



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

REPORT OF DEBATES

Tuesday 27 September 2022

REVISED EDITION

Contents

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS	1
QUESTIONS.....	1
COST OF LIVING - PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT	1
PUBLIC SECTOR PAY CLAIM- PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT.....	3
GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES - PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT	5
MENTAL HEALTH WEEK IN TASMANIA	6
TASMANIAN RACING INDUSTRY - DAVID SYKES REVIEW INTO ANIMAL WELFARE	8
ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE - PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT.....	9
HOUSING LAND SUPPLY ORDERS - PUBLIC, SOCIAL AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	10
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY - LAUNCESTON GENERAL HOSPITAL STAFF.....	12
HOUSING CRISIS - PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT	14
DERWENT FERRY SERVICE - EXPANSION	16
PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT - OPPOSITION	19
CHILD SAFETY - WORKFORCE SUPPORT	21
PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT - ONGOING RUNNING COSTS.....	23
PROPOSED STADIUM DEVELOPMENT - ONGOING COSTS.....	24
POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT - INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT	25
PERSONAL EXPLANATION	26
MEMBER FOR BASS - MS FINLAY	26
HEALTH LEGISLATION (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS) BILL 2022 (NO. 19).....	27
BILL AGREED TO BY THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL WITHOUT AMENDMENT.....	27
MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	27
CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION - QUEEN ELIZABETH II	27
JUSTICE MISCELLANEOUS (ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES) BILL 2022 (NO. 41)	28
STATUTORY HOLIDAYS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (No. 40)	28
FIRST READING	28
MOTION	28
SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS - MOVE MOTIONS	28
MOTION	29
LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE - LEAVE DENIED	29
MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE	38
STATE OF THE HEALTH SYSTEM	38
STATUTORY HOLIDAYS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (NO. 40)	47
SECOND READING	47
STATUTORY HOLIDAYS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (NO. 40)	49
SECOND READING	49
TRIBUTES TO HER LATE MAJESTY THE QUEEN	54
LAND USE PLANNING AND APPROVALS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (NO. 29)	84
SECOND READING	84
ADJOURNMENT.....	98
IRAN'S FEMINIST REVOLUTION	98
DEFENCE AND VETERAN SUICIDE INTERIM REPORT	100

TASMANIAN ROWERS - TRIBUTE	104
JOHN LEWIS PERKINS - TRIBUTE.....	104
WORKPLACE PROTECTION LAWS	105
HOBART CITY MISSION - SLEEP ROUGH.....	107
SAFE SPACE - NIGHT PROGRAM	107
TASMANIAN ROWERS - TRIBUTE	109
TASRACING - HARNESS AND GREYHOUND TRACKS ON NORTH-WEST COAST.....	109
DAVID SYKES - REPORT INTO ANIMAL WELFARE	109
HELLYER COLLEGE - <i>LIKE YOU LIKE IT</i>	110
PRIORITIES FOR TASMANIA.....	111

Tuesday 27 September 2022

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

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Mr SPEAKER - Honourable members, I draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of the Mental Health Council of Tasmania. Welcome to Parliament House.

Members - hear, hear.

QUESTIONS

Cost of Living - Proposed Stadium Development

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.01 a.m.]

Right now you are so out of touch with Tasmanians that you cannot see their number one priority is dealing with the soaring cost of living. Tasmanians are struggling to keep up with the cost of groceries, their power bills have gone up 12 per cent because of your broken promises, and you have slugged them with a new bin tax but all you can talk about is building a new \$750 million stadium in Hobart. In the middle of a cost-of-living crisis, why are you so obsessed with building a new stadium in Hobart?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question and her interest in this matter. All members of parliament representing their constituents are interested and mindful of the cost-of-living pressures on all Tasmanians. For example, this side of the House has made our feelings known to the federal government about the impact of the fuel levy rebate. We are wondering how you are going over that side in lobbying for the continuation of that fuel levy rebate. The member, when she gets up for her next question, might like to inform the House about her lobbying efforts, and that of the state Labor Party, given the impact of fuel on cost-of-living pressures and the flow-on effects of high fuel prices in terms of increased food prices as a result of transport, agricultural production and the like.

Cost-of-living pressures are impacting not only in Tasmania but across the nation and the globe. There are many global factors: inflation and interest rates are going up and this is worrying for many, especially home owners. We also know from household demand figures, that spending on petrol, transport and groceries, which is impacted by fuel and transport costs, is one of the biggest outlays for people at this time. These costs are hurting Tasmanians.

You have abandoned Tasmanians by agreeing to a fuel tax hike in coming days, even though the federal government expects a \$50 billion budget boost. The extension of that fuel tax rebate for a little longer would alleviate the pressures on Tasmanians when it comes to cost of living.

We are responding and supporting Tasmanians with cost-of-living pressures. We acknowledge the impacts of cost of living. Some \$305 million in our State Budget reflects that when it comes to supporting low-income Tasmanians with the impact of cost of living.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, I am not going to put up with the constant interjections on the Premier. You have put a question to the Premier and he is answering it. The Standing Orders indicate, as we all know, that when a member is on their feet, they should be listened to in silence.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The 2022-23 Budget and forward Estimates provided \$305 million in concessions to help vulnerable Tasmanians with day-to-day living expenses. You can add \$17 million resulting from our winter bill buster of support to concession customers to that as well. Concessions provided by the Government each year help with expenses such as electricity costs, water and sewerage, and council rates. The concessions provided by the Government make a real difference to those in need. That has been reflected in correspondence I have received.

An eligible electricity concession card holder can receive \$575 in annual assistance with electricity costs. This is revised annually to reflect any increase in prices approved by the Tasmanian Economic Regulator. Last year, for example, the energy concession was \$513 and it has increased some \$61 this year. Also, this year, concession customers will receive additional support with a one-off payment of \$119 appearing on their bill from this month, through our winter bill buster support.

From 1 July 2022, water and sewerage concessions of up to \$211.50 will be available to eligible concession card holders. That is \$105 for water services and \$105 for sewerage services. In 2022-23 eligible concession card holders can receive council rates remission assistance of \$345 per annum as a TasWater customer or up to \$507 for ratepayers who are not TasWater customers.

As I have said many times in this House, we are also supporting the organisations that support vulnerable Tasmanians, such as our neighbourhood houses, some 34 community houses across the state -

Mr SPEAKER - Can you wind up, please, Premier?

Mr ROCKLIFF - receiving a one-off payment. Included in that is the \$5 million commitment to support the organisations that support vulnerable Tasmanians.

We are very mindful of the cost-of-living pressures on Tasmanians. We are very focused on ensuring we have targeted support for Tasmanians on fixed or low incomes, as we should, supporting Tasmanians most in need. What will also support Tasmanians is the extension of the fuel levy rebate. This side of the House had advocated for that extension. I am not sure what is happening over there.

Public Sector Pay Claim- Proposed Stadium Development

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.09 a.m.]

Nurses, teachers and other public sector workers are walking out of our hospitals and schools because they are at breaking point and you are not listening. After two years of working through some of the most difficult conditions imaginable, they are now seeing their workloads getting worse, not better. This has terrible consequences for Tasmanians who rely on public services. You are adding insult to injury by claiming you can only afford to pay them 3 per cent more this year, when their cost of living is going up by more than twice that.

Do you realise how out of touch you sound to Tasmanians when you say your priority is spending \$750 million on a stadium in Hobart rather than delivering better pay and conditions in our schools and hospitals?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question. I do not accept the premise of her question. My priorities for all Tasmanians are health, education, housing and cost of living. Those are my priorities, and I said that from day one as Premier.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - That remains the fact, Mr Speaker. They will always be our priorities, as well as growing our Tasmanian economy and supporting more jobs, as we have done since coming to government, with 29 000 more jobs created in this state. In fact, my understanding is that there are more Tasmanians employed now than ever before. We are proud of that record of supporting people into work and creating the economic conditions that enable small, medium and large businesses to thrive. Therefore the funding circulates around in our community, people are employed, and people contribute to their community through that employment.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - We will always support vulnerable Tasmanians who are unable to access work opportunities, which is why we are focused on cost of living and why we are spending record amounts such as \$1.5 billion into housing over the course of the next 10 years, \$1.5 billion into health infrastructure over the course of the next 10 years, and more police on the beat.

Mr Speaker, I tell you what the public service fears most and that is another shot at a Labor-Greens government, which we saw in 2010 to 2014, where they sent 10 000 people to the dole queues as a result of their economic credentials. Their government released an economic development plan and three months later the place was in recession. That is how good they are at managing the economy and supporting Tasmanians into work. People will

not forget their priorities and the 2011 budget where their number-one priority was closing 20 schools around regional Tasmania and sacking a nurse a day for nine months.

Dr Broad - You do not even know how many nurses you have.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, Dr Broad, order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - This Government has employed some 1300 more FTEs in our health system since July 2020. We have ensured we are supporting our paramedic workforce by increasing it by some 270 FTEs. We are ensuring we are reversing all the cuts to community safety; where those opposite sacked police officers, we are re-employing them. When we talk about valuing our public service, we value that by building their capacity and providing more opportunity, more employment and more people in our public service.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I have always said that we will negotiate in good faith with industrial advocates. I had a productive meeting with representatives of the unions a few weeks ago. We have put an offer on the table and I look forward to hearing back from the unions.

We value our public sector workforce. Last night I was at an awards ceremony recognising our hardworking and dedicated public service across various departments - Police, Health, Department of Premier and Cabinet, TasRail and others across the whole of government. Some had 25 to 35 years of service, and some 40 years in the public service. One person I had the absolute pleasure of thanking and recognising had been working diligently in a dedicated way with an enormous commitment of 50 years in our public service.

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

Mr ROCKLIFF - I take my hat off to each and every one of them. We are a government that values our public service. We have built capacity with our public service through employing more people across Health, across Education -

Ms White - This is a pretty pathetic defence of your stadium priority.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, Ms White.

Mr ROCKLIFF - There are more teachers in our schools and more nurses in our hospitals than there were under the Labor-Greens government, which focused on closing schools and shutting down hospital wards.

Government Priorities - Proposed Stadium Development

Ms O'CONNOR question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.15 a.m.]

Tasmanians are sleeping in tents because they cannot find a home. People are dying on the elective surgery waiting list, or while waiting for an ambulance or ramped outside emergency departments. We have industrial action from essential workers from across the State Service: firefighters, child safety officers, paramedics, and nurses. Tomorrow, teachers are taking to the streets. All feel undervalued and deprioritised yet you push ahead with your unnecessary fantasy football megastadium and tell Tasmanians you are committed to the state chipping in close to half a billion dollars to make it happen. Where did you go so wrong with your priorities? Is this the Government of heart you promised Tasmanians you would lead?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question. Our priorities are very clear. Our priorities are health, education, building capacity across our public service, supporting our child protection employees and recruiting more. I understand that recruitment is progressing well when it comes to supporting people and building capacity within our child protection and safety services. These will always be the priorities of our Government; I want to make that very clear. Hospitals, schools, public housing - and our budget clearly demonstrates that. Whatever you might say, our budget clearly demonstrates the investment we are putting in to all those key areas across Tasmania.

They are essential services that Tasmanians care about, such as the investment in elective surgery. The member mentioned waiting lists. They have come down from 12 200 in January 2021 to around 9200 now on our elective surgery waiting list. Our focus has been very clear in that area, working with clinicians on our clinician-led, patient-focused four-year plan. By listening to people working at the coalface and backing that up with investment, we are seeing a significant drop when it comes to our elective surgery waiting list. I say they are still too high. I have always said that, but it is coming down and heading in the right direction because of our investment.

There is our investment into affordable housing and public housing. Our commitment of over \$1.5 billion over the course of the next 10 years highlights our focus, and this is a priority for our Government. Every single Tasmanian, absolutely and fundamentally deserves and has that fundamental right to be safe and have a roof over their heads. That is the focus of our Government.

Members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - That is why we are reforming when it comes to Housing Tasmania. Shame on you for being the roadblock when it comes to that reform which allows more.

The cost-of-living focus is another priority area for our Government, with \$305 million of concessions, the \$17 million we are investing into the winter bill buster, and the \$5 million supporting the organisations that support vulnerable Tasmanians.

There are also the reforms we are making in mental health. I acknowledge the Mental Health Council of Tasmania representatives here today. I will be speaking about Mental Health Week later on, particularly at lunch time. There are significant reforms into Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services: some \$45 million investment in reforming that area and ensuring we have more services to support our children and adolescents when it comes to mental health. We are reforming mental health in terms of integration, with new programs such as PACER, our Police, Ambulance, and Clinician Early Response team, mental health clinicians, and emergency response team.

Since January this year, 1000 people have been supported in the community, and 80 per cent of those people have been cared for in the community by that emergency response team triaging and supporting people with acute mental illness who would otherwise have gone to an emergency department.

These are the investments and reforms we are making as a Government. They signal very clearly the priorities of this Government. They always will be.

Mental Health Week in Tasmania

Mr TUCKER question to MINISTER for MENTAL HEALTH and WELLBEING, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.21 a.m.]

Can you update the House on how the Tasmanian Liberal Government is supporting all Tasmanians to improve their mental health and wellbeing ahead of Mental Health Week in Tasmania, which commences on 8 October? I also welcome the Mental Health Council here today.

Members - Hear, hear.

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for Lyons for his interest in this matter. Like me, he is very interested in supporting more services when it comes to mental health and wellbeing, particularly for rural and regional Tasmania.

As a Government, we are committed to improving mental health outcomes for all Tasmanians. I have just finished my previous answer with an example of exactly what we are doing with our PACER team.

A strong economy enables us to deliver essential services for Tasmanians, and is enabling us to build a better mental health system with a focus on early intervention and prevention, more community-based options and new facilities.

This is underscored by a significant investment of some \$370 million in this important area since coming to government in 2014: the PACER - a rapid response service for acute mental health stress in our community; \$5 million to completely transform child and adolescent mental health services; a Tasmanian lifeline, a call-in and reach-out service for psychosocial

support; building 27 new mental health beds and wraparound services, the Peacock Centre, and St Johns Park.

Mental Health Week will be held from 8 to 16 October this year. I encourage all members and Tasmanians listening to participate in events held across our state, from bush dances to trivia nights, art, music, story-telling, educational workshops, exhibitions, films, dog-walking, gardening, comedy shows, and everything in between. You can find out what is on in your area by visiting the Mental Health Council of Tasmania's website.

This year's theme of Awareness, Belonging and Connection highlights key aspects that are needed to boost mental health and wellbeing and build resilience. Having conversations about mental health can reduce stigma and encourage our communities to value our mental health and wellbeing as much as our physical health. We can all check in and talk with each other, our families, friends, neighbours and colleagues, and encourage people to seek help where they need it and develop an understanding of when we might need to reach to help ourselves.

Our Government is providing more mental health and wellbeing services and supports than ever before through our overarching mental health plan for Tasmania, Rethink 2020, and the Tasmanian Mental Health Reform Program.

I acknowledge some of our key partners in this work and the representatives in the gallery today: Flourish, Mental Health Families and Friends, GROW, The Link, Wellways, Baptcare, Colony 47, Lived Experience Australia and the Tasmanian Health Service.

People with lived experience of mental health challenges, and those who have lived experience as a family member, friend or carer supporting someone living with mental health challenges, are central to delivering contemporary recovery-focused and compassionate mental health services in Tasmania. Their expertise and voice provide us with vital insights into the challenges that consumers, families and carers can experience. These insights help us to enhance people's interactions with mental health services and supports, and ultimately aid in their recovery.

Our commitment to integrating the voice of lived experience into the mental health system is evidenced by our support of Tasmania's Lived Experience workforce strategy, with implementation of the strategy being led by the Mental Health Council of Tasmania.

The inclusion of Lived Experience representatives and Lived Experience workers in new and existing services such as the Peacock Centre and the Mental Health Hospital in the Home will lead to better health outcomes by improving the experiences of consumers and their loved ones, and providing further employment opportunities for people with lived experience to join the mental health workforce.

I thank them for the valuable work they all do. They are living proof that with the right care and support, we can give people the very best chance to live positive and fulfilling lives.

Tasmanian Racing Industry - David Sykes Review into Animal Welfare

Ms JOHNSTON question to MINISTER for RACING, Ms OGILVIE

[10.25 a.m.]

