporting an independent oversight of progress on emissions reduction targets and other targets, including sector-based plans. We, of course, think it should be stronger and it should be on sector-based targets, but we support this amendment.

Minister, you should do your homework a bit better before you come in and make statements such as, 'We actually have really strong accountability and strong reporting mechanisms in this bill'. Frankly, you have no idea.

Mr Jaensch - With respect.

Dr WOODRUFF - With respect -

Mr Jaensch - Thank you.

Dr WOODRUFF - What you have not done is referenced what other states in Australia are doing. They are doing far more than what is being proposed in this bill.

South Australia, for example - which with the ACT is going ahead in the most incredible way - has to prepare, under their Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Act 2007, a report every two years on the operation of the act, an annual report on the progress of sector agreements. The Premier's Climate Change Council - it would be great if we had one of those - is to prepare an annual report. It has to be tabled within six days in parliament. The Climate Change Council in the ACT has to prepare an annual report. The government must give its response within 21 days to that. The ACT minister has to prepare an annual report on their actions, on the effectiveness of government actions to reduce greenhouse emissions, and so on.

Mr Jaensch - We are doing all that.

Dr WOODRUFF - Well, 'We are doing all right' is not what the University of Tasmania scientists think and they do not agree with you. As you know, they did a very large blueprint

for a positive future last year, and then they again provided a submission to the climate change bill in November last year. It was very clear that what should be in this bill, and is not in this bill, is more reporting and publication for transparency and accountability. There is no doubt that we can do better.

This is not going to stop the work of government agencies helping, incentivising, working with industries and major industrials to get on and do emissions reduction. I hope there are enough arms of government to be able to do the work of that sort of activity and to prepare the reports, so we can all be clear that we are making the progress we need to make in this important area.

I do not agree that this bill is in step or ahead of other jurisdictions in Australia. It is clearly not, which means we have to stop using terms like 'world-leading', because we are not. We are not even Australian-leading, unfortunately. Would it be so.

Mr Jaensch - Yes, on emissions, absolutely.

Dr WOODRUFF - Not on the matter of sector emissions; not on the matter of reporting targets.

Ms WHITE - It is disappointing that the minister continues to be ignorant to the need for independent oversight. It was very clear in the submissions that were received by government, in the process they undertook calling for submissions. I will remind the House again - and I made this point in my second reading speech - that the Government took just 10 days to consider more than 60 written submissions before tabling the bill in this House. How on earth are you supposed to give consideration to the detailed submissions that were put to the Government in good faith, with terrific ideas, in just 10 days. It belies sense really, and it was such a lot of work.

It is disappointing not only that you have rejected our inputs to amend the bill to better reflect the desire expressed in those submissions - and that is also reflective of best practice in other jurisdictions, which you point to frequently and try to claim that Tasmania is leading the way, when we are not - but it also flies in the face of the rhetoric from the Premier, who claims he wants to lead the most transparent government and the most accountable government, when you will not even allow for an amendment to provide for independent oversight of the Government's progress on its climate action plans.

It is not a radical thing. It should be something you welcome. There are so many clever and smart people who want to help Tasmania, and want to help our economy and society and environment manage our response to climate change. To have an independent oversight measuring progress, providing recommendations, suggestions and solutions should be welcome. It is disappointing that you are planning to reject this, because it suggests you will not seek to support any of the further amendments that the Labor Party or the Greens have proposed around structures to provide proper independent oversight of the Government's work and a climate change bill and its different functions.

It is really out of step with best practice in other jurisdictions, and you cannot keep saying that. Dr Woodruff is 100 per cent correct when she calls you out on that.

Minister, I am disappointed to hear you are not going to be supporting it. As I said, it would also provide you with some structure on how you are going to manage your ministerial advisory group that you are proposing to establish, which, as far as I can tell, all we have in terms of detail about that will operate is two paragraphs in the second reading speech. There is very little information from your Government about how this advisory group is going work, what its task is, who is going to be on it, how long they are going to be operating for. It just seems like a bit of a tokenistic effort by your Government to appear like there is some independent oversight. It is just a massive failure on your behalf to show some more strength when it comes to making sure that this is the best bill it can be.

Where is the Premier on this one again? He claims to be a champion for transparency. Completely silent. It is utterly disappointing, Chair.

Mr CHAIR - The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 11

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

NOES 11

Mrs Alexander
Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Mr Winter

Ms Ogilvie

Mr CHAIR - The results of the division, Ayes 11, Noes 11, therefore in accordance with standing order 257, I cast my vote with the Noes.

Amendment negatived.

Ms WHITE - I will move the next two amendments I have together. They essentially seek to achieve the same thing.

First amendment -

Page 7, proposed new section 4, paragraph (b) after 'emissions'

Insert ", at a local and state level".

Second amendment -

Same page, same proposed new section, paragraph (c), after 'Tasmania'

Insert ", at a local and state level".

These amendments were recommended to me by the Local Government Association of Tasmania. I presume they made similar representations to you. In their letter to me, which was in March this year, they said:

Tasmanian local government recognises action is needed to address our greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change risks. However, the capacity to do so varies enormously across the state. We are pleased that the key themes of council feedback in LGAT's submission were addressed in the draft Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill. Our submission was informed by a direct consultation with the 29 Tasmanian councils and the resolution at the LGAT July 2019 general meeting that acknowledged the urgency to address climate change, the need to work together and that our actions must be in line with global activities.

Our view is that the intent of these changes can be better articulated, particularly given local government's role as a unique collaborator with the Tasmanian Government and the sector's key role in community preparedness and resilience against climate risks and impacts. In collaboration with other governments, council can work with community to lead local action to reduce carbon emissions. We make the following recommendations to improve the Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill 2021 from the local government perspective.

They provided a number of recommended changes. The first change they made was to 4(b) and 4(c) and that is to add 'at a local and a state level'. The comment they provided is that emissions reduction needs to be tackled at all scales within Tasmania. This is at a state and a local level. This amendment helps to clarify what 4(d) intends.

They also make the point, by including it in 4(c), that adaptation measures need to be understood and implemented at a state and local level. The intent of these amendments is to give effect to the recommendations received from the Local Government Association of Tasmania and to recognise the very important role that local government now plays in supporting our community and will continue to play, particularly around adaptation and resilience-building across our community.

This is a very straightforward amendment. It is not political at all. It is further clarifying that this effort needs to occur at a local and a state level, and recognises the important role of local government in helping the Government achieve its objectives under the climate change amendment bill.

Mr JAENSCH - I thank the member for this proposed amendment. We are big supporters of local government, and the Local Government Association certainly sees that there is a very important role for local action in addressing the challenges of climate change. The

important thing here is that the objective of supporting local-level climate action is already covered in object 4(d), which says:

facilitate Tasmania's contribution to international, national and local government emissions reduction and adaptation measures to support the transition to a low emissions future.

There is some redundancy in what is being proposed because the objects as they stand already acknowledge the inclusion and the role of local government and local action. The objects in the bill have been informed by the outcomes of the independent review of the act and broad consultation. Written submissions on the draft bill indicated broad support for the objects in the bill as they are.

The act currently states that it contains measures to help the state address the challenges of climate change and contribute to the broader national and international response to those challenges and for related purposes. Its purpose is not intended to guide or mandate climate action for the local government sector. It is to guide state government activity.

Obviously, we need to be taking action at all levels. This bill focuses on what the state needs to do, including to facilitate Tasmania's contribution to local government emissions reduction and adaptation measures. We note that emissions data is not available at sub-state levels and there is no methodology currently available to do this.

The advice I have is that 4(d) gives us the acknowledgement of local government and the objective of working with local government towards Tasmania's goals and aims, and that the bill is predominantly about how Tasmania achieves its economy-wide target by directing state government activity.

On that basis, we do not support the amendments that have been proposed for 4(b) and 4(c).

Ms WHITE - Thank you for that explanation. It is because of the ambiguity within 4(b) and 4(c) that the Local Government Association tried to help by clarifying it. You are right to point out that in 4(d) it does mention local government. They want to make it explicitly clear that 4(b) and 4(c) also reference the work that would need to happen out of state at a local level, so there was no confusion.

If you feel satisfied based on the legal advice you have that 4(d) is adequate - I see someone nodding in the box - I will accept that. However, the conversations I had with the Local Government Association were very constructive. Their policy officer who is working with the Local Government Association of Tasmania has quite a depth of expertise in climate action and climate policy. I feel very confident bringing forward these amendments on their behalf because I found the arguments very compelling. However, if you found that legal advice supports the clarification as defining 4(d) is adequate, I will accept that and hope that you have also been able to convey that to the Local Government Association.

Dr WOODRUFF - It is very important that we recognise the difference. The minister talked about Tasmania and local government. So (d), which we have referenced in this conversation, is why (b) and (c) are being considered to be amended. It says:

facilitate Tasmania's contribution to international, national and local government emissions reduction ...

'Tasmania' in that sense is not a very good word to use because it could be read as - I think it is intended to be read as the state level of government. It also means Tasmania that incorporates the state and local level of government. You can read it in two ways and it is not really clear who the actor is in paragraph (d) to facilitate every entity in Tasmania or the state of Tasmania's contribution to local government emissions, which is how it could be read.

I prefer to have the clarity of having the amendment that Labor has proposed for (b) and (c) to make it very clear that we are doing this at local and state levels. The minister said that the state is doing this, as in we are doing everything. We are responsible for the legislative oversight of the local government sector and we are responsible for requirements to develop a whole range of measures and responses to reduce emissions and prepare for adaptation. It is important that we are very clear in laying out the responsibilities and that all levels of government are required to make this contribution at all levels.

Clearly, our local government does not report to the international level, but other than that, I still support Labor's amendments. Ms White, are you proposing not to put the amendment to (d) as well?

Ms WHITE - I will proceed to move the amendments because that was the commitment I gave to the Local Government Association. The minister has given advice to the parliament that the legal advice he has received deals with that ambiguity issue that you and I have with the wording.

Mr JAENSCH - It is advice from my department, Ms White, that 4(d) provides the necessary referencing of local government. I would not characterise it as legal advice necessarily, but it is through their drafting. Their response to the proposed amendment was that it is covered.

Ms WHITE - Thank you for that clarification, minister. I will still move them because it does not hurt to make it very clear what the intention is of 4(b) and 4(c) but I accept what you have said, minister.

Amendments negatived.

Dr WOODRUFF - Chair, I move my second amendment.

Page 7, clause 5, proposed new section 4, after paragraph (c)

Insert the following paragraphs:

- (A) to promote and facilitate early action on climate change; and
- (B) to protect terrestrial and marine carbon stores; and
- (C) to promote energy efficiency and conservation; and

Chair, these amendments introduce two new objects; that is, to promote and facilitate early action on climate change and to protect terrestrial and marine carbon stores and they also retain an existing Object to the Act that has been removed by this bill and that is the object to promote energy efficiency and conservation.

The purpose of including these objects of promoting and facilitating early action on climate change and protecting terrestrial and marine carbon stores and promoting energy efficiency and conservation is to ensure that all the decision-making that we have is fundamentally environmentally focused. The reason we are here today is anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases are causing an unsustainable heating of the planet and if we do not keep sight of that, we are in grave danger of failing to act as rapidly and urgently as we need.