I have finally received, through the right to information process, the David Sykes review into animal welfare undertaken at the request of Tasracing. The review makes 83 recommendations for improving the welfare of racing animals, noting there are significant structural, leadership and staffing concerns at both Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity (ORI), and a lack of focus on animal welfare. One of the most alarming aspects of the review is that ORI did not participate in the consultation at all. To quote Dr Sykes on page 4:

I was ... unable to examine welfare data and statistics collected by ORI and could not make meaningful comparisons with similar data collected by other racing authorities.

Additionally, I was unable to discuss welfare-related protocols that ORI has in place.

ORI has racked up quite a list of failures. It has turned a blind eye to licensing requirements for trainers in flagrant breach of the Dog Control Act. There are serious concerns over animal welfare enforcement, and now it will not even participate in Tasracing's internal welfare review.

Can you really expect the community to believe you take animal welfare seriously when the Office of Racing Integrity, under your watch, failed to participate or provide data to a crucial report into racing animal welfare?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank Ms Johnston for that very important and serious question. Of course we take animal welfare seriously. Before I start, I note that the review was actually released so I am not sure why you felt the need to RTI it. It was publicly available. It has been made transparently available.

Ms Johnston, I have also taken the time to write back to you in relation to the last question you asked in parliament, even though you did not like to mention it. I am very happy to provide information at any time.

The Tasmanian Government is a very strong supporter of the Tasmanian racing industry, which makes a vital contribution to our economy and employment, particularly in regional Tasmania. We are committed to improving animal welfare outcomes in the racing industry across all three codes. The Government and Tasracing are investing more money than ever before into greyhound and horse welfare to ensure they are treated with dignity and care before, during and after their racing days.

During April 2022, Dr David Sykes was engaged to conduct a comprehensive review of Tasracing's animal welfare department, including current programs. Dr Sykes is an internationally renowned regulatory veterinarian. The review was communicated to a range of internal and external stakeholders all of whom were offered the opportunity to engage with

Dr Sykes and provide input. The resulting review was provided to Tasracing on 1 August 2022. The review makes 83 recommendations. While these recommendations are appropriately and properly considered by Tasracing, an immediate analysis of the paper shows that six of the recommendations are already in place, and a further 30 recommendations are already underway.

Tasracing is now considering the review in detail, and will determine an appropriate plan to action relevant recommendations - entirely sensible, of course. Subsequent updates will be provided in due course.

Tasracing publicly released the review on Monday 26 September. This shows that Tasracing and the Tasmanian racing industry are committed to transparency and industry performance reporting.

Access to Health Care - Proposed Stadium Development

Ms DOW question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.30 a.m.]

Irene Zielinski lives in constant pain and discomfort and has been waiting to see a specialist for two years. Living in constant pain is having a severe impact on her daily life, her sleep and her mental health and wellbeing. There are more than 55 000 Tasmanians waiting to see a specialist and over 9000 waiting for elective surgery. Can you explain to these Tasmanians why your priority is spending \$750 million on a stadium in Hobart instead of prioritising Tasmanians getting access to the health care that they so desperately need?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for her question. She mentioned the outpatient waiting list. This is the waiting list that those opposite hid from Tasmanians and that we had to RTI, and we now regularly update Tasmanians in an open and transparent way. The list is at 55 000, it was at 59 000, so it is coming down progressively but it is still too high. I recognise that, which is why we have the Outpatient Transformation Program, a considerable investment, to ensure we bring that waiting list down.

I commend our team across our Tasmanian Health Service for the extraordinary job they have done with the massive disruption throughout the pandemic. The fact that we are reducing our waiting lists while we have had the disruption of the pandemic is an extraordinary effort and the result of commitment by all of those on the front line of our health service.

The member raised a matter of a personal nature with respect to Irene. Of course I am aware of her circumstances and that she has been waiting an extended period for a neurosurgery outpatient appointment. I have requested that the hospital make direct contact with her and address and discuss her concerns, and encourage her to seek an updated referral from a general practitioner outlining her current symptoms and updated imaging, which can be provided by the neurosurgery team for review.

When it comes to the outpatient waiting list and the circumstances that people find themselves in, such as Irene and many other Tasmanians, I have to say -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I have always acknowledged that, and that is why it is our priority when it comes to health. That is why it is our priority that we are delivering more funding, more staffing and more health services than previous governments. Despite this, there are ongoing challenges with demand continuing to increase while responding to the challenges of COVID-19, and it is pleasing to see that that has settled.

Implementing measures to safely continue to deliver outpatient services in a COVID-19 environment, including social distancing and alternative models has, at times in 2022, impacted on our outpatient capacity during COVID-19 peaks. That is why we are taking action to reduce waiting times by providing additional appointments, increasing use of telehealth appointments and developing alternative care pathways for people who have been waiting the longest. We are developing a statewide outpatient plan for Tasmania which, like our statewide elective surgery plan I have mentioned already this morning, will provide a very clear, focused roadmap for delivery of innovative outpatient service models over the next four years and is being co-designed with clinicians, patients, and other key stakeholders to transform the way outpatient services are delivered. This year's Budget committed some \$7.2 million over four years to implement the outpatient plan.

Housing Land Supply Orders - Public, Social and Affordable Housing

Mr O'BYRNE question to MINISTER for STATE DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION and HOUSING, Mr BARNETT

[10.35. a.m]

Immediately after then premier Will Hodgman convened the housing crisis summit in 2018, your Government set about introducing the housing land supply orders. This extraordinary measure was justified as a way to fast-track the development of small parcels of Crown land in established suburbs for public, social and affordable housing. During debate on the bill, your Government was crystal clear that this land was to be used to target the shortage of public, social and affordable housing.

Can you confirm that not a single house has been built on these 700 lots? Can you also confirm that most likely over half of the 700 lots will be sold off to the private market to be purchased by developers, builders for spec homes and investors who will most likely land-bank, which will then completely undermine your Government's own commitments to the parliament and the thousands of Tasmanians who are in desperate need of a roof over their heads?

Ms O'Connor - It is disgraceful. The great privatisers of public assets.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for Franklin for the question in respect to housing. I reconfirm this Government's commitment to the record investment and most ambitious plan in Tasmanian history to support building more homes faster and note Labor's opposition, the member for Franklin's opposition and indeed the Greens' opposition.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr BARNETT - More specifically, as to the question regarding land supply orders, what we know is best practice. That is what we are on about in this Government. We know that mixed tenure development is best practice, not only in Tasmania but in other jurisdictions around Australia and at a national level.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. The minister is on his feet and I am not going to allow constant interjections. The question has been put to the minister and he should be allowed to answer it in silence.

Mr BARNETT - Thank you, Mr Speaker. The member has asked the question and I am entitled to respond to that question.

We are about best practice and we know what happens in other jurisdictions in Australia and at a national level, and best practice is mixed tenure development. We are not going back to broadacre housing as the member, I suggest, is alluding to. We are not going back to the 1950s; we are not going back to embedding into the community social housing and social disadvantage like they used to do in the 1950s and 1960s. We are not doing that.

We are going forward, based on best practice. Using as a guide for social housing developments, about 15 per cent or thereabouts has been long-accepted practice, not only by our Government but in the recent Labor-Greens government. How about that? Even under the Labor-Greens government, under the former minister for Housing, the Leader of the Greens -

Mr O'Byrne - These are lots in established suburbs. These are not new lots - stop misleading the House.

Mr SPEAKER - Order, member for Franklin. If you continue I will ask you to leave.

Mr BARNETT - The member knows too well that this approach has been used under successive Tasmanian governments including the years of the former Labor-Greens government - since 2009, to be specific, so you have been caught out.

In terms of the guide of 15 per cent for social housing and 35 per cent for affordable housing, this is all about the law of supply and demand. I thank the former minister for those land supply orders and getting them through the parliament to provide more -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr BARNETT - The point I am making is that the land supply orders have been able to provide more land for housing. That is the objective of our Government. On the other side, you have been opposing. Woe betide when the public knows that you continue to oppose our plans to build more homes faster.

Commission of Inquiry - Launceston General Hospital Staff

Dr WOODRUFF question to MINISTER for HEALTH, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.40 a.m.]

The commission of inquiry has heard harrowing testimony of how children were harmed at the Launceston General Hospital and other institutions. It detailed the serious failings of the LGH management to discharge their responsibility to take allegations seriously, to report them and act to protect children. Many of these failings have been known for up to two years yet most of those responsible remain in their positions.

Your Government is planning to introduce a Criminal Code amendment to make failure to protect a child a crime, highlighting how serious this matter is. However, there are people working in the LGH right now who have actively distorted evidence of child sex abuse in what can only be seen as deliberate attempts at cover-ups and they have failed in their obligations as mandatory reporters.

As Minister for Health, what actions are you taking in relation to those LGH staff? Why have they not been stood down already?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question and acknowledge the serious matter she brings to the parliament. We all acknowledge the bravery and determination shown by victims and survivors who have participated in the commission of inquiry. It is essential that we keep our Tasmanian children and young people safe. Our Government, as indeed all of us united across the parliament, are committed to learning from past mistakes and failures and to implement real and lasting change.

It has been a difficult period for the Tasmanian community, particularly with the confronting evidence heard during the commission of inquiry hearings. Our Government has made it clear that we are committed to accepting and implementing the recommendations of the commission of inquiry.

Greens members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. The two Greens members understand the rules. The question has been put to the Premier. You will allow the Premier to continue with his answer and not interject on him, please.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Mr Speaker, I am working closely with the secretary of the Department of Health to consider how to respond sensitively and effectively to ensure that child safety is embedded in workplace culture in all our hospitals and health facilities. The secretary and I announced the Child Safe Governance Review of the Launceston General

Hospital and Human Resources in early July to demonstrate that we will not wait to take action where it is clearly needed. The Child Safe Governance Review has been established to drive immediate change with a priority focus on the handling of serious misconduct such as institutional child sexual abuse. The review will -

Dr WOODRUFF - Point of order, Mr Speaker, standing order 45, relevance. This is a serious matter. We have asked about the specific people who are still in their position, not about the general response of the Government in the Health department or other institutions. Those people are in their job.

Mr SPEAKER - There does not need to be an explanation. You have brought up relevance. I remind the Premier of relevance although, in my view, he was talking about the issue you raised. I will allow the Premier to continue.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The review will make recommendations on matters including the hospital's organisational structure, management, and leadership and manager training.

The Child Safe Governance Review is being personally led by the secretary of the Department of Health. The Government's advisory panel to inform the review has recently been established. Its membership includes a range of expert staff and union representatives. Three experts in child trauma, governance and hospital administration have been appointed, including Professor Erwin Loh, Adjunct Professor Ann Maree Keenan and Adjunct Professor Maria Harries AM.

It is critical that staff also have meaningful input into the review. Six current staff with broad experience have been appointed: Catherine Graham, Clinical Nurse Consultant; Dr Lucy Reed, Director of Emergency Medicine; Ashleigh Miller, Assistant Director of Nursing, North and North-West; Paul Eagar, Chaplain of THS-LGH; Dr Emma-Jane McCrum, Senior Psychologist; Amanda Duncan, Registered Nurse; Sam Beattie, Nurse Unit Manager; and William Gordon, Registered Nurse. Union panel representatives include -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Mr Speaker, standing order 45 to relevance. I respect your earlier ruling but the Premier has not gone anywhere near the issue of people at the LGH who came before the commission of inquiry and testified to failing children.

Mr SPEAKER - Again, it does not need an explanation. I remind the Premier about relevance. The point I have often made in this Chamber, and previous Speakers have suggested, is that the Speaker does not know what the Premier is going to say in the future. I must allow him to continue to complete his answer. It may not be what you want to hear but the Premier has control of how he answers the question.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Dr Helen McArdle from the AMA; Emily Shepherd, Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation; Tim Jacobson, Health and Community Services Union; and Thirza White, Community and Public Sector Union. Tasmania's chief medical officer, Professor Tony Lawler, has been appointed to the panel as well.

It is very important that the experiences of victims/survivors are a key part of this review to ensure that their voice is heard and they have an opportunity to provide their valuable input. That is why we have created the expert reference group, which victims/survivors will be invited to participate in and provide advice to the review.

The panel has begun to meet regularly and, to date, has considered reports on the Child Safe Organisation Project and One Health cultural improvement program based on cultural assessment of the LGH. The panel has also provided an update from the chair of the Lived Experience expert reference group. The governance advisory panel has developed a forward meeting plan that will support it to develop its recommendations within the scheduled time frames.

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

Mr ROCKLIFF - To support the reform work, the department has established a dedicated Child Safe Organisations project team that have progressed a number of key actions.

The department's new Child Safety and Wellbeing Framework and staff training has recently been launched following external and internal consultation, which will see the department implement 10 national principles for child-safe organisations. The framework will ensure the structure and systems are in place to mandate and foster a child-safe organisation and culture by embedding effective leadership and governance at all levels of the organisation. It applies to all employees across the Department of Health and details our shared duty to safeguard children and young people in our care.

I assure all victims and survivors that our Government is committed to listening, that we believe in you and, most importantly, will act to respond.

Housing Crisis - Proposed Stadium Development

Ms HADDAD question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.48 a.m.]

On Sunday, Shelley Ford had no choice but to front the media to share her story. Shelley is a disability pensioner who is raising her teenage niece. They have been on the priority housing waitlist for two years and four months. In that time, they have been couch surfing and sleeping in a tent. Her niece has missed significant periods of school because of their insecure housing situation. Shelley's health and wellbeing is being seriously impacted. She feels desperate and alone. She feels lost in the system.

Can you explain to Shelley, and to the 4500 other families on the housing waitlist, why your priority is putting a roof over a new football stadium instead of putting roofs over the heads of Tasmanians in desperate need of housing?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question on this very important matter. I recognise the advocacy of Ms White and Ms Haddad on Ms Ford's behalf, to the minister as well. I acknowledge that Ms Ford is one of the many Tasmanians we are trying to assist into secure accommodation at a time when we are seeing unprecedented demand.

We understand and acknowledge Ms Ford's challenging situation. As the members know, the minister sought an update from his department on Ms Ford's circumstances, and I understand responded to Ms White on 18 August. That followed contact from the department

to Ms Haddad in July. The minister has also asked his department to ensure a support worker makes contact with Ms Ford again to work through all the options available to her, including interim support.

As I said, every Tasmanian deserves a roof over their head. We know some Tasmanians are doing it very tough. That is why we have a very strong 10-year plan that centres on building more homes for Tasmanians. Our record \$1.5 billion investment - the biggest in the state's history - will see 10 000 more social and affordable homes and units of accommodation provided for Tasmanians by 2032. We know it is hard, and we recognise it is also difficult to hear for people on the waiting list, but it is important that Tasmanians know that we do have significant investment - historic investment - into housing. We do have a plan. We are building homes right now, and as quickly as we can.

We are also creating Homes Tasmania to deliver this plan, which will have a dedicated focus on improving housing. Homes Tasmania will have the powers and flexibility to partner with the community service providers and industry to get the job done, and make sure those who need our support get it.

This is new infrastructure - like the new infrastructure we are putting in across our health system, and our school system as well. Building new infrastructure is a very good thing, which I know the Labor Party opposes. I think I heard from the member for Bass, 'now is not the right time to be building new infrastructure'.

Ms Finlay - It is not the right time to build a new stadium in Hobart. That is the message from Tasmanians. We support housing and health care.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Goodbye Legana High School, Legana Primary School. Ten hours down the road to Brighton High School. See you later Brighton High School.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. I will allow the Chamber a few seconds to quieten down. I cannot hear the Premier, let alone the gallery. All I can hear is a whole heap of noise. Settle down and allow the Premier to answer the question, please.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The Labor Party's plan for infrastructure is 'Now Is Not the Right Time for New Infrastructure'. See you later Legana, 10 hours down the road to Brighton High School.

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Mr Speaker, standing order 2. I ask you to draw the minister's attention to the responsibility to be truthful in this place. The Labor Party does not support a stadium, that is true - but we support investment in education and health care.

Mr ROCKLIFF - That is not what you said. That is not what the Labor Party believes in. I am not sure where that leaves the LGH masterplan, and the \$580 million investment -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I am not sure where that leaves the mental health precinct on the north-west coast of Tasmania.

Ms WHITE - Point of order, standing order 2. Mr Speaker, I seek your advice. The Premier is misleading the House. I ask you to remind him of his obligations to be truthful in this place.

Mr SPEAKER - I will remind everyone of the obligation not to mislead parliament and to be truthful in this place. The Premier, as I understood, was putting a rhetorical question to the Chamber.

Ms White - They are not accurate statements.

Mr ROCKLIFF - No new homes for Tasmanians -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr ROCKLIFF - because that is infrastructure. That is the position of the Labor Party - no new infrastructure. I know you are sensitive about it, but we do need new infrastructure because it builds the economy, and it employs people. When you have the economic benefits of construction and new infrastructure, not only do you have the enabling infrastructure that further enhances the economy, but the jobs created and all the wealth created flows through to essential services, which allows the Government to fund those things that I have mentioned - the essential services into our schools, our homes and also health infrastructure.

When it comes to housing and housing affordability, I understand the serious pressures Tasmanians - and indeed, every Australian - is under, but this is a government that has been very proactive when it comes to reforming this area, when it comes to Homes Tasmania, when it comes to \$1.5 billion of investment. We believe in new infrastructure, even if those opposite do not.

Ms FINLAY - Mr Speaker, I was on my feet before the Premier takes his seat. On a point of personal explanation, the Premier is misleading the House indicating that I am not supporting new infrastructure in Tasmania. That is not correct. In a conversation about football stadiums, I have said no new infrastructure. It is not okay for the Premier to mislead the House.

Mr SPEAKER - Order. Personal explanations are in place so that a person, an individual if the member refers to them, can respond to that. It is not for the debate to continue after the question has been answered.

Derwent Ferry Service - Expansion

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

[10.57 a.m.]

Could you please update the House on the Government's next steps with the expansion of the Derwent ferry service as part of our commitment to improving our public transport network?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I do thank the member for Franklin for his question, and for his consistent great support for our new Derwent Ferry Service. You have caught it and enjoyed it. Members of the public can have a coffee on the way to work in the morning, and can even have a beer on the way home at the end of the day on our new Derwent Ferry. It has been a great success.

I thank the many people in my department and the Clarence City Council who have been instrumental in helping us set up this service. It has been a great outcome for our community. I am pleased to tell the House that more than 120 000 passengers have now used that service since it commenced only one year ago. The daily average since the start of 2022 has been 550 passengers. What a great success for our community - more public transport options, faithful to our pledge.

We made this commitment ahead of the 2018 election, and we delivered it during that term - despite the very negative Nevilles opposite who were out there saying this was setting up the ferry to fail. It was completely incorrect. They tried to undermine that service from the get-go but the public has responded, and it has been brilliant.

In fact, our ferry has been so successful that we announced earlier this year that we will expand the service to other locations in greater Hobart. The engagement framework has now been developed. Councils have it and have been consulted on the expanded network. I am aware that the response from councils has been very enthusiastic. That is great.

A number of new sites, which will require some new infrastructure, have been proposed, and will be assessed on the establishment of passenger demand, the potential to remove pressure from key arterial roads around Hobart - so we can again deal with congestion - and the adequacy of ferry terminal infrastructure that may be in place.

I welcome the commitment by the new federal government of \$20 million for new infrastructure to further support ferry service infrastructure on the Derwent, particularly in those new locations. I hope, with enthusiasm, to see that funding in next month's federal budget as we press forward with our master plan.

Members will be keen to know that a recent survey found 81 per cent of passengers using our ferry would have otherwise been driving across the Tasman Bridge in peak hour. That points directly to the way we have designed this service and set it up to succeed. It shows the primary benefit for the ferries as public transport for weekday commuters.

For this reason, we have locked the service into the Budget released this year, with an investment of \$18.8 million over four years to keep it going. This initiative also includes funding for the design and construction of a floating pontoon at Bellerive, and new infrastructure to further improve the passenger experience and provide more shelter.

We also recognise the potential for an expanded service beyond the weekday commuter demographic, so I am pleased to announce that Saturday ferry services between Bellerive and Sullivans Cove will begin next month on 29 October. We know the temporary Saturday ferry last summer proved very popular and people are keen to continue to use the service for access to attractions on both sides of the river. We also know that the event-based ferry services for

the Ashes test match in January was wildly popular, with about 11 000 passengers over three days in a service that was put up in the week before the event, so the public really responded.

To other matters, I can announce today that the Government will ensure that the feasibility work to support the new stadium proposed for Macquarie Point will also include public transport planning for major events, not just for football.

Ms O'Connor - The one you've just told us we have to have without consultation. You northerners telling us what to do with our waterfront.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr FERGUSON - Would it not be good for people to catch the ferry or a bus to see Michael Bubl  at the new proposed precinct at Macquarie Point rather than having to get a JetStar flight to Melbourne?

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr FERGUSON - I expect the new and expanded ferry and bus services to be scheduled to coincide with major events, including AFL game days and, even better, these ferry services will be expanded to other suitable wharf locations on the Derwent estuary, including in public transport. I would like to emphasise more buses, using our Metro Tasmania and other intercity regional services, to help people get in and out of their regional centres to Hobart.

As I conclude, I am confident that Tasmanian footy fans and concert-goers will flock to event days, with ferries berthing at Brooke Street Pier and just a short walk to Macquarie Point.

The Premier has called it out. One member opposite, who I suspect will not be given another opportunity for a media conference any time soon, in a disastrous media conference was, apart from being unable to answer the question about where they stood on pokies reform and harm reduction measures also said in the same interview that Labor does not support any new infrastructure for Tasmania at this time.

Mr SPEAKER - Minister, wind up, please.

Ms FINLAY - Point of order, Mr Speaker I am being misrepresented again. I want to make a personal explanation at the end of question time.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Ms WHITE - Mr Speaker, can I seek your ruling on the request Ms Finlay made to provide a personal explanation at the end of question time?

Mr SPEAKER - There is the opportunity at the end of question time to make personal explanations. They must be short and to the point of the reason why you need to make that point, and not a political statement. I will allow that opportunity then.

Mr FERGUSON - Mr Speaker, it was a good video. It was a terrible media conference. To assist the member, the quote was as follows. Ms Finlay, on behalf of the Labor Opposition - and you can jump into all the points of order you want - said: 'This is not the right time for significant investment in new infrastructure in Tasmania'. If that is Labor's position, stand by it. If it is not Labor's position, condemn the quote.

Proposed Stadium Development - Opposition

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.04 a.m.]

Will Hodgman's former chief of staff and Liberal Party veteran Brad Stansfield has shared his views on your stadium proposal. He said:

It is madness. We are going to have a stadium within literally direct line of sight to another stadium across the river where they play AFL football three or four times a year. It's just crazy stuff, seriously. You've got health in the news every second day, you've got teachers going out on strike for not getting paid enough, and you're going to spend this much money on a stadium that nobody wants. It is just crazy. There is overwhelming opposition to this.

They are not my words, Mr Speaker; they are the words of Brad Stansfield.

Just this morning, Bridget Archer, the federal Liberal member for Bass, went on the radio to declare that she does not believe that Tasmanian taxpayers should be paying for a new stadium.

Premier, Tasmanians do not want this stadium. Liberal party members are lining up to oppose it. Why are you so obsessed with building a new stadium in Hobart?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for her question and interest in this matter. I know you do not have any policies but I never expected you to draw your policy positions from the former chief of staff to the premier, Brad Stansfield. I must admit, I never really expected that, being led by Mr Stansfield, who I respect and whose opinion I respect on many matters.

I recognise the opposition to the proposals and I hear that in the community. However, as I look around the nation when it comes to stadiums built in Adelaide, Perth and Townsville, there was opposition in all those quarters but you will not find too much opposition now. That is why we need to push ahead with new infrastructure, with not only a stadium but an arts, cultural, and entertainment precinct that can build the confidence of Tasmanians, including an AFL team, which the other side has gone very quiet on, I must say.

You cannot ignore the economic analysis when it comes to 4200 jobs during construction, \$300 million injected into the community in that construction phase, 950 jobs therein the year after when it is completed, an injection of \$85 million into the economy. You cannot ignore that, Mr Speaker. This is why we have to be bold and not cowering like the Opposition, which

does not have a position on anything and stands for absolutely nothing, except no new infrastructure.

I do not know what those opposite, such as Ms O'Byrne, who is travelling around the Chamber at this present time, and Ms Finlay - no new school at Legana. That is new infrastructure. A new school at Exeter - that is new infrastructure. Upgrades to the LGH - that is all new infrastructure, which they oppose.

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Mr Speaker. Whilst I was travelling around the room, I heard the Premier say that I said that I did not support a Legana school. I would like him to prove the evidence of that, otherwise I would like to make a personal explanation at the end of question time, or the minister can apologise for misleading the House.

Mr SPEAKER - There is no point of order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I was asking a legitimate question. If one member of this House on the Labor team says this is not the right time for significant investment in new infrastructure in Tasmania, you would have to ask the question: do the members for Bass support upgrades to the East and West Tamar highways? Do those opposite, such as Ms Dow and Dr Broad, support an upgrade to the Port of Devonport? This is all new infrastructure. Upgrading the Port of Burnie - it is new infrastructure. Do they support upgrades to the North West Regional Hospital? These are legitimate questions because a Labor member has put on record that this is not the right time to invest in new infrastructure.

Ms White - No, in a stadium.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Does the member for Clark, Ms Haddad, not want us to build upgrades to the Royal Hobart Hospital, at Cosgrove High School, or a new ambulance station at Glenorchy?

Dr BROAD - Mr Speaker, point of order under standing order 45, relevance. This is getting ridiculous. We cannot have the Premier of this state going around verballing each and every Labor member based on something that has already been called out for personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER - Take your seat, Dr Broad. I will remind the Premier of the point of order on relevance. I also remind the Opposition that taking a point of order is not an opportunity to make a political statement.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Thank you, Mr Speaker. Does the member for Franklin, Mr Winter, not want us to build a new school at Cambridge, upgrade some more of our primary schools, upgrades to the Cygnet township, expansion of the Kingston Health Centre? These are new infrastructure builds.

These are legitimate questions on the minds of Tasmanians, given the position, as explained by the Labor member, that now is not the right time to build investment in new infrastructure in Tasmania. Why are we building infrastructure such as an arts and

entertainment cultural precinct, including a stadium? It is because we want to grow our economy to fund our services.

You bring very legitimate concerns to this parliament of Tasmanians in distress when it comes to accessing health and housing. We hear every one of those Tasmanians, which is why we are building capacity in our economy and creating jobs so we can fund these essential services. Clearly, under you lot, that would not happen.

Child Safety - Workforce Support

Mr WOOD question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, CHILDREN AND YOUTH, Mr JAENSCH

[11.11 a.m.]

Can you update the House on the Government's progress in better supporting our Child Safety workforce in the important work they do in safeguarding the welfare and interests of our most vulnerable children and young people?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for Bass, Mr Wood, for his question and his interest in this important area of the Government's work. The safety of Tasmania's vulnerable children and young people is an absolute priority for the Tasmanian Government. We continue to do all we can to ensure their safety and wellbeing, and support the staff who look after them.

This week we are on the cusp of an important change that will deliver better and more integrated support for the children in our care, for the Child Safety workforce and the services they deliver for children, young people and their families in Tasmania.

On 1 October this year, we will bring together the departments of Communities and Education to form a new Department for Education, Children and Young People. Under the new department, we will coordinate our efforts to ensure our children and young people are known, safe, well and learning.

For staff in Children, Youth and Families, this will mean closer working relationships with their Education colleagues, breaking down silos that stop us truly sharing our responsibilities for child safety and wellbeing.

The new department is being built around the nationally agreed Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth Wellbeing framework, known as The Nest, which provides an evidence-based approach to supporting children. The new department will continue our long-term reform of the child safety system, Strong Families, Safe Kids.

Our reforms are already ensuring more support is provided to families earlier. Fewer families are entering the statutory child safety system and fewer children and young people are entering out-of-home care. As a direct result of our reforms, we estimate that since 2018, around 250 children and young people at risk have been supported to remain safely with their families, instead of entering care. The Intensive Family Engagement Service, a key part of our

reform, has been delivering an exceptional program of support, with 95 per cent of families involved in the program continuing with the care of their own children.

Since 2021, 76 children who entered out-of-home care were supported to return to the care of their families. We currently have around 586 foster and kinship care households, with around 90 per cent of children stable in their care placement. We are currently supporting 172 young people in their transition from care to independence, ensuring young people have a better chance to achieve their goals as they head into their adult lives.

These are all significant achievements and testament to the success of our reforms and the dedication of our hard-working Child Safety Service staff.

We recognise the need for ongoing investment to further bolster the Child Safety workforce, particularly around recruitment and retention. Pleasingly, off the back of recent efforts, the Child Safety staff vacancy rate has reduced to around 13 per cent. We continue to progress initiatives to fill positions and relieve the pressure on the existing workforce.

Additional support positions are being recruited to allow Child Safety officers to focus on their core functions. This includes unit coordinators who will help reduce administrative work for child safety officers and youth workers to assist our young people to transition to independence.

An alternative employment pathway for university graduates is being created, allowing us to employ social work students as case aides during their final placement. On graduation, the students can be considered for child safety officer roles. We have recently appointed 12 social work students as support workers following their student placements. These students will be considered for child safety officer roles when qualified and assessed as suitable.

We have approved recruitment of additional relief positions above the current full staff complement to fill temporary vacancies or when staff need to take leave. This is in addition to our commitment, as part of the 2022-23 Budget, of \$5.4 million for an additional 10 FTEs to be added to the child safety workforce around the state. This will help to meet increased demand and continue to support improved outcomes under the Strong Families, Safe Kids child safety redesign.

While our child safety system is fundamentally different from the system we inherited, with more resources than ever before, we will continue to invest in continuous improvement. We want to ensure more Tasmanian children and young people are safe and well, and learning and able to reach their full potential. We will continue to support our Child Safety workforce to help them to do just that.

These are our overriding top priorities as a government - investing in our children and young people, their safety and their learning, their housing and their health.

Labor makes a big show of attacking our Government's ambition and vision to grow our economy and provide opportunities for our lifestyle, businesses and employment, as well as the priorities we have for the health and wellbeing, learning and safety of our children and young people and our families. We have our priorities right. Part of that is growing our economy to pay for services like those of our child safety system.

Proposed Stadium Development - Ongoing Running Costs

Dr BROAD question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.17 a.m.]

Is there a business case for the ongoing operation of your new stadium, including running costs and estimated profit and loss? If there is, will you table it now?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for his question. The benefits through construction of around 4200 jobs outlines the investment into the local economy of some \$300 million. Following construction, \$85 million in the local economy, supporting around 950 ongoing jobs.

We are committed to supporting development on Macquarie Point as well as providing an entertainment and cultural precinct, including a stadium that allows all Tasmanians to watch not only AFL content but other codes as well. Also, international acts which are not able to be supported in Tasmania at present.

The economic activity around the Macquarie Point precinct for clubs and hospitality venues as a result of that construction would be enormous, not to mention people being drawn to the Reconciliation Park and the Antarctic and Science Precinct, another key investment. They can all complement each other, coexist and be supported.

Dr BROAD - Mr Speaker, point of order. It was a very simple question. Is there a business case for the operation of the stadium, or not? If there is no business case then just admit that.

Mr SPEAKER - A standing order is not an opportunity to repeat the question.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Further work is being done when it comes to the feasibility study, over \$1.25 million. This is an exciting opportunity and an opportunity -

Ms White interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - that should not be bypassed by weak politicians, which is exactly what you are. Not a single new idea. When the going gets tough, you withdraw, not only from a stadium, but all new infrastructure. When the going gets tough, the Labor Party withdraws back to their hidey-hole, with no position on anything. It took you six days to come up with a position on gaming reform - six whole days.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Honestly, you are the alternative government and you cannot come up with a position on gaming reform and harm minimisation. It takes you six whole days: as long as your policy position on no new infrastructure.

Dr BROAD - Mr Speaker, point of order, under standing order 45. The question has nothing to do with gaming policy. It has to do with the business case. Is there a business case? It is a simple question.

Mr SPEAKER - Again, I remind the Premier of relevance and the question. However, the Premier will answer it as he sees fit. I cannot put words in the Premier's mouth.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have answered the question, Dr Broad, in relation to economic opportunities. I have not mentioned the nineteenth licence and the opportunities of having our own AFL team in the national competition which we thoroughly deserve. Complementing that will be a new stadium. Broader than that, the arts, cultural and entertainment precinct will bring so much economic activity in which all Tasmanians can participate and enjoy. New infrastructure, whether it be in housing, our schools or hospitals, supports economic activity -

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

Mr ROCKLIFF - supports jobs and supports our ability to fund essential services.

Proposed Stadium Development - Ongoing Costs

Dr BROAD question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.22 a.m.]