There is no doubt that the protection of carbon stores everywhere is going to become increasingly critical. I suspect in the near future communities around the world will be doing absolutely everything they can to protect the carbon that we have already in the ground. That means doing everything we can to avoid the loss of peat and the drying out of peatlands and the release of methane emissions. It means doing everything we can to increase biodiversity.

We expect the increase of biodiversity and functioning healthy ecosystems through restoration projects is shortly to be agreed to by the United Nations Convention on Biodiversity, which has a very strong target - the 30x30 target, it has been called, of a 30 per cent increase habitat that is to be restored to functioning natural habitat by 2030. What we are talking about is globally having 30 per cent of land that is not being used for human development, for land clearing, for extraction, but instead is being returned, restored so that we can keep the functioning of our biodiversity across the world and, very critically, keep our carbon stores intact. That is going to be a massive challenge for every country on the planet, and it is only eight years away. The clock is ticking. Each day we have one day less to get to that goal, so it is clear that functioning biodiversities provide intact systems that do what they have always done - which is to store carbon and keep it stored, because they are not being despoiled and cleared. There is not the extraction that is damaging the surface of the planet. Also they house the biodiversity - the animals and plants and the variety of things that we need to do everything that they provide us.

That is why we have introduced those two new objects, and we would really like the minister to explain why the Government has removed an object of the act as important as promoting energy efficiency and conservation. We strongly disagree with that.

I am sure the Leader of the Tasmanian Greens, Ms O'Connor, will say something in a moment about this, because when she was the Greens climate minister, we had a very far-sighted program of energy efficiency in public housing in Tasmania. We had a focus on energy efficiency and conservation that has been completely dropped over the past eight years.

What we have to do is go back to an understanding that we had in the 1970s when the oil crisis struck the world. People realised for the very first time that we had a precious resource. They realised what it was like to think of a future without that resource - to imagine a world without oil, and without fossil fuels. There was a huge global movement to conserve and to be energy efficient. That was incredibly positive and reaped a lot of good for the planet because there was less pollution in cities for a time in the 1970s. People drove smaller cars; they did not drive as often; they car-shared. There was a greater investment in public transport in most of the big cities in Europe and in parts of Australia and the United States. When the oil crisis finished, we went back to our old ways.

Energy efficiency has become way down the bottom of the list of actions of governments - probably fundamentally because it conflicts with a kind of Liberal growth

imperative. We have had, and lived with, the imperative for growth and the idea that businesses and economies must, and will, as some law of nature, continue to expand forever the limits of growth.

The conversations were had by far-sighted people in the 1970s, but we are now living at the limits of growth. We are experiencing what that feels like, and it is a very difficult time.

What we need, minister, is to put energy efficiency and conservation front and centre in this act, so that it drives the sort of investment that will not just reduce the amount of emissions we have, but will help people save money. It will reduce their cost of living. It will dramatically affect their capacity to be able to pay their power bills, because the power bills will be much smaller. It will make their lives a lot happier.

It will be fantastic to have less pollution in the city. It would be awesome if we had less toxic pollution from fire smoke and from diesel cars. This is killing people. We have data about how many people die each year from pollution. Yes, even in Tasmania we like to think we are immune. We have cleaner air than almost any other city on the Earth, but there are people who are affected in Tasmania by diesel particulate pollution and other forms of pollution that we can avoid. These are all emissions, and that is why we have to have this as an overarching object in the act.

Mr JAENSCH - The preamble or the rationale for the amendments has to do with the changes to the number of objects in this act. It was a very clear recommendation from the independent review of the act that we need to consolidate the objects into fewer, less ambiguous, less duplication -

Ms O'Connor - Honestly, you are deferring to a private consultancy rather than acknowledge the kind of facts of the science.

Mr JAENSCH - Sometimes you love it when government seeks advice from experts, and sometimes -

Ms O'Connor - I would not call that group of people 'the experts'. They are a private consultancy.

Mr JAENSCH - when you do not like it, you disagree. Anyway, we sought advice on the best way to frame the legislation as part of its review. We consulted with the audience and the users of the legislation who supported a simplification of the objects of the act down to the five that we have.

I understand that the intention of that was not to remove content or coverage, but to condense them into a fewer number of high-level objects which achieve the same goals. For the record, I am advised that between them, the areas that objects 4(b), 4(c) and 4(d) cover - regarding, in particular, energy efficiency measures - were previously separately identified in the objects.

I do not mind dipping into some of the proposed changes that Ms Woodruff outlined.

Ms O'Connor - Dr Woodruff.

Mr JAENSCH - Dr Woodruff, I beg your pardon. Early action issue is covered in the time frames specified, and ones that we have and will propose in response to proposals that have been brought forward for action on the production of our action plan, our emissions reduction and resilience plans as well as a whole, and for particular sectors including transport.

We are conscious that the whole bill and target turns on the need to achieve significant reductions to avoid Tasmania becoming a net emitter again - which is projected, according to the modelling, to be something that we risk at around 2030 and in years beyond. The whole purpose is defined by that now less than eight-year window.

Our planning and our action plans and our reporting cycles will be cognisant of that and the need for urgent action and an adaptive management approach, because we will have cycles of reporting on what we have done, and what effect that has had on emissions across our economy.

With regard to the proposal to introduce protection for carbon stores, I am advised that this risks duplication of protections for forests, the marine environment and other carbon stores that is contained explicitly in other legislation. The advice I have regarding the protection of forests, marine environment and other terrestrial settings already exists under other legislation and we do not want to duplicate it here.

Dr Woodruff - Which legislation, minister?

Mr JAENSCH - In terms of energy efficiency and conservation -

Dr woodruff - You are misleading us with that statement. If you cannot provide any evidence of those pieces of legislation, you have accidentally misled the House.

Ms O'Connor - There is no statute that protects carbon stores at the moment. Name one?

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - Order, the minister has the floor and you will get the opportunity to respond in a second as soon as he has finished.

Mr JAENSCH - I have spoken with my advisers and their clarification is that while there may not be other legislation that explicitly protects things as carbon stores, the fact that your reference to carbon stores in forests, maybe in peat systems and other natural environments, those are protected under other legislation.

Dr Woodruff - No, they are not and I did not actually say that. I said terrestrial and marine carbon stores.

Mr JAENSCH - Maybe you have a different interpretation of that. However, that is the advice I have been given and I am presenting it to you for the benefit of the record.

In terms of energy efficiency, saving of energy is a contributing activity to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and our ability to use our energy, even renewable energy, wisely in Tasmania. A range of initiatives indicate the Government's considerable commitment to energy efficiency in homes, offices, businesses and government operations over a number of years, including our \$15 million investment in public housing energy efficiency for hot water

systems and heating and cooling systems. There is \$50 million in our TEELS (Tasmanian Energy Efficiency Loans) program; our business resource efficiency programs as well. Solar panels on schools. There will be further efficiency actions identified within our energy sector emissions reduction and resilience plan as well. There is still a broad suite of activity underway.

This is one of those areas where, unlike, say, significant emissions reduction opportunities that might come from transformation or fuel switching in a major industrial, this is something everyone can do. We understand the importance and opportunities that programs that drive and support energy efficiency in people's homes and lives is an important part of us reaching our target and bringing Tasmanians with us so that they are part of the transition we are talking about, and making their lives better in the process.

No one need fear that energy efficiency has fallen off the agenda. The advice from my department is that energy efficiency is now bracketed within and under the summary objects (b), (c) and (d) as part of us collapsing 10 into five under the advice of the independent review and the consultation we made, which I understand was broadly supported by those who made submissions to simplify and reduce duplication across the objects. The intent of those objects has not been lost and I am advised that the objects, as they remain, cover the same range of topics. Therefore, we do not support the amendment as proposed.

[5.50 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF - Thank you, minister, that is very disappointing -

Mr Jaensch - Reassuring, I hope.

Dr WOODRUFF - No, I am not reassured in the slightest because I think you were not being correct, or possibly not even particularly honest when you said that there were other acts. You have had time for your advisers to find those acts and nobody has produced one. Therefore, it is pretty clear, for the record, for people watching, that there is no legislation that protects terrestrial and marine carbon stores in Tasmania. It is not true to say it is already there. That is one of the reasons why it is important that it is an object of the act, because nowhere in this bill do we talk about the critical need to protect carbon stores, which form our greatest asset in this time of climate change.

As you yourself often say, it is one of the reasons we have been a world leader to date with our net zero emissions but that will not remain unless we protect the carbon stores we have and grow them. There will inevitably be volatility in our carbon stores. That is the nature of a natural system. They will not always remain static. It is like an investment market - it goes up and down, and you cannot be confident it is going to stay at the level it is now in one, three or five years' time. You have to be doing everything possible to protect and enhance them.

We have no idea about marine carbon stores and that is the point. Unless we have an object to protect marine carbon stores, we will not be making the effort and doing the work to find, count, document and understand them, and recognise the impact of activities on reducing or enhancing them. We need to understand the impact of our industries and the natural world in reducing the marine stores we have.

We are very disappointed. We hope that there might be some interest in expanding the objects of this bill when it goes to the other place because it is so important to have the high-level settings right to make the decisions that are made by agencies flow and need to match them.

I do not agree that parts (b) and (c) at all properly reflect the very important need to have energy efficiency and conservation as an object of this act. We are disappointed that you have not made any progress on this, particularly when you said in your second reading speech response that you want to focus on 'hunting down emissions and reductions opportunities'. It is clear that the most enormous emissions reduction opportunities we could take would be to end native forest logging. If you did that you would find that there is an enormous opportunity here and you would be fulfilling an object of this act.

Maybe that is another reason why you are disinclined to accept this amendment to protect our carbon stores: because you know that your Government is destroying the biggest carbon stores we have every single day and you are projecting, if you had your way, to expand the destruction of those carbon stores. We will continue to fight against that because we know, the scientists know and the young people know, everyone who has their eyes open knows, that we have to hang on to what we have and grow it.

Ms O'CONNOR - Briefly, Madam Deputy Chair, I remind the minister that we actually have statutes here that accelerate the loss of carbon from our carbon stores. We have the perversely named Forestry (Rebuilding the Forest Industry) Act 2014. We have the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement which is exempt from the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations (EPBC) assessment.

We make special laws for corporations and companies to exploit our natural resources and release carbon. It is a bit like the State of the Environment Report. If you are not looking and you are not recording and you are not acknowledging something, you can tell yourself it is not there. You can tell yourself it is not serious or significant enough. The State of the Environment Report is a classic one - do not want to know. It happened at a federal level. It is happening here again at a state level - two statutory deadlines missed - just do not want to know.

The same with the actual emissions from native forest logging, which are detailed in Dr Jen Sanger's fantastic work which has not yet been addressed or challenged in any meaningful way by government. Mr Ellis tried it and then got fact checked by RMIT as being totally wrong. This is a robust scientific report on forest carbon in Tasmania. It shows us that the biggest risk, as Dr Woodruff said, is the loss of carbon from our forests. There is also a huge issue in the fact that we do not properly count emissions from clear felling, burning and the loss of carbon from our soils. This is a little of the 'don't want to know' about terrestrial and marine carbon sinks because if we acknowledge them in statute we might have to do something about them. That is not something that we are seeing any real commitment from this minister to do. You might sense the frustration from Dr Woodruff and me.

We talk to many scientists and young people. We can see an opportunity lost through the amendments to the Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008 because ideology and politics have infected this legislation. They have. You can tell us that the independent consultants wanted you to compress the Objects. We do not let independent private consultants write government legislation. Parliament should not be doing that, minister.

What the independent consultant says should form part of a picture because what scientists are saying - scientists like Dr Jen Sanger, but she is one of many - is that we have to acknowledge the carbon stores that we have. We have to protect them and we have to increase the carbon that is sequestered. So far we have not seen a hint, a clue from this Government that that is going to be the way it is because it does not suit the ideology and it is far too scientific.

We have a minister for climate change who does not seem to have read Dr Sanger's report or pointed to Mr Barnett as someone who had refuted it. It was quite alarming to have someone like Mr Barnett, who never saw a natural forest he did not want to see clear felled, burnt and chipped, do a precis of Dr Sanger's outstanding work. It is because it is ideological and that is why the changes to this act are not good enough. They are not scientific enough and they will not be effective enough - tragically, regrettably.

Ms WHITE - We have no problems supporting this amendment from Dr Woodruff, the member for Franklin. It further explains what the intent of this bill is, and that seems to be a recurring theme for the Government that has a problem with detail.

Every time we have tried to insert more detail through amendments to this bill it has been rejected. It is very important that when we are looking at the Objects of the Act that they are very clear. Every decision that will be made by government in relation to how this act operates will refer back to what the Objects state so if they are ambiguous or there are gaps that will be problematic. The Government should really consider why they are so opposed to making sure there are clear details there agreed to by the parliament, so we will be supporting this amendment.

Mr CHAIR - The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 11

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

NOES 11

Mrs Alexander
Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Ms Finlay

Ms Ogilvie

Mr CHAIR - The result of the division there being 11 Ayes and 11 Noes, in accordance with standing order 257 I cast my vote with the Noes.

Amendment negatived.

[6.06 p.m.]

Ms WHITE - Madam Deputy Chair, I seek to move an amendment on page 7, proposed new section 4, paragraph (d) -. I propose -

Leave out ', national and local government emissions reduction and adaptation measures'.

Insert instead, 'and national targets and objectives on emissions reduction'.

This is an amendment that was brought to my attention by the Local Government Association of Tasmania, further to our earlier conversation where we discussed how we could provide greater clarity in the bill. The purpose behind this amendment is to help achieve that objective. I do not think there is anything further I need to add. It is simply about providing some greater clarity.

Mr JAENSCH - Ms White, thank you very much. I sought some advice on this one as well. As I understand it, the effect of this is to replace a reference to 'national measures' with 'national targets', principally.

Ms White - Yes.

Mr JAENSCH - Right. I am advised that there is a risk of unintended consequences by making that change, because 'measures' and 'targets' mean different things. There may be policy positions or initiatives that support emissions reduction or adaptation that are not target or objective based. For example, under the current Australian Government's Powering Australia policy, there are multiple non-target-based measures to do with things like the EV strategy or the electric car discount. If we define a 'measure' as a plan or a course of action taken to achieve something, a 'target' is a thing that is aimed at, or sought, or a goal.

What could happen through this change is that we could exclude, unintentionally perhaps, non-measurable actions - whereas, I understand, if we were to leave the language as it is, it can capture both. On the strength of that advice, we do not support the amendment due to the unintended consequences that might be had by substituting measures for targets, or vice versa.

Ms WHITE - That is a helpful explanation. Thank you, minister.

Amendment negatived.

Dr WOODRUFF - Clause 5, page 7, we have an amendment that proposes a new section for paragraph (d) after 'emissions reduction'. I move to insert -

", emissions reporting,".

This amendment includes facilitation of our contribution to international and local emissions reporting and to the objects of the act, as we have it here. What paragraph (d) says is to:

facilitate Tasmania's contribution to international, national and local government emissions reduction and adaptation measures to support the transition to a low-emissions future.

Our amendment would change that to say:

facilitate Tasmania's contribution to international, national and local government emissions reduction, emission reporting and adaptation measures.

We are putting some more emphasis on reporting. I draw the minister's attention to UTAS's submission on this draft bill. They have made it very clear that the act in its current form, despite some of the things that you have been saying minister, our reporting obligations are limited relative to other jurisdictions. We believe it is important that we do everything we can to emphasise the need to report because we learn from each other, other jurisdictions. It is an important opportunity for people who are confronting enormous changes happening to the environment, the impacts of extreme events and the slow-boil changes that are occurring to natural systems and their capacity to support agriculture and all the other industries, extractive industries and fisheries and so on.

We need to understand where we are all the time, because increasingly, as the planet warms and the climate becomes more volatile, more variable and more extreme we will have many people in the community, organisations and businesses who will be looking very directly to understand exactly what governments are doing; how effective their actions are and whether they can and ought to be doing more and doing things differently and also providing their expertise. Governments do not have all the expertise and they cannot even outsource to all expertise. We need to draw on the body politic, the civil society and businesses and other organisations to engage as much as possible as we move forward into the future. Part of that is reporting, so that there can be a conversation to ways people can read, understand and speak back.

We strongly believe that there is not enough emphasis in this legislation on reporting and that is why it is important that it is here in the Objects of the Act.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you, Dr Woodruff. This is an amendment to one of the Objects of the Act. There is the independent review proposed and the Government has adopted a reframing of the objects and a consolidation down from 10 to five. Those five are arranged around particular themes. You can see them in clause 5, sections 4(a), (b), (c), (d) and (e). They are: (a) targets and reporting; (b) actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; (c) adaptation to projected climate change; (d) complementarity with national and international climate change responses; and (e) engagement and partnership.

I am advised that the reporting objectives of the act are contained in the Object marked (a)(i) and (ii), particularly the second part which says:

The object of the act is to -

- (a) support Tasmania to take action on climate change by providing for -
- (ii) reporting and Parliamentary oversight of progress made towards achieving Tasmania's emissions reduction target and other targets;

Introducing another reference to reporting as an Object of the Act in 4(d) undoes the rationale of how those objects are organised and repeats the same issue in a different Object, as I understand it.

The bill also proposes reporting to parliament with our climate action plan, the provision of climate change risk assessment, emissions reduction and resilience plans, but also, annually, a greenhouse gas emissions report and an annual climate activity statement to the parliament each year from this Government directed by this legislation.

The greenhouse gas emissions reports are ones that we are obligated to table. We receive them from the National Greenhouse Gas Emissions Accounting System, which operates under the National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act 2007. We have a role in that. We support the process of tabling and adopting that. I believe that there are some sectors and government operations which have a role in submitting some information into that process in its annual cycle as well.

The Objects at the moment reference the Government's and Tasmania's emissions reporting obligations, both against our own target and plans and also other targets in section 4(a)(ii). To introduce reference to emissions reporting further in 4(d) might lead to some confusion between the architecture of those five objects that are guiding the legislation.

We do not support the amendment, but we are confident that the intent of the amendment is covered in the existing objects.

Dr WOODRUFF - Thank you, minister, for outlining that. We are not going to die in a ditch over this because I believe you are correct in saying that reporting in parliamentary oversight of progress made towards achieving Tasmania's emissions reduction target and other targets is in section 4(a)(ii). Our point is that 4(d) talks about, in addition, contribution to international emissions reduction as well as national and local government, so -

Mr Jaensch - Other targets in section 4(a)(ii) would cover that.

Dr WOODRUFF - Yes, that is right, but it does not necessarily cover the reporting in relation to adaptation measures. It has a different context in 4(d). To add it in reporting into 4(d) puts it in with emissions reduction reporting and adaptation measures.

We might be reporting not only on emissions reduction targets. We are, I understand, required to report to international bodies not only on targets but on other matters. Increasingly in the future, it will be the case that different agreements and frameworks are established not only around targets but it could be around export conditions, criteria for exporting the carbon dioxide footprint of goods that are traded - a whole range of things, some of which would be at the federal level.

My point is that it is not only around emissions targets, which is why we wanted to add reporting into that area. As you said, you understand it is covered. We will agree to disagree.

Mr Jaensch - Your amendment as it is written is specifically about emissions reporting.

Dr WOODRUFF - Yes, that is true.

Amendment negatived.

Mr JAENSCH - I have an amendment, Madam Chair. I propose our amendment to Object 4(e) on page 8 -

First amendment -

After the word "bodies,"

Insert "children and young people,".

With regard to the first, children and young people, you would be aware of some strong advocacy over some time for the specific reference to children and young people in this context.

Children and young people - as those with most of their lives still ahead of them, and therefore people who will be witness to and subject to the eventual effects of climate change for longer, and whose participation in measures to address climate change will be important for longer - need to have a role and a voice in decisions that affect them. We have had a number of proposals for other groups within society to be specifically referenced in this context, but we recognise that children and young people have a particular interest in this matter, given it is about their future - but also because we need to make special provisions for children and young people, as people who do not vote, and who are not part of advocacy bodies or organisations which may give them voice directly.

With the policy and how we intend to consult, we have talked in the second reading speech about ensuring how all the materials we produce need to be in formats that are going to be accessible to children and young people to enable their meaningful engagement in consultation. That is one example.

Through our processes we will also need to find mechanisms to ensure we are reaching them and channelling their engagement in consultation processes through offices like the Premier's Youth Advisory Council, the Commissioner for Children and Young People, and Tasmanian Youth Climate Leaders Program - as they have been involved in previous rounds of consultation on development of action plans and the bill itself.

Our proposal is to include that reference by adding 'children and young people' after 'bodies' in section 4 (e).

Ms WHITE - We support this amendment. We have the same amendment, and I note the Greens do too. There are further groups we would also like to add to this clause, but with respect to what is before the Chair now for a decision, I can indicate our support.

Dr WOODRUFF - We support this amendment. We had also crafted an amendment to this effect.

I am very pleased that the minister has listened to young people, presumably from the Premier's Youth Advisory Council; they have been some of the young people who are speaking up for this amendment. Hopefully just by looking out the window when the School Strike 4 Climate happened on numerous occasions, the young organisers brought together some of the largest street rallies we have ever had in Tasmania - young children carrying placards, striking from school, as Greta Thunberg herself started back in March 2019, before the 2019 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP25). She sat there outside the parliament every day in Sweden with a little sign she had made herself. She was only 12 or 13 at the time. She started something, and it has shown us that the power of one voice should never be underestimated. She is, of course, a leader in this space and remains so, and she is working across the world, but what we have in Tasmania and around the country are young people who have stepped up, spoken out and demanded action for their future.

Obviously, they have to be consulted; obviously, it is critical to consider the impacts of climate change on future generations. Everything we do and emit today is impacting upon them, so thank you minister for bringing this amendment in.

I am surprised that you did not fix this up at an earlier stage. I do not understand why that would be the case. The cynic in me wonders whether the last weeks of the commission of inquiry would make it a very unpleasant space to not be listening to the needs of young people because really, they are so important. I do not understand why it came in at the last minute.