Your stadium plan will be a huge drag on a state budget you have already driven deep into the red, and that is just the construction costs of this new stadium. Now you have just conceded that there is no business case for your new stadium. This means you have no idea what the annual running costs of the stadium will be and no estimate of the ongoing annual subsidy that the stadium will require. How can you, in good conscience, sink \$750 million of public money into this stadium when you do not even have the answers to these basic questions about running costs? How can you expect the Tasmanian public to trust you with the state's finances when you are willing to be so reckless?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, I thank the member for his question. He must have missed the part of my answer when I said there was work on a feasibility study ongoing.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - Dear, oh dear.

Ms White - You don't know the answers.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I tell you what the Tasmanian people expect from you and that is some policy positions you can come up with. You are asked a question and it takes you six days to come up with an answer on a policy position. You speak about budgets - how about providing an alternative budget for the Tasmanian people to scrutinise so they can understand your priorities, because no-one knows what you stand for. At least they know what we stand for. They might not like everything we stand for but at least we have something we stand for - health, education, housing, economic activity, new infrastructure. At least they know what we stand for. At least we are producing policy positions which we believe can take this state forward, as difficult as those policy decisions are. What they get from you is whingeing and whining, no policies and no plan.

Police, Fire and Emergency Management - Infrastructure Development

Mrs ALEXANDER question to MINISTER for POLICE, FIRE and EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, Mr ELLIS.

[11.24 a.m.]

Keeping Tasmanians safe is important to ensure that our communities thrive and they have a positive way of interacting with each other. Can you update the House on the infrastructure delivered by the Liberal Government for Police, Fire and Emergency Services, and how is this benefiting our community keeping Tasmanians safe in Launceston and around Tasmania?

ANSWER

Mr Speaker, can I say from the outset how refreshing it is to have a member for Bass who actually believes in building new infrastructure. That is outstanding, and we have not one on this side of the house, but two in Mr Wood as well.

We are a government that believes in building new infrastructure, including for community safety, including for law and order. This is a government that believes in investing in our police service. Total offences in Tasmania in the last year were only 25 000, and that is half the number from 20 years before under the previous Labor-Greens government. That has happened because we are investing in more police, unlike those opposite who defunded the police, who sacked one in 10 cops in Tasmania, who sacked one in four of the State Service who supported them. This is a government that has invested in hundreds of new police, including 35 additional since 2014 at the Launceston Police Station, and another four on the way.

That is what happens when you invest in people and infrastructure. It is in stark contrast to the savage cuts from those opposite when they were last in power. We are investing heavily in police infrastructure, and it is not just the stations, it is also the cop houses. I happened to work on the Queenstown police houses as a plumber and saw the terrible state they were left in. Cops in remote areas were left in houses that were rotting and mouldy and disgraceful. This is a government that has invested in keeping our people safe and making them comfortable when they come home from work, in stark contrast to what those opposite did when they were in government.

We are putting \$106 million into new infrastructure over the forward Estimates with capital spending, and that is only delivered because we are a government that runs a strong economy, that employs more Tasmanians and that enables more small businesses to get ahead. There is \$3.6 million for the southern Special Operations Group building. I wonder if those opposite support that kind of new infrastructure. There is \$12 million for the new Sorell Emergency Services Hub. I wonder if those opposite support that kind of new infrastructure.

There is \$7 million to upgrade the Launceston Police Station, a project I have toured, and they are doing fantastic work there. It is supporting plenty of tradies but it is also supporting our hardworking, diligent police officers. I wonder if the member for Bass over there supports that kind of new infrastructure in her electorate in Tasmania, supporting the people who keep us safe.

This is a government that continues to invest in new infrastructure, despite the carping and complaining and small-mindedness from those opposite. It means we can keep crimes down in our community and we can have police presence keeping people safe -

Ms Finlay - But you're not keeping crime down in the northern region; it's the worst in the state.

Mr SPEAKER - Member for Bass, you have been warned.

Mr ELLIS - and that we can make them comfortable and have world-class facilities as they go about their very important work.

Time expired.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Member for Bass - Ms Finlay

[11.28 a.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Mr Speaker, a point of personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER - It needs to be concise.

Ms FINLAY - Thank you, Mr Speaker. On three occasions this morning, the Premier, the Treasurer and Mr Ellis indicated that I made a comment to say we do not support new infrastructure in Tasmania. I want to make a point of personal explanation and read out the transcript of what I said in the context of being asked questions about another stadium in Tasmania that Tasmanians do not want. I have five short points to make. I said:

We know that Tasmanians want a Tassie team, but it's not the right time to be investing in new infrastructure and building a new stadium for Tasmanians.

When asked about the stadium, I said, 'We know it is not the right time to make significant investment into infrastructure in Tasmania when Tasmanians are struggling', and I said:

Now is not the right time for Tasmanians to have another stadium. We need to make sure our priorities are correct, this is not the time for this decision. The task force knew maybe a decade down the track we would need new infrastructure. This is not the time to build another stadium.

Mr Speaker, that is the context of my words, which were about a football stadium.

Mr SPEAKER - Ms Finlay, if you could take a seat. Personal explanations, of course, should be concise, to the point, not to go through a debate on the issue. You have mentioned infrastructure, you have mentioned your words. I will accept that to go in, but I cannot allow your contribution to go past that point.

Ms FINLAY - Thank you, Mr Speaker.

TABLED PAPERS

Public Works Committee - Reports

Mr Tucker presented the following reports of the Public Works Committee:

Tasman Bridge Upgrades; and

Glenorchy Ambulance Station.

Reports received and printed.

HEALTH LEGISLATION (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS) BILL 2022 (No. 19)

Bill agreed to by the Legislative Council without amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Condolence Resolution - Queen Elizabeth II

The following Message was received from the Legislative Council:

MR SPEAKER,

The Legislative Council having taken into consideration the following Resolution from the House of Assembly:

"That the following Address be presented to His Majesty the King through Her Excellency the Governor -

TO HIS MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY, THE KING:

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN

The Members of the Parliament of Tasmania, the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, desire to express to Your Majesty, the deep sorrow with which we have received the news of the so much lamented death of our late Queen, Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Australia, a Sovereign whose reign, unprecedented in length, was characterised by Her unfailing devotion to the duties of Her exalted Office, particularly as Head of the Commonwealth of Nations, and whose patience and leadership was a model for all Her people and will ever cause Her name to be remembered with reverence and affection.

We deeply sympathise with Your Majesty and all other Members of the Royal Family in your bereavement, and we pray that there may be before Your Majesty, a long, peaceful, and prosperous Reign."

does agree to the Resolution and has filled up the blank with the words 'Legislative Council and the'.

Legislative Council, 13 September 2022.
C. M. FARRELL, President

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

STATUTORY HOLIDAYS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (No. 40)

First Reading

Bills presented by Ms Archer and read the first time.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing Orders - Move Motions

[11.37 a.m.]

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

That so much as standing orders be suspended as would prevent:

- (a) the Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill 2022 from proceeding through all stages at this day's sitting; and
- (b) Honourable Members from paying tribute to her late Majesty, the Queen, for a period not exceeding 10 minutes each.

I need to find a better name for the 'gang of four' - Mr Winter, Mr O'Byrne, Ms Johnston and Ms O'Connor - who I advised what we plan to do today, for their agreement.

I also indicated that the only way we would sit past 6 p.m. tonight is if it took past 6 p.m. for the condolence motion to the Queen to be done. Every indication is that, with the number of people who want to speak, that will not be the case.

I can also indicate that the Government does not have any intention at this stage of sitting past 6 p.m. on any day this week.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Leave to Move Motion Without Notice - Leave Denied

[11.38 a.m.]

Mr WINTER (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, I seek leave to move a motion without notice for the purpose of moving the suspension of standing orders to debate the following motion:

That the House does not support building a \$750 million stadium at Macquarie Point.

Mr Speaker, there is a motion being passed around. The reason we do this is because once again this morning, during question time - which we have seen repeatedly over past few sitting weeks - the Opposition has asked a series of questions about the same issue, and they are continually not answered and not dealt with.

It was an extraordinary scene this morning, where it took five questions before the Premier of Tasmania would stand up and say the word 'stadium'. Such was his determination to not answer questions about a stadium, he just refused to say the word.

What we are asking the House to do is to debate the matter of this \$750 million stadium at Macquarie Point: to make a determination about whether this House believes building a \$750 million stadium at Macquarie Point is a good idea for Tasmanians right now who are struggling with the cost-of-living crisis, and who are concerned about the health crisis, the housing crisis - the big issues that matter to Tasmanians - yet this Government's priority appears to be building a \$750 million stadium at Macquarie Point.

Mr SPEAKER - Mr Winter, if I can jump in there before this 35-minute debate gets too long. We are on the seeking of leave at this point. While this is a matter of urgency, I need people to contain their statements to that and not get into the substantive debate. I understand it is an issue but from the operation of parliament's point of view, the question is why should we put other things aside and have the debate now? Why not do it in Private Members' time or at another point? You can make your contributions but I will pull people up for digressing into the actual debate.

Mr WINTER - As I said, Mr Speaker, this is a critical issue for Tasmanians. Therefore, it is a critical and urgent issue that the House should debate today. There was an opportunity

this morning for the Premier to clear matters up that are concerning Tasmanians but he has chosen not to. That leaves an Opposition that wants answers to these matters urgently with only one option. That is to move this motion and ask the Government to provide the information Tasmanians desperately want.

I hope the leader of government business supports this. He has a record of not supporting motions like this. We just heard the leader of government business say that the Government does not intend to sit past 6 p.m. We know that on the last full sitting day, on 8 September, they filibustered their own bill in order to prevent the stadium bill coming on later that day. He therefore cannot argue that the parliament does not have time to debate this matter. It is important and urgent that the Government and this parliament debate the matter today.

We had questions and we still have questions for the Government and whether it has a business case for this stadium before it commits to spending \$750 million on a stadium at Macquarie Point. What does the business case look like?

Today we have heard the Premier say words to the effect that it would be a stadium that would help fund the health and education system here in Tasmania. I want to understand exactly how that might happen and I want to understand that today. It is urgent that we understand that if the Premier has a plan - and this must be the first state anywhere in Australia that is going to fund its health and education systems using a stadium - it is important that we understand the economics of that. A business case would be a good start.

He has spoken about a feasibility study. After he has already committed \$375 million, at least, of Tasmanian government funding to this, he is now doing a feasibility study. I want to understand, and the House should understand, before a significant investment like this is made, exactly what the Government plans to do about this.

It is not good enough to obfuscate answering simple questions all morning then say 'no' to even debating the matter. If the Government is so proud of this; if it is so hell-bent on building this stadium, why would they not debate it? Why will they not say the word, 'stadium'? Why would they not allow this debate to occur?

The Government should allow this debate to occur because it is a debate that is happening across Tasmanian households, at families' dinner tables, right now. There are not many issues where people stop me in the supermarket and say, 'I tell you what, that is a bad idea'. The stadium fits the bill. If Tasmanians care about this, if they are so concerned about this issue, then the parliament should care enough to debate this today as well.

We are not asking the Government to vote one way or the other. We are just asking them to allow us to debate this matter. If it is an issue that is important to Tasmanians, as it is, and an urgent matter because we know that the time lines around negotiations with the AFL are happening and the AFL is hell-bent on building this stadium, Tasmanians should understand exactly what the Government is committed to when it comes to this.

Why is it that, despite the stadium not being a part of the AFL bid, this Government is committed to building one? Why have they committed to it and are now saying they might do a feasibility study and they cannot outline what the business case says?

They say that they can fund health and education from a stadium but there is not a single stadium in Australia that can claim to have done that. In fact, they lose money. How is it that this Premier thinks that he can be the first to build a publicly owned stadium that makes money and funds health and education?

The Opposition is only asking this Government to answer these questions, and they can do so in this debate. The only conclusion I can come to, if they vote against this, is that they do not want to talk about the stadium and they do not have the answers to very simple questions that by now they absolutely should have.

[11.45 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Speaker, I did expect someone from Government to leap up and make the case for the stadium. We support the seeking of leave, as we always do. We do not support a stadium on Hobart's waterfront at Macquarie Point. The reason this is an urgent issue is that right now, as we sit in here, well paid and comfortable, there are Tasmanians living in tents, people who do not know how they are going to pay the rent next week, people dying on the elective surgery waiting list, and Tasmanians who have died waiting for an ambulance to come for them in their hour of need.

This is a question of priorities. Since the stadium announcement was made, Dr Woodruff and I have had any number of conversations with our constituents, with stakeholders, and people who contact us. Not one has come in asking us to support this stadium. The level of resentment about this stadium in the community is very high.

The people of nipaluna/Hobart have been told that we are going to have a stadium put at Macquarie Point. All that community conversation and consultation about the future of that site goes out the window because a bunch of blokes in suits decided that is where they want to put a stadium. It feels like a make-work scheme for the former premier's former chief of staff, Andrew Finch. The resentment in the south of the state particularly over this proposal is deep and will deepen. I have not travelled up north since the announcement. I am going on Friday and it will be very interesting to have those conversations up there too.

This is a warped priority from a government that has basically told Tasmanians it has \$350 million to put into a stadium that it cannot put into health, housing or the education system. It is shameful. For the Premier to say in his announcement that there will be no money diverted from essential services is disingenuous at best. It is a choice not to put that money into essential services.

It is also fanciful to suggest that a stadium of that scale could be built for \$750 million. The Optus Stadium blew out. It was projected to cost about that much but ended up costing twice that much - \$1.6 billion. It is insulting to the people of Tasmania. It is insulting to people who are living in tents or facing eviction into homelessness -

Mr SPEAKER - Ms O'Connor, I will remind you, as I did Mr Winter, that we are seeking leave and are not into the substantive debate.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am well aware of that, which is why I have been making the argument that this is urgent, because so many Tasmanians are missing out. It is an urgent issue. It is certainly urgent in the community to understand why a government

would prioritise building a billion-dollar stadium on the waterfront when we have so many gaps in our essential services funding and delivery.

It is also baffling to Tasmanians, particularly those who have been to AFL games at Bellerive or York Park, to understand why a state with little over half a million people would need another stadium on the waterfront. The argument has not been made. All we have had is a seven-page glossy as a foundational document for this stadium. No business case for its construction, as was confirmed in question time this morning, for its ongoing operation. It is offensive to people who are battling.

It is a matter of public record that the Greens support the tripartisan push for an AFL and AFLW team for Tasmania. It is about time we were invited to join the national league, but our support does not cover a stadium, because the state does not need another stadium.

I remind members that this site, Macquarie Point, was the heart of a promise to Aboriginal people to have a truth and reconciliation park in the middle of it. Now there is uncertainty about where the truth and reconciliation park will go. There has been no consultation with Aboriginal people, none whatsoever.

We hope that this Liberal Premier has a look at South Australia where a Liberal government promised a megastadium, took it to the election and got thumped by Labor. I predict that is what will happen here if this Premier, and the Government he leads, does not wake up to what is happening in the community.

Mr Tucker - Don't you want to be the Greens government?

Ms O'CONNOR - What I want is good governance.

Mr Ferguson - Do you want to be a Labor minister again?

Ms O'CONNOR - What a revolting idea. What we want is good governance and we want a government that prioritises looking after the wellbeing of the Tasmanian people. This stadium will make zero contribution to the wellbeing and the health of Tasmanians. It will only put a roof over the heads of Tasmanians potentially on game day; we do not know if it will have a fancy retractable roof or not. This stadium is folly of the highest order and at the Tasmanian Greens state conference over the weekend members overwhelmingly voted against this stadium because it is an insult to the people of Tasmania.

Time expired.

[11.52 a.m.]

Mr STREET (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Mr Speaker, the Government will not be supporting the seeking of leave for urgency. The simple fact is that this is a policy difference between two sides of this Chamber. We support the stadium being built at Macquarie Point. The Opposition clearly does not. That is fine. They have many opportunities in the forms of this House to debate that. They have 90 minutes of private members' time tomorrow. They have two MPIs over today and tomorrow as well to debate this. There is no urgency to debate this today.

The blue very clearly sets out the orders of the day and the Government will not be supporting the seeking of leave for urgency to upend the government business for the day simply because the Opposition disagrees with a policy position we are taking.