Perhaps you could explain that, because this has been on the table since very early on, more than one year. Congratulations to whoever has done the last-minute lobbying.

I would like to move an amendment to this because it is unacceptable that the Government does not also include Tasmanian Aboriginal people.

Our amendment seeks for the amendment to be amended by inserting the words 'Tasmanian Aboriginal people' before the words 'children and young people'.

I propose the following amendment to the amendment:

Insert "Tasmanian Aboriginal people"

Before "children and young people,".

Tasmanian Aboriginal people, as well as children and young people, are critical peoples in Tasmania who must be consulted. That partnership must occur on all of the meaningful elements of action in this act. The Palawa/Pakana are the traditional owners of Tasmania. They are continuing custodians. Aboriginal communities across the state embody thousands of generations of accumulated relevant climate and ecological knowledge. The incorporation of this traditional knowledge as well as Aboriginal land management practices should be an essential element of Tasmania's climate change policy and legislation around Australia.

Other states are recognising the importance, the requirement, the urgency of incorporating first peoples' land practices and care into our colonial systems of land

management, which have effectively been mismanaged. We have desperately mismanaged the Australian island since we colonised it over 200 years ago. We have done everything we can to clear land and extract resources, to infect with weeds and pests and all manner of other heartaches. Aboriginal people around Australia have to witness and continue to see that destruction every day.

We strongly believe that Tasmanian Aboriginal people have a right and it is our duty to give them a voice in this most important Tasmanian piece of legislation. Their role in helping us walk through these difficult future years is critical. We are incredibly grateful for the knowledge they bear of how to live on this island. They have endured and expanded through glaciations, through extreme weather conditions, so they know, they carry that knowledge within them and their communities. We need to put them front and centre in this bill. We commend this amendment.

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - Dr Woodruff, could you please hand that amendment to the table.

Mr JAENSCH - I thank the member for her contribution. As Minister for Children and Young People and as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, I am very sensitive to ensuring that we are providing respectful, inclusive processes on something as important as climate change. We do not need to speculate on any dark political rationale for why these amendments are being brought. I am the Minister for Climate Change and Minister for Children and Young People, and I have the support of my colleagues to bring this amendment.

To the specific suggestion regarding inclusion, similarly, of Aboriginal people in this section of the act, my understanding is that Aboriginal people are included in the references to community bodies and the Tasmanian community in this same paragraph. There are a very long list of organisation types and groups within that broader community we could list. The more we add, we would always be leaving someone off. In choosing to reflect children and young people specifically we identified that they are in a slightly different category. They are not voting adults. They do not, perhaps, have direct avenues for representation and advocacy that other groups in society may. I include among them unions; we will have that discussion a few amendments down the track.

We certainly want to ensure that Aboriginal people are welcomed and valued in the processes of implementing this act but we believe in the drafting of this section of the act that 'community bodies' and 'the Tasmanian community' is sufficient to ensure that they are included and not overlooked as a group.

While there has been reference from a couple of submitters into our process that consultation with Aboriginal people should be considered, we have not had direct representation from Aboriginal people seeking separate recognition in the act as a group to be directly consulted with. I would not for a minute seek to discourage them from participating. We want to hear from everyone who has something to say and we acknowledge the unique perspectives of Aboriginal people among them. We believe that the wording covers them and ensures that they are recognised as part of the Tasmanian community and as community bodies in our legislation on that basis. We do not support the amendment to the amendment.

Dr WOODRUFF - That is very disappointing given that you hold the portfolio responsibility for Aboriginal people. I want to put this in context. This part (e) does not say,

'support a consultative partnership approach with community bodies, local government and the Tasmanian community'. If it said that, I would accept your logic.

Mr Jaensch - Well, it does.

Dr WOODRUFF - No it does not say that. It puts a whole range of other groups in before it says that. The groups it puts in are business first, industry second, scientific third, environmental fourth and community bodies. It names a shopping list of groups that are important but it does not name the Aboriginal people. It does not name the First Peoples of Tasmania. It does not put them in that list. It does not elevate the Palawa/Pakana for consultation and put them on the same level as business. I find that offensive. In a year where your Government is purporting to be working on treaty, when you are the Aboriginal Affairs minister, I find it offensive that the fact there were no Aboriginal representations specifically on this matter, is enough of a 'get out' for you to not feel that you need to include it. Which other groups would be more important than the traditional and ongoing custodians of this land, about which they know so much? They hold so much embedded knowledge. Why would we not want to go to them first on so many issues that are to do with adaptation planning, managing our natural places and retaining carbon stores? They know. They have great experience and they ought to be on this list.

I encourage you minister, to rethink this. There are no problems with changing your mind. I promise I will say 'there will be no egg on your face moment'. This is not a 'gotcha moment' by any stretch of the imagination. It simply makes sense to move us, as other states are doing. The State of the Environment Report federally has done this. Every single chapter, not only a separated area, incorporates Aboriginal knowledge in environmental management. That is a front and centre intrinsic in the climate change bill; that we have this knowledge recognised and their expertise listed as a group of people who ought to be consulted, especially above business, industry, scientific and environmental groups.

Ms WHITE - I indicate our support for the amendment to the amendment and recognise as the member for Franklin Dr Woodruff has, the bill explicitly names particular groups who will be consulted. It is right to point out that business is referenced and then industry is referenced. Two different sub-groups. I find that interesting and an important point to make when considering whether to include Aboriginal people and no doubt unions, when we get to that amendment, and whether it is appropriate and right to include them for consultation.

The first part of the sentence 4(e) says 'support a consultative partnership approach' and then it lists who that consultative partnership approach will be with. I would hope that the government wants to have a consultative partnership approach with Aboriginal people, with unions, with children and young people and the other groups that are listed here.

We are being pretty reasonable. We have not come into this place with an exhaustive list of different groups that we would like to see added. We are being responsible and identifying those key groups that need to be included. It is important that we have children and young people. It is good to see the Government has recognised that with their own amendment. Had they not, then the Greens and Labor would have moved the same amendment.

It is not onerous or difficult for the Government to agree to the amendment to include Aboriginal people. I foreshadow the inclusion of unions as well, the representatives of workers, many of whom will be at the forefront of the transition to help decarbonise our economy.

It is not an unreasonable ask, minister. We are not here with a shopping list of different groups to include. It is in the interests of supporting that consultative partnership approach that is outlined as the intent of this clause. It would be wise to agree to this amendment.

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - The question is that the amendment to the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 11

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

NOES 11

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Tucker
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Ms Finlay

Ms Ogilvie

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - The result of the division being 11 Ayes and 11 Noes, in accordance with standing order 257 I cast my vote with the Noes.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

[6.51 p.m.]

Ms WHITE - Madam Deputy Chair, I have an amendment to move on page 8, same proposed new section, paragraph (e) -

after 'government',

Insert ', relevant unions'.

I also indicate, Madam Deputy Chair, that I will no longer move the next amendment that I had planned to move because that amendment has already been agreed to by the House. I can withdraw that.

This amendment is about making it very clear in the Objects of the act who needs to be consulted in considering the impacts of climate change, particularly on future generations. This

goes to the conversation and debate we just had on the previous amendment about who is included in that consultative partnership approach with government to ensure that the best advice is received, and the most important stakeholder groups are represented at the table to ensure the best outcomes for our state.

Currently, that list reads that the Government supported a consultative partnership approach with relevant business, industry, scientific, environmental and community bodies, local government. It now includes children and young people and the Tasmanian community to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and build resilience to the impacts of climate change, considering the impacts of climate change on future generations.

This amendment by Labor is to include 'relevant unions' to ensure that they are also consulted, and so the Government can build a collaborative partnership approach with them in considering this significant issue.

That is necessary, in our view, because unions represent workers across our state. They have a unique perspective to bring to the table. The Government has identified they wish to consult with business and with industry: you have the bosses at the table, but you do not have a representative for workers at the table.

This is an opportunity to ensure that their voices are heard and, by giving them a seat at the table, building that partnership approach with them. It also assists in assuring that any transition that might be required for an industry or a business or a community is done in a way that is inclusive and upholds that principle of a just and fair and equitable transition.

Without that voice being at the table - and included in law as being required to be consulted by Government - I do worry how you will properly engage, in a structured way, to get that relevant advice.

Minister, there has been a concerted effort by this Government over time to remove unions from boards, from other consultative bodies that previous governments have included unions on. This amendment is about enshrining in law the requirement of the government of the day to consider unions as a partner in how we respond to climate change, the impacts of climate change, and also the impact on future generations.

It needs no further explanation beyond that. I hope that is clear to you. I take it from your earlier response to the amendment that you did not support it and you are probably unlikely to support this but I can indicate that we will continue to pursue this from the other place because, again, we have not come to this debate with a shopping list of different groups we would like to see included. We have been specific about the reasons why would like to see these particular groups included.

It is our hope that you will accept the goodwill and good faith with which we have brought these amendments forward. It is simply about making sure that in developing that collaborative approach, it is inclusive, and that voices who are not ordinarily heard by government are given a chance to be heard - particularly when we are talking about workers who might be directly impacted by transitions that impact on their job, job security, decent work and that principle of a just transition being upheld.

Mr JAENSCH - I thank the member for her proposed amendment and the rationale for it. I note that the current wording references under section 4 (e) support a consultative partnership approach with relevant business, industry, scientific, environmental and community bodies. Then we have added 'children and young people' after that.

From the Government's perspective in the drafting of this, we consider that the reference to 'relevant business and industry bodies' captures a broad range of stakeholders in the business and industry sectors, including unions - and that when we are talking about an industry sector, it is inclusive of the parts of that industry. We believe that, by the scope that is provided by referencing relevant business and industry bodies, unions would be counted amongst them.

We do note that we have not had direct representation from unions in the form of submissions to the review of the act, or a submission on a draft bill when it was out for public consultation. We would definitely welcome engagement with the unions in our consultation processes, particularly where the future of important industries in our state with large numbers of employees is concerned, but consistent with the previous amendment and the discussion regarding Aboriginal people.

We are making a separate case for children and young people, but we do not intend to specifically name other groups who we believe are captured within the broad terms of those relevant groups, including business and industry bodies, that are currently in object 4(e).

On that basis we will not support the amendment.

Ms WHITE - Minister, I am fascinated that you think industry and business bodies apparently include unions. That is a remarkable change in definition by your Government. I think the union movement would be both aghast at that, as I am, but also excited at the prospects now available to them when government is making appointments to boards and calling for representatives from industry and business bodies. They now know the door is wide open for them to put their hand up and get a spot on a government board.

Is that a change of definition from the Government now that an industry and a business body also includes a union, because if that is the case, that has implications for a number of other functions of government? You need to clarify that because, if it is not the case, what you have done is just misled the House.

Mr JAENSCH - I do not think there is anything for me to clarify. Our view is that in reference to 'relevant business and industry bodies', we would consider unions to be within that definition for the purpose of this act, and we would welcome the engagement of unions in the consultative processes that it refers to.

Ms WHITE - Minister, that is quite a surprise. I will be letting the unions know about this new broad definition the Government has, which includes unions in business and industry bodies. I reckon they will be knocking on your door to gain a spot on those boards where you have previously excluded - you cut them out - because you have just given them a pathway back. Is that not exciting?

What it does also demonstrate is your lack of understanding of what a union is and who a union represents.

Mr Jaensch - So you are happy and sad.

Dr Woodruff - I understand where Ms White coming from. It is the shock. It does not have any historical precedent.

Ms WHITE - No, this is the first occasion I have ever heard of this Government or any government claiming that a union and a business are the same thing.

Mr Jaensch - I did not say that. It said 'relevant industry of business and industry bodies.'

Ms WHITE - They are not. A union is not an 'industry body'. A union is not a 'business body'. They are fundamentally different and they are not included in your definition here as somebody who I can see you consulting with in a partnership approach because you continue to explicitly exclude them. If you were happy to include them, name them. What is the problem? They are most definitely not an industry or a business body - certainly never in my interpretation or any understanding of government definition.

If you think that they are, then you need to go back to the history books and have a good look at where unions came from. They represent working people. They represent the workers. They are not the businesses. They are not the industry bodies. They are not the TCCI. They are not the Small Business Council. I am pretty sure those industry and business bodies would also not like to be called unions.

It goes both ways, minister. You cannot say a union is a business and industry body. If you do, you are also saying that TMEC is a union, that the TCCI is a union, the Small Business Council is a union. You are clumping them all in together. They are different things. Your clumsy way of trying to explain how unions will be consulted has really caused a bit of confusion here. It would have been much simpler for you to support Labor's amendment to name them in a clear way so that future governments that are looking at this legislation and trying to understand how to enact it in practice have no confusion about how it should be applied because it clearly states that unions are also included in a collaborative partnership approach. It should not be a difficult task - just like it was not a difficult task to include children and young people.

If this Government wants to be inclusive in the way it manages things as important as climate change, it should seek to have everybody at the table who has a stake in the future of our state and decarbonising our economy. Unions should be at the table.

Dr WOODRUFF - Madam Deputy Chair, I rise to say that we support Labor's amendment and that the minister's response does not make any sense whatsoever. I am sure it will make the news somewhere some time because it is quite novel and it will set the industry and the unions' heads spinning. I do not know what the outcomes of it will be but we certainly think it is important to have not just industry and business but unions involved in consultations in this instance.

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 11

Dr Broad
Ms Butler
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Johnston
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms O'Connor
Ms White
Mr Winter
Dr Woodruff (Teller)

NOES 11

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Tucker
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Ms Dow

Ms Ogilvie

Madam DEPUTY CHAIR - The result of the division there being 11 Ayes and 11 Noes in accordance with the standing order 257, I cast my vote with the noes.

Amendment negatived.

[7.11 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH - I move our second of the couple of amendments under Object 4(e):

After 'change,'

Leave out "considering the impacts of climate change on future generations."

Insert instead "including considering the impacts of climate change on -

- (i) the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians; and
- (ii) future generations."

This is a response to strong representations we had, through submissions and directly to me as minister, regarding the need to recognise the impacts of climate change on individual people and their health and wellbeing. That is something that needs to be planned for as a risk associated with climate change that we, through government policy, need to have regard for.

We had strong advocacy from the AMA, in particular, and met a delegation of its members who spoke to us at length and demonstrated that they were very well informed and interested in a broad range of topics relating to climate change and people's health and wellbeing.

We are referencing the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians in the Objects so as to establish it at that high order of the intent of the bill, to have regard for that in the development of policies et cetera below it. I commend the amendment to the committee.

Ms WHITE - We will be supporting this amendment. I go back to the point I made earlier that it has come about because the Government took only 10 days to consider more than 60 recommendations they received last year before tabling the bill we are now considering. It was a rushed process to table that bill within 10 days of receiving more than 60 submissions, including the one from the AMA, which sought the change you are now amending your own bill to achieve. Had the time been taken to get this right, perhaps you would not have been in the position where you are amending your own bill.

We support this and recognise that it was in the submission from the AMA provided to the Government at the time submissions were called for but obviously duly ignored at that point. I am thankful you have seen the light and have amended your own bill now.

Dr WOODRUFF - I strongly support this amendment and thank the people from the AMA for their advocacy on this matter. There have been other groups of doctors. There is a Doctors for Climate group and Doctors for the Environment has been a longstanding organisation in Australia, which has been going for decades. Doctors for the Environment were the first people to draw attention to the health impacts of climate change and the importance of considering the integrity and function of the environment for people's health.

We are understanding more and more the intrinsic relationship between human health and the environment. We have nature conferences. Only two decades ago, when I was finishing my work at the National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, people were scoffing at the idea that being in nature would have beneficial effects for people. Some people set out to demonstrate that and now we have a very substantial body of international evidence showing how critical it is for people to be able to function well at all. This includes the impacts on a whole range of body conditions and illnesses, especially mental health, if we do not spend time connected to nature. The increase in violence, the increase in safety in cities are linked to the amount of connection people have to even grass growing on lawns outside their apartment buildings. To be able to see a single tree has been shown to have an effect at reducing violent incidences in highly urbanised areas in the US.

There is no doubt being connected to nature is essential but the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians captures much more than that relationship. I had a collaboration two decades ago with the national AMA about the importance of reducing anthropogenic emissions to try and hold our emissions at 350 parts per million. It would have been great if we had been able to achieve that but we have not. We are approaching 450 and 3 degrees of warming. Thank you to all the doctors and other health professionals who continue to talk about why we need to act on the climate emergency. They know and they see; when there are bushfires they see the impact in the hospitals of smoke-related incidences, among other things, so we support this.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms WHITE - Chair, I would like to move the next two amendments concurrently.

First amendment -

Same page, new proposed section, same paragraph -

Leave out "generations."

Insert instead "generations; and"

The first amendment is the as the one we just debated.

Second amendment -

Same page, same proposed new section, after paragraph (e)

Insert the following paragraphs:

- "(f) to ensure that vulnerable people do not bear a disproportionate impact of emissions reduction action and that no one is left behind, as articulated in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, women, children, youth and other persons, people's groups and communities in vulnerable situations; and
- (g) to ensure workers, communities and regions are supported through a fair and equitable transition to manage the risks and grasp the opportunities in the transition to a low-emissions future; and
- (h) to ensure a fair and equitable transition for all towards an environmentally sustainable economy is well managed and contributes to the goals of decent work for all, social inclusion and to ensure that no person is left worse off."

The reason, we have sought to amend the bill in this way is to make it really clear that the intent of this bill is not only to achieve emissions reductions, which has been set out already and has been discussed, but also, to make sure that the most vulnerable are protected from bearing the disproportionate impact, to ensure that workers are supported in any transition that might be occurring in their industry or business and to make sure that there are fair and equitable principles applied for our society and our economy.

Essentially, this goes to the earlier arguments we have had about what are the objectives of this bill, what are the principles that should underpin the action that is required to be taken to address climate change in our state. There is already detail in the bill about the need to take action to support ecology and environment.

I come back to the point that I made earlier that there is limited mention of people and community. There is a really important need to clarify that. When we are talking about climate action the objectives of the act need to be very clear. This is about protecting the most vulnerable and ensuring there is a just and equitable transition and that we make sure that no one person is left worse off. In decision-making, whether it be the ministerial reference group, or whether it could be, in the future, an independent oversight body or the Government making

decisions ordinarily through the course of its business, there needs to be an understanding of what the objectives of this bill are.

Currently, there is no mention in the Objectives of the Act about people or vulnerable communities, workers and how we make sure we support our economy to transition in a way that is fair and equitable. We think it is very important to have these included in the Objectives of the Act. Members have had time to read through them. The ministers have had these amendments for some time because they were drafted through OPC earlier this year and went through the Speaker's Office. I am assuming he has had an opportunity to see them. We regard this as being fundamentally important: to make sure this act operates well in the interests of all Tasmanians.

Dr WOODRUFF - We will support this Labor amendment. We support the intention. It is probably a little more wordy than I would have had but all of these ideas are important and separate in their own right - (f), (g) and (h).

It is very important to link what we do to the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. It is important on a number of levels, not the least of which is that many local governments are working assiduously on sustainable development goals - Greens Councillor Bill Harvey on the Hobart City Council in particular.

As a state and as a country we need to be tying what we do to those goals because they are about making sure that the impacts, which will not be evenly spread are not a burden and remain a burden on the most vulnerable people who are the least capable of financing or resourcing a response to them. We very much support (f) and we have discussed our support previously in Labor's amendment for an equitable and fair transition that was not supported by the Government. Finally (h), 'a fair and equitable transition for all towards an environmentally sustainable economy that is well managed and contributes to the goals and decent work': there is no economy that is not environmentally sustainable. We only have any sort of economy that functions because we have an environment that provides us with everything that we need for life. That is critical.

In having a sustainable economy, we must ensure that everybody has decent work, that people are included and that we do not leave out individuals and put them in the too hard basket. That was certainly the way the previous federal Liberal government was treating people on Centrelink, for example. Robot debt was a very dark part of Australia's history.

We support the amendment and I look forward to, hopefully, the minister supporting it too.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you, colleagues. Through the discussion, we have had elements of this discussion earlier on. We are broadly in agreement on the overarching sentiment that Labor is presenting with these amendments. These three new Objects would take the Objects back out to eight, rather than our five down from the original 10. There were a couple of others suggested which is not where we wanted to be with regard to simplifying the objects.

The intent of them, the fairness and the care for the vulnerable and ensuring that our development is sustainable and that there are not any unanticipated consequences of actions that mean that some parts of our society bear the brunt of a cost of change more than others, are principles that we would all very much agree on. They have been principles that have

played out very strongly, particularly through the last couple of years with COVID-19, and more recently in this winter, addressing cost of living pressures for Tasmanians. Our Government, as previous governments have and other governments in other places have responded by ensuring that the people who are unduly affected by circumstances beyond their control are looked after. We all agree on that.

When applied to this bill, I still have the overarching feeling that Labor and the Greens in their support for it are working on the assumption that doing something about climate change is going to be damaging to our economy, jobs and people's wellbeing whilst at the same time saying that not taking action on climate change will be damaging for people's jobs and the economy and people's wellbeing at the same time.

Our modelling and the approach to addressing climate change that this bill is built on and that our target is built on, indicates that our economy can be better off. Tasmanians can have more opportunities. We can have growth in our economy following pathways that simultaneously achieve emission reductions and help us to achieve our target. That is the win-win that we going for. I take the opportunity to reiterate that our Government does not go into this anticipating that we will be closing down industries and businesses with people losing their jobs. It is not the way we want to approach this.

That is why we are looking for that partnership approach with sectors and the industry, business, other groups who make them up -

Ms White - Go on, say unions.

Mr JAENSCH - We welcome the involvement of unions to find ways forward that are good for Tasmania, good for the atmosphere and good for Tasmanian jobs and families as well.

This is not the right place for these inclusions. They belong in a broader consideration of government policy and this is not the right place for them. We can point to examples of where these sorts of sentiments are being played out in the actions of government as we speak, and outside of things to do directly with a response to climate change and our emissions reduction target.