[11.53 a.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition) - Mr Speaker, I rise in support of the seeking of leave motion that has been moved by my colleague, Mr Winter. This is an urgent matter and the pathetic defence by the Leader of the House of a stadium indicates that they are not really convinced this is a good idea for Tasmania either. They will not even have a debate about it in this House. We have a government that has made an announcement to commit \$750 million of public money to build a stadium that barely anyone wants. The most offensive thing about it is that if you go up to the Cenotaph you can see people who are sleeping rough and in tents, who do not have a roof over their heads, looking down upon a site where the Premier says he is going to build a stadium that does have a roof. How offensive is that?

This Government is making a decision on behalf of all Tasmanians - and future generations who will have to pay off the debt that is built up by this Government to fund this thing - without any consultation. There was no discussion about this at the last election. There was no discussion about this when the tripartite agreement was reached around support for an AFL and AFLW team, yet right now negotiations are afoot between the state of Tasmania and the AFL for a Tasmanian team, which does have our support, but not for a stadium. That is scandalous because the state of Tasmania under this Premier, Jeremy Rockliff, is signing up the state to a deal that we cannot agree with, and I would argue many Tasmanians across the state disagree with too.

That is why this place - the parliament, the Chamber that represents the people - should have the debate about whether we do support a stadium at Macquarie Point because I would put it to you that the community does not support this. Everywhere I go the overwhelming opposition to this so-called policy position of the Government has been extraordinary. The contrast between what the priorities for Tasmanians who are battling day to day, struggling with the rising cost of living, waiting on a waiting list for housing, waiting on a waiting list for health care, and then they see their Government talking about a stadium, obsessing about a stadium, when they cannot even get the basics right.

That is why this needs to be debated today. We need to be able to demonstrate to the community of Tasmania that at least we are taking it seriously. The Government is treating them like mushrooms. There is no business case. He just signs a blank cheque to build a stadium in Hobart when we already have one in the south and one in the north, so this would be a third stadium capable of hosting AFL content, when we already host AFL content. I went to a game at Bellerive earlier this year to watch the mighty Cats play. They won the grand final. The best teams in the league are already playing in our stadiums in Tasmania. We do not need another stadium.

There are urgent issues facing our state. There is a health crisis, a housing crisis, a cost-of-living crisis. We do not have a lack-of-stadiums crisis - we have plenty of those - but that is what this Government wants to spend its time and the public's money on. That is completely the wrong priority for our state.

There is open hostility toward this idea. You would hear it in the community as much as we are. There are teachers walking out of the classroom tomorrow because this Government

is not properly supporting them to do their job with the resources or the pay they need. Nurses have walked off the job, paramedics have walked off the job, and our fires are walking off the job. The Government is treating them with contempt but they can find \$750 million to fund a stadium.

Mr Speaker, this is reckless spending without a business case on something that nobody wants. The question that we have, and why we should be debating it in this parliament today, is what is the Government signing us up to? What are you signing us up to? There are 11 work streams and one of them is a stadium and it has not been resolved, so what are you signing us up to? We have not had that discussion. The community has not had its say. This was not taken to anyone outside the Cabinet room to get their opinion on. It is a betrayal of the Tasmanian people for the Government to think that their priority is a stadium when it is not.

That is not even to go anywhere near the shambles that is Macquarie Point. The master plans that have been developed have just been tossed in the rubbish bin. There are questions around what happened to the developer engaged to build the escarpment for housing, and the Government instead is going to build a stadium. You could not have a stronger contrast if you tried, that the Government is actively going to pay a developer to not build housing so they can build a stadium, to put a roof over a stadium while people are sleeping rough up on the Domain and the Cenotaph in tents who cannot get a roof over their heads. The warped priorities of this Government should be called out by this parliament.

This motion gives the Government a chance to explain why a stadium is their priority. Get up and defend it. Tell the people of Tasmania how you are going to build a stadium on Macquarie Point instead of building houses for Tasmanians. There is an opportunity now for Government frontbenchers to get up and defend this position. I would love to hear from the Premier. I would love to have the debate and hear the Premier tell Tasmanians why he is choosing to build a \$750 million stadium in Hobart when nobody wants one, and he is failing to act to support people who are on the housing waiting list, the health waiting list, who are struggling in a cost-of-living crisis. This Premier is failing to support our public sector workers who cannot get a pay rise that keeps up with the cost of living - who were told by their Premier that the budget cannot afford it, but he can find money to build a stadium.

Mr Speaker, this is an urgent issue. The Premier needs to get to his feet right now and explain it.

Time expired.

[12.00 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Mr Speaker, this is an urgent motion. This needs to be debated right now, because the Government is signing blank cheques that they cannot cash. They are going to have to borrow this money, and we have no idea how they are going to pay it back. We have no idea of running costs. This is not the way to run a state. That is why it is urgent that we debate this motion.

Tasmania's priorities should not be building a second stadium in Hobart, for at least \$750 million, when this Government does not even know the basics about what they are signing this state up to. Today, in question time, the Premier could not even answer basic questions about a business case. That is because there is no business case. That is why this is an urgent motion: the Government needs to explain how they are going to pay for this. How is this going

to run? What are they actually signing this state up to? Why is their priority a \$750 million stadium at Macquarie Point when we have people sleeping in tents, our roads are falling to pieces, people cannot get a roof over their heads, and we have people employing engineers from the mainland who have to turn around and head back to the mainland because they cannot find a place to live.

This Government's priority is a \$750 million stadium at Macquarie Point - yet they cannot even explain the basics. We need to know why the Government is signing us up to something when they do not even know the basics. You have the Premier and Treasurer signing a blank cheque. This is reckless financial management. That is why this is an urgent motion, and why we need to debate this motion right now.

Why is it that the Government is signing us up to \$375 million? Why is it that even the Liberal Party stalwarts, the brains trust, people like Brad Stansfield are saying it is madness, we are going to have a stadium with literally direct line-of-sight to another stadium across the river where they play AFL football three or four times a year? It is just crazy stuff.

That is not coming from the Labor Party. It is coming from someone who lives and breathes the Liberal Party, whose only goal in life, it appears, is to get the Liberals re-elected - and even he is saying this is a crazy idea. That is why we need to debate this motion right now. He goes on to say that you have health in the news every second day, you have teachers going on strike for not getting paid enough - and you are going to spend this much money on a stadium that nobody wants? That is not coming from us. That is coming from Liberal Party stalwarts - veterans who have fought to get this party elected - trying to drive them back to a better course of action. It is crazy stuff. There is overwhelming opposition to this, and it is not me saying it. Why is it that Brad Stansfield would have this opinion?

We need to debate this right now because it is reckless. We have heard today there is no business case - there are just feasibility studies in progress. We have a Government making a \$750 million decision without even knowing the basics, without even knowing what the running costs are going to be, or even if it is going to make a profit or a loss.

That is why this is so urgent, because if there was a business case, we could judge it as an investment. We could look at, for example, the internal rate of return. We could have a look at the net present value. We could see how much value it is for the state. Instead, we have the Premier saying things like this is going to fund the health system. If that is true, we need this Government to defend their decision, and not make stuff up on the run.

Why is this so important? It is because if this stadium makes a loss, that money has to come from somewhere. We have a health system in crisis, an education system in crisis, and we have people homeless. What we could see is the Government having to subsidise a stadium. That money will have to come out of the health system, or the education system, or they are going to have to borrow that money. There is no magic pudding. If they are going to borrow all that money - \$375 million, which they will have to do - how much interest will the Government and Tasmanian taxpayers be on the hook for?

These are the important questions that need answering. That is why this debate should happen urgently. What is going on at Macquarie Point? It is in direct line of sight to another AFL stadium. There have been huge amounts of money poured into Macquarie Point already.

What we have is a \$100 million-plus cul-de-sac. All they have to show for it is a bike track that was ripped up and a cul-de-sac. Now the Government is saying they are going to spend another \$750 million on that site, with no idea how they are going to pay for it, how much it is going to cost to run, or if it is going to make a loss and, as has been pointed out, what happens to The Escarpment? We have had the Treasurer stand up in this place and talk about all the housing and investment The Escarpment is going to unlock. Are we going to see a situation where the Government is going to have to be paying the developers of The Escarpment not to build houses? These are the sorts of questions that we need answered: a \$100 million cul-de-sac and a development that the Government has been crowing about - but if their plan goes ahead, they are going to have to pay out that developer.

We need answers. How much is this going to cost to run? How much is it actually going to cost to build? How deep do you have to put the pillars into Macquarie Point before you hit rock? You are going to put a stadium on top with a heavy roof. How much is this actually going to cost to build? How do you expect somebody else to fund the other half of this stadium when they cannot even give the basics on how much it is going to cost to run?

How good an investment is this going to be, when they cannot say how much it is going to cost to run? They cannot even give basic financial information like net present value, internal rate of return - and should I go on?

We cannot make a good decision without information. That is why this is reckless financial management. This Government is running the state by signing blank cheques to the AFL without having any idea how they are going to pay it back, and how much money they are going to have to suck out of the rest of the state service to prop it up.

We know stadiums lose money. How much money is this one going to lose? All we have is an economic study that uses figures from the AFL in Launceston. What is this going to mean for the people of Tasmania? We urgently need answers. We should do it now instead of putting Tasmanian taxpayers on the hook for unlimited amounts of cash without knowing basic information.

Time expired.

[12.07 p.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I support this urgency motion. Following the performance in question time this morning, when the Government was repeatedly asked questions about this project that they seem so committed to, and were unable to make direct and simple responses to these questions, Tasmanians need to know why it is that this Government is so obsessed with a \$750 million stadium - or perhaps a \$750 million stadium -

Ms O'Connor - Double that.

Ms FINLAY - when the stadiums I have seen developed across the country - I cannot imagine this Tasmanian Government believes it will get away with building a stadium for \$750 million. Let us say it is that much. Let us say they have done their homework. It is curious that when the first stadium was proposed - when that announcement came out of nowhere and the scratchings on the back of the envelope said it was \$750 million - they now announce another stadium around the corner and down the road in completely different circumstances, but curiously it is also going to be \$750 million.

This Government has to demonstrate and defend their position on this to the Tasmanian people - today. This is urgent because we have Tasmanians who are living in tents, living in cars, sleeping on their friends' couches, sleeping in cars in driveways of former partners where there have been terrible situations occur, so desperate to not be on the street. We have people struggling in pain every day not able to live a good life because they are waiting to be served by our health service.

We have children in our education system who are struggling to meet the standards required and expected of them because of the failing education system. So many people struggling in our community cannot believe this Government would continue to be obsessed with the idea of building another stadium - a third stadium in Tasmania, a second one in Hobart - at a time when there are so many other priorities Tasmanians expect this Government to be focused on.

It is clear that this Government has lost the plot. They have their priorities all wrong, but they do not understand. They are not hearing the concerns of the Tasmanian people. They are not hearing the message from Tasmanians about what they expect this Government to be focused on right now. They do not expect this Government to be focused on building another stadium in Tasmania when we have the perfectly good York Park in Launceston, and Bellerive here in the south, where Tasmanians know they can enjoy top-level AFL content right now, here and there. The task force said maybe in the future, but now is not the right time. This Government has their priorities all wrong. It is urgent that the Premier, the Treasurer and other ministers of the front bench stand today and defend the Government position because Tasmanians do not understand.

They do not understand when they are struggling, when their health and the system meant to support them is in crisis. They do not understand when the housing system that is meant to be able to support people struggling to find a roof over their heads, with people who have been waiting not one, two, four, many years for a place to live, they do not understand the priorities of the Government. They do not understand how they could be so wrong.

As other members from our side have said, we cannot understand how this Government continues to defend its position when it does not even understand what it is really going to cost. What are the real capital costs, not just on the build but all the associated infrastructure? What are the operational costs? What are the maintenance costs? What is the depreciation? What is it going to cost for interest on the borrowings they are going to take if they do not even know what the format is going to be?

It is completely irresponsible for the Government to enter into commitments. It was said by a member of this Chamber this morning, quoting the Premier when he said, 'there will be a stadium at Macquarie Point'. How do you get off being so determined and clear without consideration of Tasmanian people who are struggling that you will continue to hold this position yet disrespectfully not answer the questions asked directly and simply of you in parliament this morning? You did not even respond to questions about the stadium with references to a stadium and you do not stand up now to defend your position.

This is an urgent matter. Tasmanians need to know where their Government is at. They need to know they have a government that cares enough about them to do the work before they make the commitments, that they understand the true costs they are committing Tasmanians to, the true debt levels they are committing Tasmanians to, the true operational, maintenance

and all sorts of other burdens and responsibilities they are committing Tasmanians to when Tasmanians are struggling.

The Government, to this day, stands up and talks about the support they are providing for Tasmanians in a cost-of-living crisis. It is clear they have not read the 3P Advisory report that demonstrates that three-quarters of Tasmanians are moderately to extremely concerned about the cost-of-living pressures in this community, and half are concerned that it is going to get worse year on year. There are new demographics of people in our community who are struggling. There are more and more Tasmanians struggling every day. Tasmanians between 35 and 54 years old, Tasmanians earning \$50 000 to \$100 000 a year are struggling under the pressures of cost of living, who cannot access great health care and housing when they need it, or be confident that their children are getting the best level of education because our results are the worst in the country across so many areas.

Premier, I call on you, the Treasurer and ministers on the front bench to stand up and defend your position, that you are expecting Tasmanians to continue to -

Time expired.

Mr SPEAKER - The question is that leave be granted.

The House divided -

AYES 12

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

NOES 12

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

Mr SPEAKER - The results of the division are Ayes 12 and Noes 12, therefore, in accordance with standing order 167, I cast my vote with the Noes.

Motion negatived.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

State of the Health System

[12.18 p.m.]

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

That the House take note of the following matter: state of the health system

It is breathtaking to see what transpired in this place throughout question time and just now on that important motion we put forward in this place on behalf of Tasmanians. I do not know where the Premier has been over the last few weeks but I have been out and about in our electorate in north-west Tasmania and everywhere you go people are talking about this stadium and what a waste it is. It was said to me last week in the north of the state that it is obscene. I think that describes it very well. There is no support in the community for a \$750 million stadium - the second for the south - on Macquarie Point.

It is clear today what this Government's priorities are. I can proudly say that we stand beside Tasmanians as the Tasmanian Labor Party and that our priorities are clear. We want to get the basics right for Tasmanians. This Government is not getting the basics right for Tasmanians, whether that be health, housing or the cost-of-living crisis across Tasmania. We brought forward this Matter of Public Importance on health because that is a key priority for Tasmanian Labor, improving our health system which, right now, is letting Tasmanians down. We effectively have a part-time health minister on part-time duties across the state. What we need is a dedicated focus on the health system, the crisis before us.

I cannot understand why the Premier is prioritising a \$750 million stadium in Hobart when so many people are suffering at the hands of our health system. It is not meeting their needs. As the shadow health minister, I meet people every day who are waiting too long to see a specialist, too long for necessary surgery, and we know that those people who are waiting for a specialist will eventually need elective surgery at some point in their illness trajectory, and if they are not getting the care that they need right now, that is putting additional pressure on our hospital system.

It is a mess. The Government cannot even tell us how many vacancies they have across their nursing and midwifery workforce, when we know there are significant shortages and that is one of the critical factors that contributes to bed block. At the moment we have the worst bed block in the country, at the Launceston General Hospital. We have our healthcare workforces taking industrial action. They do not do that lightly, they do that out of desperation, and still this Government does not listen to them and will not improve their pay and working conditions. They are going to leave Tasmania or leave their profession because they feel so unsupported by this Government.

The priorities of Tasmanian Labor could not be clearer or in starker contrast to that of the Tasmanian Liberal Party. It is absurd and obscene that priority for a stadium that we do not need in Tasmania is being given priority by this Government over investment in our health system. To come in here today and say that we do not support investment in the Launceston General Hospital is absolutely misleading this place and taking the good faith that we come to this place with for granted.

Of course we support that; it was one of our key election policies. It was your signature health policy at the last state election and, to date, very little money has been expended on the LGH. People in the north would much rather see money expended in capital improvements at the Launceston General Hospital so they can get access to the care they need when they need it and where they need it across the north of the state than being invested in a football stadium in Hobart. People have clearly said that to me. They are shocked by the arrogance of this

Government that they would prioritise that stadium, which we know very little about. There is obviously no business case.

It is about transparency with the Tasmanian people about this Government's priorities. It is lacking right now. They are not being upfront about the true cost of that stadium. To say that to have a health system we can be proud of we have to build a stadium beggars belief. We should have a health system across Tasmania that all Tasmanians can be proud of right now. It was this Government that came to government aspiring to have the best health system by 2025. Where has that aspiration gone?