However, I will also point to the whole-of-government policy framework that will be developed by government in response to the review of the act, and, complementing the legislation, the bill in front of us now - which will adopt the principles recommended in the independent review, which include sustainable development and social equity, but also complementarity, which means that we do not undertake some initiative, some action, in the name of emissions reduction that has a consequential impact on something else that we are also committed to and doing.

We need to have that assessment of our actions to ensure that what we achieve on one hand does not create a problem somewhere else. Where we already have commitments to growing jobs for Tasmanians, ensuring Tasmanians have a bright future to look forward to and that their best interest and wellbeing is cared for, that would be an example of where that complementarity principle kicks in, so that we can audit our actions against any likely deleterious outcomes that we need to plan for or avoid.

Also, in these proposed amendments there are principles that I think we would all understand but which, written in legislation, might be tricky. I do not have specific advice on this. I have advice from my department, but I do not have drafting advice - but principles like no one person is worse off, and what constitutes decent work, for example, are quite subjective things to measure and determine. I am not familiar with them in the context of legislation like this, so that is a bit of new territory as well.

While understanding the intent, it will be difficult to implement, so for those reasons the Government will not be supporting the amendments laid out by Labor for new object (f), (g) and (h). There seem to be three named similarly, but I might have that wrong.

Ms WHITE - What I find most disappointing, minister, is that you have had these amendments for a while. We also did adjourn the debate last week for you to look in more detail at what you could and could not support.

Throughout the course of the last few hours of debate, there has been one amendment out of the many amendments that have been moved, of the 59 we are to debate, that you have come part way to supporting. Even though you have just stated that in principle you feel there is a lot of what Labor is proposing here you agree with, you have not endeavoured to include it in any way or shape in this bill.

I accept that perhaps there are some questions around drafting. We went through the Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC), which is great. We finally have access to legal drafting but if there are particular questions about a couple of words here or there that made you cautious, you could have come forward with an amendment to the amendment in order to give effect to the outcome that we are seeking to achieve.

As I said earlier, you and I are not that far apart when it comes to how we hope to see these principles actioned by future governments, but again you have reverted to your pessimistic view of the world that it is about shutting things down. It is not. It is about making sure we do protect the most vulnerable from a very disproportionate impact, and we see that right now.

As part of the National Electricity Market, Tasmanians are seeing increases in their power bills as a consequence of coal fire generators shutting down, or no longer contributing. You have an enormous disruption to the energy market, nationally, and Tasmanians are bearing the brunt of that. That is precisely why we believe that the objectives of the act need to clearly state that we protect the most vulnerable from bearing a disproportionate impact.

There are more Tasmanians, compared to the national average, who are older, who are on a pension and who receive some kind of income support. They are on fixed incomes and they do not have disposable or discretionary income to pay for an increase in power prices as a consequence of the decarbonisation of the energy market. That is precisely an example that is applicable today in Tasmania.

To the other point you made about shutting down industries, that is not what your Government is about. If industries are going to make decisions because markets are instructing them that they want a different outcome, they are doing that now. They are making decisions because they have become bored sitting at a global level looking at that global economy in a global environment. They are determining they have ESG obligations and they are factoring

in lower emissions profiles for their businesses. They are making adjustments, they are transitioning their workforce. Those things are happening irrespective of what government does, but what you can do is provide leadership to support that transition for the Tasmanian economy and community - but also, where are the opportunities? This is the conversation we had earlier.

How do we take advantage of those things? Again, that should be a clear objective of this act. In responding to climate change, Tasmania is well positioned to be at the forefront of investments in new technology, engineering, design, skills, training, application, innovation. It is very exciting, but there is no mention of that in the objectives of the act. That is what we were endeavouring to include because, right now, the objectives of this act are quite narrow. There could certainly be policy elements that sit beside this, as you have discussed. It would be good if we had clear laws that set out clear frameworks for businesses, industry, workers and our community to help guide those decisions.

Again, I make those arguments and express my frustration and disappointment that you, as minister, and the Government, have not been more constructive in wanting to work with us. We have obviously put in a lot of thought and effort, as have the Greens, to the amendments that we are moving to try and strengthen the rigour of this bill. If there are elements you think you can come at, I would have liked to have seen you try, but instead you are just dismissing them.

That is one of the flaws of the parliamentary system at times. You have the numbers and you can do that, but it would have been nice if you had at least come forward with something you could have supported that helped to achieve the objectives.

Dr WOODRUFF - I support what Ms White, the Leader of the Opposition, has just said. Of all bills, there have not been many - perhaps only the pokies legislation, voluntary assisted dying - just a handful of bills that have had such incredibly wide community interest, concern, action and engagement over years, really wrestling with this legislation to get the best possible outcome for our state and for our future.

The fact that there are so many of these amendments that, minister, you have not given very strong reasons for not accepting, and there has been so much time.

The UTAS Tasmanian Policy Exchange, the blueprint for climate-positive action is a massive document and more scientifically rigorous than even the Jacobs review. Some world-leading climate scientists have contributed to that, and it is really an outstanding document. Again, the same level of detail, with submissions, specific amendments - drafted amendments - to every single clause in this bill and sub-sections within it. To have not adopted the proposals made in good spirit - and you know how many meetings Climate Tasmania and the Independent Science Group have had with you, the Leader of the Opposition, myself and, I am sure, with independent members and members of the upper House as well. They are desperately keen to get the best bill we can to reflect the urgency of the heating climate. I am disappointed that you are not going to support this amendment.

I want to correct in your mind or for people listening: you seemed to say that the Greens would not be happy either way, that we think damage is going to be done, which is why we are calling for a strong emissions reduction, otherwise it will damage the economy. Yes, we are

doing that. If we do not take strong emissions reduction action, we will damage the economy enormously.

We also understand the science and the reality of what scientists are telling us. We know that even if we take actions at this point to reduce our emissions, we have left it too late to not suffer the impacts of the heating that is already baked into the system. We are feeling that. Australians, Tasmanians are suffering as a result of the ever-increasing extreme events. The impacts on the natural system are affecting farmers and people in so many industries. We cannot avoid the damage to the economy. We can buffer ourselves, we can prepare ourselves, we can try to be resilient. We can be as adaptive, nimble, connected and diverse as we possibly can. Diversity will be our friend in the future.

We cannot avoid it. This is not possible any longer. We left that time two decades ago. We especially left it a decade ago as a planet, and Australia has made an inordinately damaging contribution to where we are internationally with our emissions reduction today. An agreement Australia set before the Kyoto conference put our country on the path to being the international pariah we are today.

The current Labor prime minister is trying to repair some of the damage of the previous Morrison government. That will take a while but he cannot turn back the tides of time. We did not make strong reductions in 1997 with Kyoto and we are still not doing it here in this bill now because your Government is not accepting sectoral targets.

I want to correct the record. We have to understand that there will be damage to businesses even if we are nimble and adaptable, if we do incentivise. We all want the best outcomes for people. That is why this amendment from Labor is important because there will be vulnerable people who will be affected. It will not be even. Some businesses will rise and fall. It depends on us, on you, minister, on your Government. It depends on how quickly we act, how rapidly we draw down our emissions and how much we bring businesses along with us; to understand that the pain we feel today is far less than the pain we will feel if we have to make these cuts in two or five years' time. It is abundantly clear.

Mr CHAIR - The question is that the amendments be agreed to.

The Committee divided -

AYES 11

Dr Broad
Ms Dow
Ms Finlay
Ms Haddad
Ms Johnston
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms O'Connor
Ms White
Mr Winter (Teller)
Dr Woodruff

NOES 11

Mrs Alexander
Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Ellis
Mr Ferguson
Mr Jaensch
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton
Mr Street
Mr Wood (Teller)
Mr Young

PAIRS

Ms Butler

Ms Ogilvie

Mr CHAIR - The result of the division is Ayes 11, Noes 11. Therefore, in accordance with standing order 257, I cast my vote with the Noes.

Amendments negatived.

[7.49 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH - Mr Chair, I move that you do now report progress and seek leave to sit again tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Education, Children and Youth) - Mr Speaker, I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Greens Obsession with Labor Party

[7.50 p.m.]

Mr WINTER (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, I rise to go back not only to the contribution from Ms O'Connor this morning about what Labor was doing but also go through the media release she put out earlier today.

Ms O'Connor - You are sounding a bit cut, Mr Winter.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr WINTER - The media release mischaracterises what Labor has been doing in the House. It is also misleading in part so I will go through it exactly.

Ms O'Connor - Oh good. I love it when you talk about us.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr WINTER - The Leader of the Greens said that Labor had spent seven questions in parliament talking about trivial matters.

Ms O'Connor - The politics of the State Liberal Council from the weekend.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor. If you could allow the member to make his contribution on the adjournment in silence.

Ms O'Connor - I totally will.

Mr WINTER - Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Leader of the Greens might think that trivial matters are power prices. She may not understand that the cost of living is the biggest issue on the minds of Tasmanian households, of Tasmanian businesses and of so many Tasmanians, but Labor does. That is why we have been repeating questions to the Government about the reasons for their change of policy position.

It is a really important issue for Tasmanians. The House needs to understand the reasons for the Government changing its position. Not only do we not understand the reasons for the Government changing its position, the Government will not tell us when it changed its position. We do not know why it is no longer pursuing the policy instruments that it has at its disposal to deal with the rise in cost of living through power prices. All the Premier can say is to deflect to the federal Government and say, 'Look over there, maybe they won't deliver on their promise'.

This parliament should be holding the Government to account and that is what Labor has been doing. We will continue to pursue this matter because it is an important matter for Tasmanians.

In the media release, the Leader of the Greens also said 'we were shocked last week that the party of unions failed to ask one question of their 21 questions for the week about the ongoing industrial chaos in the Tasmanian public sector'.

I remind the House that we did. Of course, we did. Ms White asked the Premier about the cost of living, about power prices and also about their 2.5 per cent wages policy which directly impacts workers in the public sector. That is exactly what the question was about.

Ms Finlay asked the question of the Premier. Talking about today, we see exhausted, frustrated and desperate public sector workers feeling they have been left with no choice but to commence industrial action. Lo and behold, we asked a second question about this issue. Last week Ms Dow asked another question of the Premier - Tasmanian workers, including public sector workers, are paid on average \$10 000 less per year. That is three questions in a very easy search of *Hansard* of what the House did last week.

Ms O'Connor put out a media release to say that we did not ask a single question. She put it up on Twitter for people to believe. What Tasmanians need to understand is that you cannot believe what Ms O'Connor says about Labor because she is obsessed with Labor. She says we are not focused on the Government.

Every single question we ask, everything we focus on in this place is on the mismanagement of the economy by the Government, on their failure to deliver on the basics. We are sick of it. Just because we do not ask a question about a particular topic on a particular day, does not mean we do not care about it. We care enormously about the issues facing Tasmanians.

Ms O'Connor - Talk about a glass jaw. You have walked right into this.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr WINTER - There are so many issues that we cannot do it in seven questions every day. During the last session of parliament, Ms O'Connor criticised us for not asking questions about COVID-19. Today, Ms O'Connor did not ask any questions about COVID-19. Does that mean that she does not care about COVID-19? Of course, it does not. Your argument is completely illogical.

While you use valuable parliamentary time, like you did this morning, focusing on Labor instead of on the Government, which is absolutely hopelessly failing to deliver -

Mr SPEAKER - Order, member for Franklin. Could you please address your comments through the Chair?

Mr WINTER - Of course, Mr Speaker. Whilst the Leader of the Greens spends her time obsessing over Labor like she does, she is not doing her job, which is exactly what she accused us of doing today. That is what the Leader of the Greens accused us of doing today. She says 'The role of the Opposition is to hold government to account on critical matters of public interest'. That is not just our role, that is actually the Leader of the Greens and the crossbench role as well.

Why on earth she wants to spend her time obsessing over Labor, mischaracterising what happened in parliament last week, misleading with this media release, I do not know. In doing that she wastes valuable time that she should be using to hold this Government to account. It is not delivering on power prices, not delivering on the cost of living, not getting the basics right. She continues to sit back and allow crisis after crisis to continue in this state.

It is really important that this House does its job. It is really important that we have ministers that uphold the standards of this place and that means answering questions. Once again in question time today, we do not get straight answers to straight questions. We really want to know what is going on with power prices in Tasmania. What is the Government's new power policy? What is their position on power prices going forward? We have seen the chaos in the national market and this Government is not doing anything to help with these rising cost of living pressures on Tasmanian businesses and households and so, we will continue to ask the same questions. If we have to continue to ask the same questions over and over to try and get a response, we will keep doing that because we are focused on the basics. We want to see a government that gets the basics right.

Springvale Student Accommodation - Closure

[7.57 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - I think that is a flawed strategy, Mr Winter, but I appreciate that you spent seven minutes talking about the Greens.

Tonight, I want to, again, go back to an issue that we raised in parliament last week which is the pending closure of the Springvale Student Accommodation.

Mr Speaker, you would know because there are young people from your electorate who count on Springvale as a place to stay and further their education. It is not just years 11 and 12

students from the Tasman Peninsula. We have been contacted from parents from all over Tasmania who are very worried about the future of the Springvale Student Accommodation, which I remind members has been operating for about 70 years, providing a safe place for young people from rural and regional areas to further their education in the south of the state.

What the House needs to understand is that it is the Education minister's decision alone which lead to the closure of the Springvale Student Accommodation.

Mr Bob Gilmour who has run Springvale since about 2003 or 2004 posted to a group of Springvale parents the other night after seeing the minister's answer to our question in question time. He said:

I am appalled. Here are the facts:

- (1) I own a business called Springvale Accommodation.
- (2) That business has operated Springvale Hostel since 1 January 2004.
- (3) Springvale leases the hostel buildings. It does not own them.
- (4) At the end of 2019 this company was in good to excellent financial shape.

His business model requires 50 students to break even. Based on all factors, he anticipated a very good year for 2020 but, of course, that was before COVID-19 hit. COVID killed that.

- (5) By the end of 2020 the business was on the skids. For most of the year numbers were about 40.
- (6) We received no financial assistance from any quarter. We lost about \$2000 a week for the last 30 weeks of the year.

He says:

In March this year I went to the Department of Education for help.

Now, read this carefully -

He says to parents:

the first offer put to me was that the department would fund Springvale Accommodation Pty Ltd for the shortfall for terms 1 and 2. The hostel would then close at the end of term 2. In other words, the department and the minister felt comfortable putting 35 of your sons and daughters -

And he is talking to parents here:

and 13 of my staff on the street in the middle of the school year. I urge the department to rethink this -

They did, and the second offer was to support Springvale Accommodation Pty Ltd until the end of the year. That is where matters now stand.

What happened to my business is my responsibility. It happened on my watch and I accept responsibility, but the responsibility for closing the hostel is the department's and the minister's.

I have zero power in that space. The only solution the department offered is closure. The knee-jerk reaction was closure. The department's agenda was closure.

Says Mr Gilmore -

At no time have they suggested looking at a different model of operation, a different operator, a combination of the above, and at no time have they entertained any other proposition but closure.

We have the minister in here last week, off the Greens questions, basically saying that the closure has come down to a decision of the operator not to operate Springvale anymore. Now we know the operator went to government for help, and the department's first reaction was 'close Springvale'.

We have a facility there that has been counted on by rural and regional students and their families for decades. It has provided a secure accommodation option in greater Hobart for young people who want to study in Hobart.

What we know now is that a number of options have been put to parents. I have a here a letter from Sally McGushin, the education adviser for the National Council of Women in Tasmania. She wrote to the minister last week, off the back of a question that we asked. She says:

The lack of transparency about the decision to close Springvale epitomises the lack of respect shown to the Springvale staff, students and their families. So why is Springvale closing?

In Parliament on 18 August, Minister, you stated that it was Bob Gilmore's decision. It is not up to Bob Gilmore to close the hostel. Even if he made a decision to withdraw his services, it is still a departmental decision. The hostel belongs to the department.

Sally McGushin goes through a number of options that have been put to parents by the Springvale Change Group. One of the first things parents have been proposed with is starting with boarding at Hutchins or Collegiate, but as she says:

State school students will never really fit in there. No matter how welcoming staff and other students might be, the state school students will not be part of the wider Hutchins/Collegiate school communities and, moreover, these schools will be obliged to give their students priority.

She says:

Minister, you also mentioned TasTAFE. Firstly, they will only accept grade 11 and 12 students, not grades 7 to 10. Then, like Hutchins and

Collegiate, it will give priority to its own students and is unlikely to be able to guarantee students a place in the following year.

Then there was a suggestion from the Springvale team that parents look at Colony 47. Sally McGushin says:

There is no doubt that Colony 47 provides very valuable housing support to many folk, including school students, but those students should have an independent income. Do you expect the Springvale students' families to kick them out so they are entitled to youth allowance?

Then there was the suggestion of Jane Franklin Hall at the university, which takes in older residents. Then there is a suggestion to these parents of UTAS accommodation; home stay. Some parents are being told, like the Tasman Peninsula parents, that these children could do a hybrid model where they do some of their study at Tasman District High, for example, and some of their study in town.

The bottom line, Mr Speaker, is that minister Jaensch could save Springvale. Minister Jaensch, with an allocation of between \$150 000 and \$200 000 a year, could make sure that this accommodation option was there next year, the year after, and the year after that, as it has been for the last 70 years, Mr Speaker, providing an excellent and safe accommodation option for rural and regional Tasmanian students.

Time expired.

Matilda - Marist Regional College
Like You Like It - Hellyer College

[8.04 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Mr Speaker, I rise to talk about some productions that have happened in the beautiful electorate of Braddon.

First of all, I would like to talk about *Matilda*, a production put on by the Marist Regional College at the Marist school. My family and I went along and it was a sensational production.

It was a Roald Dahl story and followed very closely the movie *Matilda*, but it was a musical, so there was lots of songs and singing. It was funny, it was well done and they managed to recreate the story, including how Matilda gets the ability to move objects and so on. It was very clever how they made that come to life. I would just like to recognise some of the people who played the main characters.

Matilda was played by Leyla McCarthy. Ms Honey was played by Charlotte Jaensch. Agatha Trunchbull, who was the hammer-throwing principal of Matilda's school, was done by Charlotte Loring. Mr Wormwood was Fraser Perry. Mrs Wormwood was Georgia Williams. There was a large cast and it was a very well put together production.

I would just like to give a shout-out to the member for Braddon, Roger Jaensch, because I thought the highlight of the whole thing was the quality of singing that his daughter Charlotte

produced. It was simply amazing. A classic voice. Absolutely beautiful singing. From what I understand, Mr Jaensch was very proud when he saw it and might have even had a few tears, being so proud of his daughter. If that was my daughter up there singing I would no doubt be emotional also, because it was just sensational. Sheer talent, which she probably gets from her mother I think.

The other production I saw was a production by Hellyer College last week with my daughters and two of their friends, called *Like You Like It*, based on the Shakespeare play *As You Like It*. It was very much modernised. There wasn't impenetrable language and the like. It was based around 1985, so we saw some leg warmers and the like. The brand-new Arden Mall was hosting a high school dance, and bookworm Rosalind wants to go to the event with varsity wrestler Orlando. It had intertwining plot lines and some very good set work, and the set changes were very nifty. The quality of that production was also really good. Again, it was a really big cast.

I would just like to recognise some of the leading actors and actresses. Mia Kendly was Rosalind Duke. Kaylen Carona was Orlando Bateman. Sophie Harvey was Audrey Sheppard. Angela Brian was Olivier Bateman. Lilly Knight was Celia Duke. Jackson Prouse was Walter Touchstone-James. Amity Hutton was Sylvie Feldman.

The production was very well staged. The crowd had a great time. Just like *Matilda*, my children had a great time watching it, so much so that my oldest daughter now wants to be part of a production. That's very exciting and I hope that is at least one child who they have inspired.

Both of these productions were sensational. Once again it shows the quality of musical education on the north-west coast and we should all be very proud.

Aqua Spa - Salmon Protest

[8.08 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, I thank the Bob Brown Foundation and the community around Port Arthur on the Tasman Peninsula for their peaceful protest this morning. It started at 6 a.m. with three vessels blocking access to the Tassal lease by the *Aqua Spa*, soon to be owned by Cooke Canada. The mood among the community and the people on the vessels was very relaxed, calm, amicable and positive. The local community there have been trying for years to get Tassal - now Cook Canada - to do better and they have been utterly ignored and pushed away.

Residents have spent months of their lives negotiating and consulting in good faith with Tassal about the conditions in that lease. They have spoken out about the green slime. They have spoken out about the brown snot, and, they have just been given a hand by Tassal -

Members interjecting.

Dr WOODRUFF - Well, you can laugh, and you might if only it were a funny matter. It is a funny word to use for something as serious as a massive algal overgrowth but that is what community have been seeing in what was a beautiful, pristine, narrow, shallow piece of

water right near Port Arthur. The whole area has been utterly spoiled by Tassal's intensive salmon farming.

The police arrived and they were very amicable. They arrived about 9.30 a.m. and it was broken up subsequent to that but they managed to make it impossible for Aqua Spa to go into that site and to pump more fish into the pens. These are the pens that the chief spin doctor of Tassal, CEO Mark Ryan, promised the communities of Tasmania five years ago that Tassal would be moving out of inshore waters, out of Brabazon Point, out of Tinderbox. Instead, what has happened is he went back into Brabazon Point, he doubled down and went in with more biomass to Tinderbox and he opened an entirely new, utterly inappropriate inshore lease site at Long Bay.

The community was standing up because of the evidence of IMAS. IMAS produced an excellent report in February this year, *Rapid Visual Assessment of Rocky Reef Assemblages in Port Arthur*. They were looking at the prolonged heavy nutrient and sediment loads being put into the waterways by salmon farming pollution. They were measuring it and the effects because the damage of over-nutrication kills off canopy species, especially rocky reef plants and kelp, and it grows nuisance algal species.