We believe this Government has its priorities all wrong. Absurd amounts of money are being expended across the health system to employ locums - over \$54 million. Imagine how that money could be spent attracting staff to come and work permanently across our health system? We could also retain those staff and reward them by paying them better and improving their conditions. We do not know how many nursing and midwifery vacancies we have across the state. We know that \$33 million was spent on overtime last financial year. All of this money could be better spent, better orientated and better prioritised by this Government to meet the needs of Tasmanians.

It is not acceptable that over 55 000 Tasmanians are waiting to see a specialist. Right now in Tasmania you have to wait 15 minutes for an ambulance to respond. It is not acceptable that this Government has said that Tasmanians can be transported to hospital by a taxi because they cannot get an ambulance when and where they need it. It is not acceptable that people are ramped at our hospitals with devastating consequences, with Tasmanians losing their lives because they cannot get access to the care they need. It is not acceptable that we have a workforce that is on its knees, is underappreciated by this Government and is crying out for better pay and conditions. We have a critical workforce shortage right across the health system and this Government does not even appear to have a plan to address that.

There could not be a clearer contrast between our priorities as the Tasmanian Labor Party and that of the Government, theirs being a \$750 million stadium in Hobart, ours being investment in the health and wellbeing of Tasmanians.

Time expired.

[12.25 p.m.]

Mr ROCKLIFF (Braddon - Minister for Health) - Mr Speaker, I thank the member for bring forward yet another matter of public importance on the very important matter of health.

When I became Premier I deliberately maintained the portfolio responsibilities of Health, and Mental Health and Wellbeing because that was a clear reflection at the time, and it is now, on our Government's priorities when it comes to health and what matters to Tasmanians, most notably education and funding in our schools, public safety and continued investment in our police officers, and investing in housing, some \$1.5 billion over the course of the next 10 years, building 10 000 homes by 2032. In all of those key areas we are implementing and continue to implement reform.

In the health system we are reforming and investing when it comes to our digital infrastructure as an example, with some \$475 million over the next 10 years and \$150 million

over the next four years, so we can lead the nation when it comes to digital health and digital infrastructure within our health system.

We maintain our investment in education when it comes to more teachers in our schools, our years 11 and 12 high school extension program, lifting aspiration and retention, and earlier engagement when it comes to education by investing in our child and family learning centres. When it comes to housing, 10 000 homes, infrastructure, Housing Tasmania reforms, which are an enabler to ensure that we can build housing infrastructure more quickly and collaboratively as well, which is important. When it comes to Health, there is \$11.2 billion over the forward Estimates.

When we came to government, Health expenditure was 28 per cent of the state budget. It is now 33 per cent, which signals our clear commitment and priorities when it comes to Health, with our \$196 million investment into elective surgery. There is a clinician-led and patient-focused elective surgery plan, delivering 30 000 additional elective surgeries over the four years. What that will do, and what it is doing, is bring down our waiting lists to a sustainable level.

During the pandemic, that severe disruption to all our lives but particularly to the health system, we had to cancel non-elective and elective surgery. We are building back that capacity within our hospitals and ensuring we are strengthening our capacity to get those elective surgery waiting lists down and it has been working over the last 12 months. We are updating every single month, being open and transparent with the Tasmanian community, as we promised we would be, so we are held accountable to the investments we are making in Health. Over the last 12 months our waiting lists have been decreased by some 15 per cent to 16 per cent.

If my memory serves me correctly, in January 2021 there were 12 200 on the elective surgery waiting list: too many people on the elective surgery waiting list outside the clinically recommended time frames. Now those waiting lists are down to some 9200. We are making key inroads with respect to that and it still needs to fall further until we get this waiting list down to a sustainable level, particularly focusing on those Tasmanians who are outside the clinically recommended time frames. It is clear why we have that focus, because the longer you wait outside the clinically recommended time frames, the higher the risk of getting sicker and requiring additional care and support from our health system. We are continuing to increase capacity in our health system and have opened around 105 new public beds and 41 new public/private partnership beds since May last year.

We have also recruited more than 1500 additional full-time equivalent Health staff since July 2020, with the majority of these positions in frontline service delivery, including nurses, doctors, paramedics and allied health professionals, and we are continuing to recruit. I want to ensure people get the right health care in the right place at the right time. That is not necessarily in the acute setting, in a hospital bed. We know that when people are treated in the community, if that is appropriate, then they recover sooner. That is why we have introduced Hospital in the Home and the Mental Health Hospital in the Home programs. We have also made our Community Rapid Response service a permanent statewide service, providing quality care in the community for people with a range of conditions, including chronic and complex illnesses, reducing hospitalisation.

We know that presentations to emergency departments in Tasmania are continuing to rise, so it makes sense to explore other options for treatment where appropriate. We want to keep the emergency department for emergencies. That is why we are incentivising GPs and pharmacies to provide after-hours services to local communities as part of the solution, by providing \$9 million through our GP After Hours Support Initiative to increase access. This is very important. This is where the federal government, in partnership with the state Government, needs to step up: the more access we can have in the primary healthcare services and our GP services, which the federal government is responsible for.

I said that when the previous government was in charge and I will say it again with the new Labor government in charge. I want to see collaboration, I want to see reform, and I want to see investment from the federal government to ensure that people of Tasmania have greater access to GP services, particularly in rural and regional areas. Why? Because with earlier access to GPs and that primary health care, and people being cared for in the primary health setting, there is less reliance on those people having to be supported in acute care settings such as emergency departments.

[12.32 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, I am continually perplexed and disturbed at the unhinged priorities of this Government, and incredibly distressed at the Premier's lack of, not just heart, but mental capacity to look at the evidence he is confronted with. He is making decisions about putting a minimum of \$375 million into a stadium but the evidence is that it will blow out to much greater than \$750 million. An investment into that at the same time as he is failing to do what other governments are doing at the moment in this enduring COVID-19 pandemic: to invest in ambulances, paramedics, doctors and nurses, and in our hospital system; our infrastructure. All of these things are critical priorities. To have a premier, a minister for health, who ought to understand the pressures on the health system yet chooses to make a decision like this is unbelievable. I support the other members who have noted for the record that there is not one single person among the most ardent footy supporters I have met who has supported this stadium.

I do not know what tiny little echo chamber the Premier and his advisers live in, but I can tell you they are on their own. Nobody who understands what Tasmania is experiencing in our health system supports a new stadium.

It is the job of the Minister for Health to look at the reality of what we are experiencing. Nothing could be more emblematic of his failure to engage his reason, his brain and his heart, and look at what is happening with COVID-19 and this Government's failed response.

We have continual pressure to remove the only health protection that will prevent people becoming infected in the first place - the wearing of the mask in indoor settings or other high-risk settings. Continual pressure from this Government even inside this Chamber to remove masks, to create an unsafe workplace.

It is true that the number of daily infections in Australia is on the decline. However, there are a high number of daily infections in Australia, a far higher number of people hospitalised in Australia every day from COVID-19 than from other respiratory illnesses. Infection, we find increasingly from research, leads to serious complications for the health of every person who is infected and reinfected. Each time we get reinfected, the risks increase.

Everybody would like to pretend that we can live in a world where this virus has just disappeared and it can fade into the background furniture along with all the other pathogens that we live with. That is not what the evidence and the scientists are telling us. That is not the experience of overseas. We know it is an incredibly clever virus. It is a deadly and disabling virus. You cannot try to pretend that it is just like the flu. Professor Brendan Crabb was quoted in *The Conversation* today on this: around 1700 people have been hospitalised Australia-wide with the flu this year yet, in just one day in July, 5429 COVID-19 patients were in hospital. How can you possibly make the comparison between flu and a virus that has a high risk of increasing long-term damage to the lungs, heart, brain, kidneys and immune system? Four per cent of people infected with Omicron - the so-called 'mild' version of coronavirus - will go on to have long-term complications.

The Premier and his Government are continuing to peddle the mistruth that there is just something called a post-COVID syndrome. It is potentially much more serious than that. This is not just about people living with a post-viral illness. It is about people getting strokes in their 30s because they have sticky blood vessels. That is the untechnical term for medical professionals - sticky blood vessels. This is why we find these high rates of people with stroke.

The latest research, in *The Lancet* just two months ago, is showing that we also have neurological and psychiatric conditions that increase not just for a couple of months but, in a study of 1.3 million people, persist for more than two years the increased risk of psychotic disorder, cognitive deficit, dementia, epilepsy and seizures. They are not just in adults, although adults are at higher risk, but also in children. It is also the case that the impacts were similar during the Delta and the Omicron outbreaks.

The Government has in response, what the Premier said to us, a long COVID clinic. What absolute rot. It is a website which, if you spend a lot of time as I did trying to find the information squirrelled there, shows you that it is a virtual clinic which might be available to you if you go to your GP and they refer you, and you might get contacted a week later. There is no support and complete denial of reality.

Time expired.

[12.39 p.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak on this matter of public importance on health. There is no greater conversation I am hearing from people in our community at the moment than this Government putting the priorities of, for instance, the development of a football stadium over supporting our health services, supporting people who have been on waiting lists for housing and supporting people who do an incredible job in our education system.

There is no doubt that this matter of public importance around health and the priorities in our community is the number-one conversation going on for Tasmanians right now. I made a commitment to the people in my community in coming to Hobart this week that I would deliver on their behalf a message to this Government to ensure that, by the time parliament was over this week, there was no doubt in the minds of this Government that Tasmanians do not want them to prioritise a stadium over health in Tasmania, they do not want this Government to prioritise a stadium over housing in Tasmania and they do not want this Government to prioritise a stadium over supporting education in this community.

There is no doubt right now that this Government is so out of touch, it has its priorities wrong and does not seem to be able to figure out a way to come back to the focus and align themselves with the needs, concerns and priorities of Tasmanians. I said to the people of Tasmania on the waiting lists, whether they are waiting for specialists or for elective surgery, I said to the people in our community who are experiencing distress when they are waiting for ambulances, or being ramped at our hospitals, or people who are not able to be entered into the hospital system because of bed block, that I would deliver a message to this Government to say that they have their priorities wrong. Tasmanians do not want a stadium over support of our health, support of housing, support of education, or support of our public sector workers, who right now are having to take action to be heard to have their conditions and their pay relative to the amount of effort, support and care they are giving and understanding that Tasmanians need.

In order to do that I want to put on the record some public commentary around the Government and their inability to understand the priorities of Tasmanians right now, so there can be no question that the Government has heard these messages. Just this morning in the *Mercury*, Michael wrote:

I read that the Tasmanian government is going to spend \$375 million as part-payment on a football stadium when Tasmania is accepted into the AFL. I also read that the same government has offered a pay rise of 2.75 per cent to public sector workers over four years. What a joke. The public sector workers deserve more than this and must feel that the Government is -

I probably cannot say these words in parliament, but people can read the *Mercury* for the comment. He continues:

When taken to hospital with chest pains by the ambulance, who do a great job, you have the consolation of knowing that, at the very least, Tasmanians will have a stadium!

Closer to the Premier's home town on the north-west coast, another comment from another Michael, not only asking the Premier, but also minister Jaensch:

Can Minister Jaensch please explain how all Tasmanians will benefit from building a new stadium and having an AFL team? I may be a bit slow but I'm not stupid. As a pensioner living on the north-west coast, will my cost of living go down? Will my power bill go down? Will my fuel bill go down? Will my weekly grocery bill go down? Will there be more doctors for me to choose from?

As recently as this morning, having indicated to the community that this would be a matter of public importance for the parliament to consider today, that we would be calling on the Government to correct their priorities and stand back from a stadium and actually focus on what Tasmanians want, there were responses made in my social media feed from locals. I am going to read some of those out so there is no question about the priority of Tasmanians:

Tell the Government and the AFL to live in tents or cars for two months, with little money to live on, not knowing if they will have a hot meal, or when they can have a shower, or when they will be warm enough at night. It is a

windy and rainy day coming. Is the tent going to stay up or will it be blown away? Maybe it could be their parents or children living like this. Would they be talking about building another stadium then?

Again, language not repeatable in the parliament, but you get the point.

The people don't need it. Tell them to look around and see what is happening. So many people are out on the streets and hungry. They can't afford to buy things for their children to eat. I'm trying to help people, but finding it hard with no funding. The priorities are education, housing, health. People need help.

From another member:

It is also an issue for me that these big infrastructure projects seem to take forever to pay off. Instead of paying them off, they're constantly diverting the money to pay for something else that's been promised.

I totally agree. It is not the stadium, it is the ongoing costs that Tasmanian people will have to cover. The government have their priorities wrong and have not done the work to really understand the commitment they are making to Tasmanians. They are putting this responsibility onto Tasmanian taxpayers without having done the work to understand the true costs of this stadium, whether it be the capital costs or the operational costs, the true cost of maintenance, the true cost of depreciation, or the true interest costs on the borrowings to deliver this big project.

It is not the right time for this Government to have their priorities so out of whack that they do not understand the priorities of Tasmanians. It is not the right time to be building another stadium in Hobart when we have extended waiting lists. We know that oral health is an indicator of all sorts of other future health issues yet we have so many people waiting on the oral health list. We have bed block and ambulance ramping. This is not the right time. The Government have their priorities wrong.

Tasmanian Labor's priority is the Tasmanian people. Tasmanian Labor are focused on supporting Tasmanians. Tasmanian Labor have been calling for Tasmanians to pay a Tasmanian price for Tasmanian power. Tasmanians are calling on this Government to stop the stupidity and walk away from their commitment to the stadium now. This is not the right time. The right time now is for you to be focused on the things that Tasmanians need: support with health, housing and education. Our public sector workers need support with their wages and conditions. This Government have their priorities wrong. It is not the right time to be building a stadium in Hobart. Tasmanian Labor stands with the people of Tasmania and will support them to make sure this project does not go ahead.

Time expired.

[12.46 p.m.]

Mrs ALEXANDER (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I rise to add my words to the Premier's comments around the critical part of the health system in Tasmania and what the Government is currently doing, what is outlined in the budget and in various other information that has been provided.

There is a significant discussion around the entertainment centre that will be doubling up as they build the stadium as well. We are all aware that there is a discussion around that and the fact that it is located in Hobart, and on top of that we have the added discussion between the north and the south. What is important in the context of that discussion, the details that sit with the decision-making and the analysis that is being done around that, is to reflect on what is being done around health and how we are going to improve health outcomes for Tasmanians.

There is no doubt that generally health has been impacted across Australia, not only in Tasmania but looking at the news from across the country and overseas, we recognise that health has suffered tremendously as the focus has been on fighting COVID-19 and prioritising that. There are a lot of patients with cancer, heart disease and other chronic illnesses who have been waiting to be attended to. We need the specialists and the workforce and the infrastructure to support us because if we do not have the right health infrastructure, how can we ensure a contemporary delivery of health procedures? How can we expect to engage with and retain specialists who may otherwise be willing to come to the state and say, 'Yes, it is wonderful place where I want to be and bring my family', especially the young specialists who want to bring their family and kids and enjoy the beauty of Tasmania, but if we do not offer the right tools for them to exercise their profession, we are failing in that process of retaining, engaging and attracting much-needed specialists to work in the health space in Tasmania.

Our Government is definitely committed to delivering on key health infrastructure and there is a strong record of delivering that. It is also part of looking beyond the horizon to build a better health system, one that makes a real difference to the lives of Tasmanians.

There has been a fair bit of discussion around what is the correct infrastructure, and how far we go. Reading what has been happening around the world in health, and the general view around infrastructure, I recently came across a 2021 OECD report in which experts agreed that investment in infrastructure can provide a boost to economic activity. This was also one of Keynes' main policy measures for recovery from the Depression in the 1930s. In more recent times it was also adopted as one of the cornerstones of the 'New Deal' in the United States.

Quorum formed.

Mrs ALEXANDER - Following the experience of this century's global financial crisis, there is widespread consensus that austerity measures in the aftermath of a crisis are really counterproductive. If a country can borrow on the financial markets to restart the economy with public investment, it should do so. These were key messages also replicated in the annual World Bank and International Monetary Fund meeting in October 2020.

The OECD also identified that the immediate economic boost from infrastructure investment comes through spending on construction activity. Every dollar spent generates additional economic activity. Infrastructure investment is a tried and tested way to successfully stimulate economic activity following a crisis. Therefore, infrastructure investments such as investment in health - also education and community safety, but we are talking about health here - are of great significance.

Going back to what our Government has spoken about and has included in the Budget, we also have a plan that forecasts investment of more than \$1.5 billion over 10 years into critical health infrastructure. This will improve patient amenity and increase capacity in our

health system, which is what we want. We want greater capacity to be able to respond in a better way to patients who are currently on the waiting list, as everyone as has talked about.

Our Government is investing \$150 million over four years to upgrade the very much needed digital health infrastructure and transform the way we deliver patient care across Tasmania. This is a down payment on the anticipated \$475 million investment over the next 10 years, as we further develop the digital health strategy.

The Government will also continue to build on the significant investments already made to ensure Tasmanians get the right care, in the right place, at the right time, with our \$1.5 billion infrastructure vision that will deliver better health facilities in every region of Tasmania.

Time expired.

Matter noted.

STATUTORY HOLIDAYS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (No. 40)

Second Reading

[12.54 p.m.]

Ms ARCHER (Clark - Minister for Workplace Safety and Consumer Affairs) - Mr Speaker, I move -

That the bill now be read a second time.

Her late Majesty Queen Elizabeth II passed away on Thursday 8 September 2022. Her late Majesty showed great affection for Australia, visiting on many occasions, and revealing a nuanced and astute understanding of national affairs. As the first reigning monarch to visit Tasmania, Her Majesty cemented her place in our hearts, always greeting her subjects with characteristic warmth and interest.

Her Majesty was not destined to wear the crown from birth, but took up the mantle when it passed to her, for a life of public service, with incredible dignity and fortitude. As a female world leader, Her Majesty provided inspiration, unwavering dedication and a steady hand that gave great comfort to our nation during times of uncertainty. We take this opportunity to honour Her Majesty's life and service and to reflect upon her legacy.

The Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill 2022 amends the Statutory Holidays Act 2000 to declare 22 September a statutory holiday to commemorate the passing of Her Majesty. Like most public holidays, this holiday does not have any restrictions on trading hours.

I note that all jurisdictions provide for the responsible minister to announce new statutory holidays from time to time. However, our act has specific consultation, timing and parliamentary review requirements that prevented this mechanism being used in time for 22 September. This bill is therefore required.

A statutory holiday is, of course, very relevant to employment arrangements, payment rates and many other matters. State and territory public holidays are recognised by the Fair Work Act 2009 and other legislation for the Commonwealth. I took care to announce the Government's intention to introduce this bill to give retrospective effect to the holiday well in advance of 22 September 2022. My department, as a priority, consulted with key employment bodies and swiftly updated its website with information about the new public holiday to ensure arrangements were clearly understood.

Mr Speaker, I conclude by expressing the great sadness with which we mark the event of Her Majesty's passing, and honour her deep connection with Australia and its people, and Her Majesty's dedication to duty as the longest-reigning British monarch, Australian sovereign and Leader of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Our deepest condolences extend to His Majesty King Charles III and His Majesty's family during this sad time.

Mr Speaker, I commend the bill to the House.

[12.56 p.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make a contribution on behalf of the Labor Party to the Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill 2022, and appreciate that this is the first time the parliament has been able to resume and address the retrospective nature of legislation.

No one in this House likes retrospective legislation. It is something we try very hard to avoid. However, this is an appropriate piece of legislation to now pass, to give clarity and effect to the decisions made by our national government in consultation with state and territory leaders to provide a public holiday to allow the nation a day of mourning for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

There were many questions from people because it was an unusual framework and, as the minister rightly points out in her second reading speech, it impacted on obligations under the Fair Work Act 2009, which require a certain lead-in of notice for our rostering of staff and employment conditions.

I do note the respectful way in which many businesses approached this, and those that chose to remain open, offering their clients and staff an opportunity to make a choice wherever possible. Many had people booked in for some time, and so it was necessary for them to continue operation. I know some upped their fees a little bit for that day, but gave people opportunities to change, or also gave their staff opportunities to pick a day that might be more appropriate to them in their planning.

The bill amends the Statutory Holidays Act to declare 22 September a statutory holiday for commemoration of the passing of Her Majesty. My daughter actually believed it was a lovely gift given just to her to celebrate her birthday, so I will go with that as well.

Like most public holidays, though, it did not have a restriction on any of our trading obligations and hours. I want to make a couple of points on the reason Australia made this decision. I probably will not get through them before we finish, but it is not my intention to speak for very long.

There are many people saying it seemed an unrealistic addition to host but it is important Australians remember that, as part of the Commonwealth, we are required to follow a number of courtesies that are subject to all Commonwealth nations. There countries that are members of the Commonwealth, but the Queen is not the head of state. She was our Head of State, and King Charles is of course now our new Head of State. That requires a whole number of complications for us as a jurisdiction. While the Queen was seen to be the Queen of England, she was absolutely the Queen of Australia, which feeds into all the conversations people will have about the republic in the future. However, we are required to follow those rules and have those protocols. It was appropriate for our Prime Minister and Governor-General to attend. It was appropriate for us to have our own mourning processes here under that framework.

In fact, it probably was not until I was elected to this House that I understood how direct our relationship to the Commonwealth actually is.

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

STATUTORY HOLIDAYS AMENDMENT BILL 2022 (No. 40)

Second Reading

Resumed from above.

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Mr Speaker, before we rose for recess, I was talking about how it was not until I entered here that I realised the very strong relationship the Parliament of Tasmania has with the Crown and its obligation. I was one of those people who did their first speech and moved the first speech. Those members who have done it here before would know that it requires us, as Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the members of the House of Assembly in Parliament assembled, to thank Her Excellency for the speech then record our continued loyalty to the throne and person of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and that the measures which will be laid before us during the session receive careful consideration.

When I was fortunate enough to become a minister, ministers will know you get a wonderful document that refers to you as being trusted and well beloved of the Queen, which delighted my grandmother.

It was not until then that I started to understand that our direct relationship for the State with the Crown is, in fact, probably greater than that of the Commonwealth, as the Commonwealth is a construct of our federation agreement while we are directly in contact with the throne and that role. That is important and it leads to why we had to take the steps we have taken in recognition of the period of mourning and the legislation before us today.

I note that Australians overwhelmingly responded to the passing of the Queen with great respect and sorrow and that regardless of your position on our relationship with the Crown, the recognition of a life of service was greatly commented on.

I also note that the response from many of our First Peoples was that a day of mourning, which has been difficult to achieve for the original inhabitants and ongoing owners of our land, can be achieved reasonably quickly and effectively if we make the decision to do so. As we go through our process of treaty, reconciliation and truth-telling, it is important to note that we

can resolve things that have seemed tremendously complex for us to resolve quite quickly if we have the will and intent. In those ongoing conversations of first ministers and premiers with the Australian Government I urge them to give pause and reflect on that. It has been a difficult time for those members that we have provided a day of mourning so quickly over an issue for which they have the most heartfelt and traumatic responses on occasion.

However, we will support the legislation. Some colleagues have suggested that we should have this public holiday every year. They were happy to curtail it, minister, if you accept this amendment, to one year for each of the years of reign of the late Queen, so for 70 years. If you would like to review that before it makes it to the upper House, I am sure we would be happy to see it come back down. It is a good procedural piece of legislation to give effect to something that has taken place in our state. We commend the bill.

[2.33 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, I will speak briefly in furious agreement and support of the legislation. Retrospectivity is a challenge for the Government, no doubt when the Prime Minister announced the national day. I reflected, as a former minister responsible for administering public holidays in Tasmania, on some of the dramas we had on Anzac Day and a few other issues. As a union official I am thinking what is the instrument, and how is this going to be done? I congratulate the Government for moving swiftly. On the whole, across Tasmania, employers and industry have acknowledged the day of significance, as announced by the Prime Minister and echoed by states' first ministers, and the importance that we acknowledge and pay respects to the passing of Her Majesty the Queen.

It causes me to reflect on the importance of public holidays. There is a lot of history and we all love a public holiday. It is very much the Australian way. There was much debate around the cost of public holidays. Every time there is a public holiday, there is an argument about how it is costing the economy and that it is a painful process, and it is stopping people doing 'x' and 'y'. I accept that a public holiday interrupts the normal flow of business. However, it is important to acknowledge why we have these days and the days of significance. When you look at the calendar of public holidays, there are 11 or 12 public holidays acknowledged across the year in Tasmania. Each of them has a form of history and it is a more contemporary history. It is about the community coming together to recognise significant events.

Originally, most of the public holidays came from religious observance, through Christmas Day, Easter and other forms. Along the way, probably since the 1890s, days were added to the calendar to acknowledge significant events such as the Eight Hour Day. We have a public holiday in March. In the north of the state, you have Recreation Day in November; in the south you have Regatta Day. These are days of community significance. When people talk about the interruption or cost to business, it is important that people understand that business works in the community. It does not happen every week or every month but there are days of significance, and public holidays are about celebrating our community.

On the National Day of Mourning for Queen Elizabeth II last week I had the pleasure of heading down to the Franklin Bowls Club. They took opportunity of that day to not only have a day of mourning and pay their respects on the passing of Her Majesty but to bring their community together to celebrate the beginning of their bowls season. It was a cracking day. The weather was perfect. The Queen turned it on for them, as they said. It was an opportunity to see that community use the day to come together to celebrate their club and to build community. That is something that should not be lost when we talk about public holidays.

This is around acknowledging significant days, acknowledging the building of community and bringing people together to either celebrate, acknowledge or pay respects for a significant thing that has occurred in our community.

There was a debate from the previous speaker about another national public holiday - Australia Day. I have made my views very clear on that. It is good to know that we can come together at short notice and acknowledge the importance of the passing of Her Majesty. It should be a debate where we continue to move forward in discussing reconciliation in Australia and acknowledge that the current celebration of Australia Day on the date chosen causes some difficulty for a big part of our community. A public holiday should be ensuring that we can all come together and celebrate our national day and what is great around our country. We should be looking at finding a day that does not cause difficulty and hurt to a significant part of our community.

Public holidays are important. I acknowledge the Government for bringing this legislation in to work in harmony with other states in acknowledging a day of significance in our community. I will be supporting the bill.

[2.38 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Speaker, the Greens will be supporting the Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill 2022. It was tempting to vote against it to see what happened, given that many Australians had a public holiday last Thursday in recognition of the passing of the Queen.

Of course we understand that the purpose of this legislation is to make sure that businesses and employers are operating under the right legal framework and that workers who worked on that Thursday received all the entitlements they deserve.

When I was thinking about this bill last night, when the Order of Business for today came in, I remembered that if the government of the day in Canberra wants to send this country to war they do not have to take that to parliament. There are no war powers statutes in this country. The most serious decision a government can make is not referenced back to parliament for that authority.

We passed legislation that retrospectively validates a declared public holiday, a day of mourning, which comes through parliament. However, as John Howard did when we joined the war in Iraq, the prime minister of the day can make an almost unilateral decision to send our people, our sons and our daughters, to war. That is certainly a reform that I hope the Albanese Government looks at, war powers reform, because a decision of that magnitude that can come at such significant loss of life and ultimately danger to our nation is something that should go for a full debate to parliament.

Of course we will support this legislation. Last Thursday I thought about the Queen from time to time. I spent the day with my partner and we went to see the wonderful Tim Morris, former Greens member for Lyons, and had a nice lunch with Tim and Pip. Quite often during the day I wondered how First Nations Australians were feeling because that Thursday was not a day for Aboriginal people. I will not go back over the comments I made on the day we returned to mark the Queen's passing, but as Ms O'Byrne said - and in fact Mr O'Byrne reinforced - as a nation we have been able to have a day of recognition, a public holiday

declared effectively with the snap of the Prime Minister's fingers and then some retrospective validating legislation go through the parliament every year on 26 January.

Our nation, sadly, becomes more divided about that day and increasingly those of us who are not Aboriginal cannot celebrate 26 January as our national day. Many of us will find a Change the Date event or rally to be at to show respect and stand in solidarity with First Nations people. It should not be contentious to accept that 26 January is a day which for Aboriginal people marks the beginning of the end of their country. I hope that one day we have the kind of political leadership in this country that can have that conversation with non-Aboriginal Australians principally about the need for us to have a national day that we can all celebrate and mark together because it is not 26 January. That day does not unite us and for Aboriginal people it is a day of mourning.

I wanted to briefly touch on a very deeply disturbing and significant news story from this past week: the reports we have read of the review into club culture at the Hawthorn Football Club. We hear many horrifying stories of racism in this country. We know it is structural and institutional but the allegations that have been made by Aboriginal players and their families about their treatment at the Hawthorn Football Club are so shocking you almost cannot find the right set of adjectives to describe the magnitude of it. There are allegations that players have been told to separate from their families and told that their pregnant partner should have a pregnancy termination. I have never read anything like it come out of a sporting club.

We know that the two clubs which have undertaken these reviews are Hawthorn and Collingwood. In each of those cases what has been discovered is systemic, destructive racism. They are the only two clubs that have had reviews into club culture undertaken and those two clubs clearly have identified a massive problem that is hurting people. Some of the best and most gifted players in the AFL are First Nations people. It is a sport that draws talented Aboriginal kids from all over the country. The AFL has a really serious moral challenge on its hands. The work that has been undertaken, first through Collingwood and then Hawthorn, needs to be undertaken by each of the clubs in the league and the AFL itself because it will not just be restricted to Collingwood and Hawthorn. After all, we do live in a racist country. Reports and stories like this make that truth undeniable, Mr Speaker.

As I said at our state conference over the weekend, the AFL should stop telling the people of Tasmania that they need a massive new stadium on the waterfront when we already have two and we have people sleeping in tents. The AFL should do the work it needs to do to clean up the culture within every club in the league and within itself, and make sure that those Aboriginal kids who come to play their dream as AFL players are safe and included and feel equal. It is one of, if not the, most important bodies of the work that the AFL can do, because we want to be able to enjoy this game without being aware of potentially very significant cruelty and discrimination within AFL clubs.

I understand that in the context of the Hawthorn allegations, all those senior people within the club who are subject to allegations have strenuously denied them. There is much more to be written in this story. I think, and the Greens think, it is an opportunity for us now as Tasmanians, for the Tasmanian Government to pull the pin on the AFL Hawthorn sponsorship deal once and for all. At the very least, we strongly encourage the Premier to suspend all talks with Hawthorn on that sponsorship deal until the results of the AFL review are known and we have some real clarity about those allegations that were made by First Nations players and their families.

The problem that Hawthorn has here is that the reports and first-hand testimony of what is in this review are consistent in their themes. A number of Aboriginal people or family members, partners, have told very similar stories about their treatment at the club. It gives that testimony - in this case, as I understand, to a journalist who was talking to people who had been involved in the review - very significant weight. This is Aboriginal people telling their story. I found the reports of the report to be both revolting and morally compelling. I look forward to seeing the results of the AFL's investigation.

With those few words, we will support the Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill 2022.

We look forward to getting on to some more substantive legislation in the hours and days ahead.

[2.50 p.m.]

Ms ARCHER (Clark - Minister for Workplace Safety and Consumer Affairs) - Mr Speaker, I do not have much to say in summing up. Suffice to say I wanted to stress the consultation that was done on this bill, obviously at very short notice.

We particularly undertook consultation with Unions Tasmania and the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, being two major groups dealing with employers and workers. These stakeholders told us they had preference for the amendment to occur prior to the public holiday. We explained the difficulties with that process, so the preference was that I issue a media release before the public holiday to give both employers and employees clarity on the arrangements.

Time constraints meant the bill was unable to be tabled before 22 September, as we have noted. Because of this I issued a media release as our stakeholders requested on 13 September. It contained specific information to assist industry to prepare for the public holiday and to ensure there was no doubt that, one, it was a one-off public holiday; two, there were no restrictions on trade; and three, businesses had to comply with the relevant requirements under their award or agreement should they decide to open on that public holiday. I also provided links to further information on the WorkSafe Tasmania website, and also the website of the Fair Work Ombudsman. We tried to cover as much of this as possible to ensure that both employers and employees had the information they needed on the day.

As we have noted, this is simply retrospective legislation to ensure all of that is validated in law.

With that, I thank members for their contributions. It is nice to put a bill through that is quite short, for a change. I commend the bill to the House.

Bill read the second time.

Bill read the third time.

TRIBUTES TO HER LATE MAJESTY THE QUEEN

[2.53 p.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Deputy Premier) - Mr Speaker, today the Parliament of Tasmania honours the life, faith and duty of our beloved late Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Australia.

On the night we were advised of the Queen's deteriorating health, like many others I was greatly affected and slept poorly. I awoke around 4.00 a.m. to discover the sad news. For the rest of that day, and the days since, like countless others I felt an immediate sense of change; that we were now living in a world without Queen Elizabeth; that one of the pillars of our global community had given way. Many Tasmanians have experienced the same distinct realisation that a discernible age of modern history, in which we have lived, has ended.