Even though Tassal only stocked part of their leases, so there was a very small amount of fish relative to what there usually is, comparing it to reference sites at other places in Fortescue Bay, the IMAS found the beautiful high macro-algal canopy and pink encrusting algae in those other places was not present at all in Long Bay. Instead, there is nuisance green, nuisance red and other so-called dust and turfing algae. These are the things we euphemistically call green slime and brown snot because that is all we see. They do not provide a habitat for fish and native wildlife. What they do is make the water a big murky soup that nothing, effectively, can live in.

This was backed up by the IMAS report and by the EPA's report released in July, which also showed very concerning high levels of nitrogen, phosphorus and a whole range of other concerning high nutrient levels in this area. Despite the fact that it was a small and insubstantial piece of research relative to the IMAS, nonetheless, it substantiates the findings of the IMAS study.

What we know is that Tassal has been getting away with dumping raw sewage into this beautiful habitat.

Dr Broad - It is not raw sewage.

Dr WOODRUFF - Yes, it is. It is fish wee, that is sewage from fish, it is pollution that goes directly into the waterways. It is incredibly high in nitrogen and it is incredibly damaging to native wild life. It is also damaging to the local residents who knew and loved that place for what it always has been.

I will give the last word to a wonderful woman, Mabs Mollineaux from Bellerive, who wrote to the *Mercury* the other day, on 20 August. She said:

It should not take a 92-year-old woman to ask that you end the destruction in Long Bay. I made a submission three years ago to the Legislative Council inquiry into finfish farming. I outlined my observations of Long Bay over

89 years, from a child to a great-grandmother, including the terrible damage the bay caused by the introduction of salmon farming. Please, minister, put an end to the destruction caused by salmon farming so future generations can enjoy Long Bay as I once did.

Minister, the community has only started. They will be back.

Time expired.

Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide - Paul Family

[8.15 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Mr Speaker, on Monday 8 August, I was invited by Ms Madonna Paul to listen to her address at the Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide. It was an honour to attend and learn of her experience. I had met with her previously. I am going to read into the record tonight on the adjournment some of the information she provided at that royal commission. I must say, the royal commission was handled so professionally. It was really well done and I am very hopeful there are some good outcomes from the information provided at that royal commission.

Madonna Paul, whose husband took his own life after a decade of serving in the army, has described the Department of Veterans' Affairs as cruel and inhumane. Madonna Paul's husband, Michael, died in 2004 after struggling with post-traumatic stress disorder and mental health issues. Ms Paul told the Hobart sitting of the Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide that early in their marriage Mr Paul was a really easy-going guy who just loved life. She said:

His behaviour changed after raising concerns with his superiors at the Swartz Barracks in Queensland about the safety of Nomad aircraft which had been nicknamed 'Widow-maker'. Eventually, he was called in and was told to 'shut up, do your job'.

In 1991, one of the Nomad aircraft crashed, killing all four crew members, an incident that would change his life forever, his wife said. Ms Paul told the commission she was not aware of any debriefing or any critical incident discussions being offered in the wake of the crash. She said: 'He would come home from work and sit in the dark.' His moods became very erratic and there was some aggression. Eventually, the couple was offered a social worker at the air force base in Townsville. Ms Paul said:

I never got to meet with her but Michael did, and he told me that she had said that we were just having marriage problems. I was just shocked because I knew that before and I never did, I've never met her so she'd made a call without talking to me.

I commenced marriage counselling, thinking that was the issue, that obviously somebody's told him that that's the issue. But it wasn't.

The commission heard that after being discharged from the Australian Army in 1994, Mr Paul was relaxed for a bit before having a complete breakdown. Ms Paul said:

He was on his first light aircraft trip when they hit a storm. He called me when they landed and told what had happened and he was crying and he said, 'I can't do this. I can't get on these aircraft and keep doing this'.

The commission heard after a period of living rough, Mr Paul was eventually diagnosed with depression and received a white card for PTSD. Struggling with their son's attempt on his own life, Mr Paul was then prescribed medication by a psychiatrist. Ms Paul said:

When Michael was on that change of medication, that's when the moods would become very erratic. So, I was always adamant because I did have a power of attorney with his physicians that he would be hospitalised for that change to medication. Unfortunately, in the week before he died he was on changed medication and the physician didn't contact me to hospitalise him.

Following Mr Paul's death, Ms Paul struggled to access support from the Department of Veterans' Affairs until she contacted the ABC 7.30 program. When Ms Paul described the sequence up to Mr Paul taking his life, it was absolutely harrowing. It was absolutely devastating.

Within 24 hours after the story airing on the 7.30 program, Ms Paul had the DVA call her and people assigned to her case. 'They awarded me a war widow's pension,' she said. She was given \$130 000 in compensation from the DVA but said she had had around \$220 000 deducted as part of her war widow payment.

To find out you know, I said to them, 'I think you have made an error, because I have just done simple maths and I have already paid this'. 'Why is this still being deducted,' she said. The woman from DVA scoffed and said, 'It is perpetual. You will be doing this for the rest of your life.'

Ms Paul said the experience of dealing with DVA after her husband's death nearly 20 years ago had deprived her of having a half-decent life, because 'you are living on next to nothing anyway and trying to make every ends meet. It's very stressful', she said. 'It just brings it all back and you have to go through it again and tell the story again. I do not understand the politics behind it but it is a very cruel and inhuman treatment.'

Ms Paul called for Australia to examine how other countries were helping veterans, including having services delivered by people with lived experiences. 'I have suffered at the hands of DVA generational and systemic abuse and it needs to stop,' she said. 'No one knows what to say after a suicide. They do not know what to say. I mean I can remember people saying, time is the greatest healer. Honestly, time does not heal it. Having a great trauma specialist heals it.'

National Health Commissioner, Alan Woodward, told the hearings that:

Any government policy aimed at preventing suicide must be driven both those with lived experience. The quest for suicide prevention will be so much

more effective if we listen and respond to the people we are seeking to serve and support than if we try to do it without those voices.

This has been a problem in suicide prevention where the input perhaps at times has been dominated by those who do not have the lived experience perspective.

Mr Woodward said:

A disproportionate number of Australian veterans were dying by suicide.

He told the Commission that:

Statistics showed deaths by suicide were more common for those who had left service involuntarily. Which further raises the importance of not just looking at the transition process where a person is moving from Defence to non-defence status when they are doing that not necessarily of their own accord for whatever reason might be associated with it.

More support was needed during that transition period. Big changes are stressful, but where a change is brought about from someone else's decision, not your own, then that is going to be even more magnified stress. It may raise all sorts of profound issues for that person about their sense of purpose, who they are, an identity and where they go from here.

So, on behalf of the Tasmanian Labor Party I would like to thank Madonna Paul for her input. It will make a difference.

Time expired.

**AGFEST
Salmon Industry
Agricultured
Fire and Ferment**

[8.22 p.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Mr Speaker, this evening I rise on adjournment to shout out to AGFEST, the incredible organisation of young people across Tasmania, part of rural youth who do so many things throughout the year in Tasmania to support young people in regional Tasmania and also to support our incredible agriculture sector.

For months now, they have been working so hard around the clock to put together an unusual AGFEST, off the back of a lack of AGFEST in August this year. I want to shout out to the Chair, to the Committee, to the volunteers. They do an extraordinary job. They are clearly future leaders of Tasmania, 15- to 30-year-olds who can put together the premier field day for Tasmania, a massive Tasmanian success story. They are just phenomenal.

As is often the case, it has been a little wet over the last couple of days so they have made some last-minute encouragements for people to make sure that you go in early and be really

aware of the instructions on how to get in and where to park, and how to keep people safe. They had a lot of trouble getting the event because of the initial COVID-19 restrictions and so, are asking for people to pay respect to the site, respect to the COVID-19 conditions, respect for all of the implementation around support for foot-and-mouth as well.

So, a big shout out to AGFEST and Rural Youth, you guys are incredible. You do a remarkable job. Unfortunately, no one in this place can be there over the next couple of days because of the proroguing of parliament. Now we are lumped with this week, but no doubt many of us will be there on Friday to support you and to be with you. We wish you all very well.

Mr Speaker, I also rise unexpectedly tonight on adjournment to back-in our incredible Tasmanian salmon industry, an industry that stands behind and supports much of regional Tasmania. Many young clever people have been attracted to Australia, and particularly to Tasmania, because of the great industry that has been developed here in short time, and is not only leading in our Tasmanian farming and agriculture, but nationally as well.

We know that the people who commit their lives to this career are family people. Although it has only had a short history, there are many parents and children working in communities right across Tasmania and they deserve our support and they deserve people to stand up in this place and let them know we have their backs. We know salmon is a great product. I was just in the parliamentary dining room a while ago and had salmon and vegetables for dinner. It is a great product in terms of feeding the world. We have an incredible reputation internationally for the great products we produce here, the great work we do, the science that we are leading, and the technology that we lead.

It is not just about people putting themselves at risk and going out into a really risky environment, which is appalling when they are potentially at threat in moments like this morning, not only the people out on the jobs. I have had a great opportunity to meet divers, workers, people making nets, workers for the onshore facilities around the hatcheries, and also super-clever scientists and tech people who are doing remote feeding and all sorts of amazing things. There is no question why we have attracted the attention of the world in a really positive way.

So, I want to stand up and back them tonight. Thousands of Tasmanians themselves rely on this great work. They are leading and well-supported, backed by reliable, credible science. Much of that science is done right here in Tasmania year on year, with surveys done across Tasmania. An increasing number of people recognise the importance and the contribution the Tasmanian salmon industry makes in this community. We are proud of our industry that continues to deliver.

Finally, I just want to acknowledge a local event in Launceston, northern Tasmania, that is taking both national and international acclaim - a fairly new event called Agricultured.

Agricultured occurred in Launceston again over the last couple of weeks, and was the first event last year. It was extraordinary, bringing together people and having and starting great conversations in our community, whether it be around agriculture, food, tourism. It was partnered not only with FermenTasmania, but also with Launceston being announced recently as a UNESCO City of Astronomy. They also, in the lead-up to the event, launched their new brand and really focused on the importance of all of the things we know and love about

Tasmanian produce, producers, creators, chefs and communities at an excellence level, but also the incredible connections of all levels that are made in communities when we gather around food.

I was pleased to attend the producer's dinner at Grain of the Silos. It was lovely to have local producers putting their products on a plate and great local storytellers. Rostella Roost made the poultry that we ate, and then some duck farmers told a great story about their ducks as well. It was a really great night

To finish up on one of my favourite things in the world: anyone who knows me well knows I love fire, and I love food cooked on fire, and one of my favourite places in northern Tasmania is Timbre. On the Saturday evening, Timbre hosted Fire and Ferment, a dinner that celebrated all the incredible local produce - very tightly local - to the Tamar Valley, cooked it across the fire and served it up beautifully. At the end of this event was an opportunity to raise much-needed funds for RAW - Rural Alive and Well, a great organisation doing a lot in our community to support people, whether it be our farmers or our fishers, many of whom are struggling right now and do need more ongoing support.

So, a great night celebrating all that is good in Launceston, Tamar Valley and northern Tasmania. I would just like to recognise all their efforts this evening.

The House adjourned at 8.29 p.m.