As the Prime Minister stated:

With the passing of Queen Elizabeth, the historic reign, and a long life devoted to duty, family, faith and service, has come to an end. The second Elizabethan age is over.

On behalf of the people of Bass, and Tasmanians, I express my heartfelt and sincere appreciation, respect and admiration for the life - and life of service - of her late Majesty, Queen Elizabeth. I acknowledge the tributes already given by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition at our last shortened sitting. There have been countless acts of mourning, many spoken words and many ceremonies. We have expressed disbelief, gratitude and sorrow.

From London, England, to Launceston, Australia, the peoples of many nations have united in a time of mourning. This, of course, amounts to billions of people expressing their personal sorrow in their own ways. For those of us in public life, we understand what it means to live in service to our community. We, as elected officials, realise we are never off-duty. We do not work nine to five. People in our communities recognise us wherever we go.

However, there is a major difference between a parliamentarian's life of service and the kind demonstrated by our late Queen. When our voters have had enough of us or we choose to retire, our life of service is over, and we return to our family and personal interests. A parliamentarian who serves, say, 20 years is said to have had a long career in politics. Not so with our Queen and now our King. Theirs is quite literally a life of service, walking the line between public leadership as well as public service, sworn to do so for the full extent of their natural lives. There is no retirement. The difference is very real between our political lives of service and the unmatched legacy of the Queen, having celebrated her 70th year Platinum Jubilee as the highest decision-maker in our Westminster system of government, at the age of 96.

Before she even took the throne, Elizabeth was ready for a life of service. She made it known on her 21st birthday, in 1947:

I declare before you all that my whole life, whether it be long or short, shall be devoted to your service and the service of our great imperial family to which we all belong, but I shall not have strength to carry out this resolution

alone unless you join it with me, as I now invite you to do. I know that your support will be unfailingly given. God help me to make good my vow and God bless all of you who are willing to share it.

The proof is there if we needed it. Even two days before her passing, Her Majesty was commissioning a new prime minister - look at that beautiful photograph - with a smile. I imagine she must have been so uncomfortable. I think about that a lot, knowing how hard final days can be. How very selfless of her. Those of us lucky enough to be able to tell our own children we lived in this time will always be able to remember Her Majesty as an inspired, disciplined leader who carried herself with enormous dignity, humility and decency.

However, she wore her crown only lightly. Make no mistake of her genuine affections for the people of our state, and our nation, Australia. For example, her humility on display whenever asked about the future of our constitution, Her Majesty said she trusted us to decide for ourselves and remained at our service as sovereign. It is well known that she was nonetheless delighted at the results of the referendum.

In respect of my own feelings, I realise that my perception of such sudden change, of living in a world without Queen Elizabeth, and the sense that one of the pillars of our global community had given way, our feelings have flowed up from the well of security, stability, honour and trust of living in the Westminster system of constitutional monarchy with a stable, peaceful democracy. These feelings, in my own way, are a reminder that we do not have each other forever. Is this not the way we always feel when we lose someone we love: a parent, a grandparent, a close friend, a sovereign? Over time, we must allow the deep sorrow that we and our community are feeling to shift instead to a deep thanksgiving for the privilege of having such a remarkable sovereign in our own lifetime.

In 1952, after deteriorating health, the young princess's father, King George VI, passed away. Her Majesty was a young woman at just 25 when she received the news - first of the fact that her father's death had occurred, and second, that she was already Queen. In the public mourning, we gain a small insight into her own private sorrows on the day of her accession, the day when she lost her greatly loved father.

Many Tasmanians will remember her seven visits to our island state, always with such an effort to reach the regions to converse with all levels of society, from the suited premiers to the young mums, from the business people to the mayors, to the farmers, and to the school kids. One of my unfulfilled hopes was to meet Her Majesty. However, like millions of others, I felt privileged just to see her from a distance on two of her visits.

Her late Majesty the Queen was a woman of strong but quiet faith. Her title, Defender of the Faith, is an ancient one with centuries of tradition. It is a form of words that while important and relevant, nonetheless has a clouding effect of what is and what must be the essence of the very personal nature of Christian faith; a relationship of trust, obedience and hope in a personal saviour; a personal faith, not an institutional one alone. In a speech in 1981, she said:

I know just how much I rely on my faith to guide me through the good times and the bad. Each day is a new beginning. I know that the only way to live my life is to try to do what is right, to take the long view, to give of my best in all that the day brings and to put my trust in God.

The people of so many nations, both Commonwealth and not, have joined together to mark our late Queen during these past three weeks. We have united around a common bond of respect for Queen Elizabeth II as head of state, but also love for the person herself, Elizabeth, a person of conviction, integrity, trust and kindness. We have lived to see a queen for seven decades in full public view show what it looks like to do justice, to love kindness and to walk humbly with our God.

We have loved her, and from the earliest of days there was that simple and hopeful trust that our monarch would act with duty and care for us and protect our way of life while also, strictly speaking, rule over us. Looking at history's list of kings and queens, we know that such simple and hopeful trust can be poorly and tragically misplaced. Not so with our gracious late Queen Elizabeth. We honour her today because she lived her life not only as sovereign reigning over us but at the same time living with her Christian humility and submission to her own king whom she publicly recognised throughout her life and, most memorably, in her now famous Royal Christmas Messages shared on radio and television.

With various people in authority around the world, whether in government, business or organisations, we see the combination of great power and great humility extremely rarely, but we have seen it in Queen Elizabeth. We have enjoyed it, we have benefited from it and we have admired it.

As I close, I will quote from her 2011 Royal Christmas Message. Her Majesty spoke about forgiveness, a subject we do not hear very much about these days, and said:

Although we are capable of great acts of kindness, history teaches us that we sometimes need saving from ourselves - from our recklessness or our greed. God sent into the world a unique person - neither a philosopher nor a general (important though they are) - but a Saviour, with the power to forgive.

Forgiveness lies at the heart of the Christian faith. It can heal broken families, it can restore friendships and it can reconcile divided communities. It is in forgiveness that we feel the power of God's love.

Let us reflect with thankfulness for the life of our beloved late Queen Elizabeth and choose to take this chance to dedicate our own lives to our families, our nation and our local community in honour of the great and unmatched legacy Her Majesty has left for us all.

[3.04 p.m.]

Ms ARCHER (Clark - Attorney-General) - Mr Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak to the condolence motion on the passing of Her late Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II and, in doing so, give thanks for a truly remarkable life. It is a tremendous loss that has been felt deeply, not only across the United Kingdom, Australia and Her Majesty's other realms and territories of the Commonwealth, but indeed right across the world.

Over the past three weeks, we have seen tributes from all corners of the globe, across the diversity of political, religious, social and cultural representation as testament of the unwavering dignity, professionalism, apoliticism and dedication Her Majesty displayed across her extraordinary 70-year reign. Whilst many positive affirmations have been offered in remembrance of Her Majesty over the past three weeks, it is her commitment to service that rises to the fore time and time again.

As we know, this life of service and the Crown was originally neither Her Majesty's birthright nor fate. Princess Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Windsor was born in London to the Duke and Duchess of York who later, through a series of now infamous events, was proclaimed King George VI in 1936, thus setting a course that, at the age of 10, would alter the trajectory of Princess Elizabeth's life forever.

Ascending the throne at just 25 years of age, Her Majesty ruled longer than any other monarch in British history, surpassing the reign of her great-great-grandmother, Queen Victoria, and lived true to her now oft quoted statement made on her twenty-first birthday:

I declare before you all that my whole life, whether it be long or short, shall be devoted to your service ...

Yet in her typical modest style, she refused to make a fuss of this milestone, saying:

The title of longest serving was not one to which I have ever aspired.

In an amazing feat she grew the Commonwealth from just seven nations to 56 members, representing more than 2.5 billion people during her tenure and in doing so became an inspiration for women and girls around the world, profoundly at a time in history when women in roles of leadership, power and influence were severely under-represented.

A working queen, she undertook over 200 visits to Commonwealth countries, visiting almost all of them, and kept a busy schedule of patronage work for more than 500 charities, professional bodies and public service organisations across a variety of causes.

Her Majesty also presided over 15 United Kingdom prime ministers during her reign, always apolitically, yet with the right to encourage and warn as she saw fit at weekly meetings held with her chief minister. Various media reports across the decades would suggest that, as a fly on the wall, some of these meetings might be far more interesting than others.

There can be no doubting Her Majesty's affection for her first prime minister, Sir Winston Churchill, at whose funeral she broke royal protocol by following his coffin out of the church and, in what seemed more of a 'warn' than an 'encourage', famously wrote to parliament upon Sir Winston's death outlining his state funeral arrangements, noting that it would be the wish of all her people to have an opportunity to express their sorrow. I quote:

Confident in the support of Parliament for the due acknowledgement of our debt of gratitude and in thanksgiving for the life and example of a national hero, I have directed that Sir Winston's body shall lie in State at Westminster Hall and thereafter the Funeral Service shall be held in the Cathedral Church of Saint Paul.

Given that that is exactly what happened, it is presumed that none of the members of parliament at the time challenged Her Majesty's correspondence.

There has been extensive media commentary since the loss of Her Majesty suggesting that in our collective grief the Queen represents someone close to us all, perhaps a grandmother, elderly relative, teacher, mentor or family friend for whom we still mourn because, despite the

pomp and ceremony of the Crown, Her Majesty was in so many ways relatable as a working woman, a wife, mother, grandmother and great-grandmother.

We know this because she was forced to live her personal life in the most highly scrutinised public eye, from her wedding day to family christenings, picnics at Balmoral, meeting her great-grandchildren for the first time and even in grief for the recent loss of her husband, Prince Philip, and other family members. The lens of the world's media was never far from her private affairs, serving only to further illustrate the enormous personal sacrifice she undertook in fulfilling her duties as monarch over seven decades.

One of the more light-hearted examples of this is an anecdote from Her Majesty and Prince Philip's 1954 trip to Australia, the first by a ruling monarch, visiting the ACT, New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia, including greeting 70 000 ex-servicemen and women at the Melbourne Cricket Ground and opening the Australian Parliament in Canberra.

In Victoria, a stunned media troop captured a very young Queen Elizabeth shouting at Prince Philip, who was storming out of the villa where they were staying, to come back. The prince dutifully went back inside, at which point the royal press secretary at the time hastily negotiated with the film crew and the film in question was quickly exposed and handed over. Moments later, a composed monarch returned, addressing the media pack with, 'I'm sorry for that little interlude but, as you know, it happens in every marriage. Now, what would you like me to do?'. She would go on to refer to him as her strength and stay, and he would proclaim at their golden wedding celebration that she had tolerance in abundance as theirs was a love story spanning 73 years.

In contemporary terms, we might refer to Her Majesty's style with jargon like 'personal brand' but our Land Rover-driving, corgi-loving, horse-riding and horse-racing enthusiast monarch with a wardrobe brimming with colourful power suits, once modestly said, 'I can't ever wear beige as no one will know who I am'. She made an art of being archetypal through authenticity well before it was a buzzword.

Further endearing us to her were Her Majesty's carefully chosen forays into pop culture for causes close to her heart, from the 'boom, really, please' line in the promotion for the Invictus Games alongside Prince Harry and Barack and Michelle Obama to her famous clip with James Bond, also known as Daniel Craig, for the opening ceremony of the 2012 London Olympic Games. Most recently, there was a heart-warming cup of tea and marmalade sandwich with the beloved Paddington Bear to open her Platinum Jubilee celebrations. In her death this has become even more iconic as people pay tribute by leaving Paddington Bears instead of flowers to express their grief outside Buckingham Palace.

These amusing and somewhat playful cameo appearances gave us unprecedented insight into Her Majesty's wicked sense of humour and made us all feel a little bit closer to our playful monarch. Known for her humility and empathy, displaying a genuine interest in meeting her subjects, and for her ability to treat everyone as an equal, Her Majesty was a constant through war, economic hardship, natural disasters, political tensions and, of course, a global pandemic.

For the majority of us, Queen Elizabeth II was the only monarch we had ever known. She was determined that the monarchy should always command a place of affection and respect in the hearts of the British people. Her reign ended in a vastly different world from the one of

1952 in which it began, yet her enduring faith is the church she led, in fact, respect for all faiths, and values of service to her people, support for her family, humility under pressure, aspiration for the future and a deep respect for the systems and institutions that promote democracy, good governance, peace and the rule of law remained relevant for the entirety of her reign and now define her legacy.

More was expected of Queen Elizabeth II than could surely be considered reasonable, yet we all witnessed that she continued to serve right up until the end of her life, with new Prime Minister Liz Truss being sworn in by the monarch just two days before Her Majesty's death. It is unlikely that our world will ever see the likes of Her Majesty again.

We give thanks for her outstanding life of duty and service, and offer our deep and sincere condolences to her Royal Family and the staff and friends who will miss her greatly. We have not only lost an iconic monarch but a deeply loved matriarch.

As patron of the Australian Monarchist League in Tasmania, I am personally deeply saddened by the Queen's loss. Her selfless sense of service, her warm and sometimes wicked character, her strong devotion to her family and endearing personality will remain in the hearts of many Australians for numerous years to come. God bless the Queen. Long live the King.

[3.14 p.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) - Mr Speaker, on 21 April 1926 a woman was born who would go on to leave a profound mark on the world. Queen Elizabeth II remained a constant in our lives during a period of significant change. Despite Her Majesty being very old, I do not think we ever expected her to pass away. In the end, her death was very sudden. I was personally very saddened by it.

The world will not be the same without Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II in it. She has left an enduring legacy. Stoicism, strength and humility epitomises the late Queen Elizabeth II. It is difficult to imagine what it would have been like to be thrust into the limelight and assume the role of queen at just 25 years of age. It was quite remarkable and an enormous personal sacrifice, particularly given that Queen Elizabeth II was married and had young children.

A lifetime of service in the spotlight is incredible over 70 years. It is an incredible personal contribution, the ultimate act of service. We have much to thank Her Majesty for during her reign.

I extend my deepest condolences to the Royal Family and her beloved staff and friends at this time of immense sadness and loss. It must have been very difficult grieving under such public scrutiny. My heart went out to the Royal Family during the Queen's funeral, especially her great grandchildren. I extend my best wishes and thanks to King Charles III as he embarks upon his new role.

There was always great interest in my family in the royals and we always watched the Queen's Christmas message. Both my grandmothers were regular readers of the *Woman's Day*, *New Idea* and *Women's Weekly*, and there were always lively discussions about the latest royal news.

The years were not always easy for the Royal Family or the Queen. The devastating death of Princess Diana is a day I will always remember. This goes to show the impact the

Queen and the Royal Family has had on generation upon generation. The Queen always dealt with public scrutiny with great poise and dignity. This characterised her nature.

I have always been interested in the royal fashions. Perhaps that came from my beloved memories of reading the *New Idea* with my great-grandmother. I want to share a couple of interesting facts and pay tribute to those. The things I am going to talk about characterise the qualities Queen Elizabeth II portrayed to us. The Queen's clothes were not just about a style choice or a brand statement. They were steeped with meaning and influence. Whether she was wearing a beautiful jewelled gown or a tweed skirt, every outfit said something about her and her role as an ambassador and figurehead for us. Her wardrobe was her communication. She had to be prepared, reliable and traditional. While walking the line of being accessible and reassuring, her clothes had to be worthy of royalty. I am reading some of this from a BBC article.

There was also a diplomatic role held by the Queen, subtle nods to a country or event shown in emblems or colours that she wore. The subtle pink-coloured dress she wore to the opening ceremony of the London 2012 Olympic Games was chosen because it was on none of the national flags. It stood out but also it was not showing any allegiance. That is very important.

Like any other iconic brand or statement piece, the Queen means different things to us all. It is through these beautiful photos and the way she presented herself to the world that people have interpreted her in their own special way. Many people have reflected on that over the last few weeks. I do not think any of us really knew who she was but what we did know was what she stood for. That was her strength, her boldness and her authenticity. These qualities still remain relevant today and they were expressed through her dress over many years.

The Queen's job was to be a calm and consistent presence, and she did that very well. Her clothes were a mix of knowing what to expect but also an ability to surprise and delight. Others have noted the beautiful colours she wore over the years.

The point I am trying to make with these observations is that the Queen's character was expressed by what she wore and how she conducted herself. That set an extremely high standard for us all and we can all learn much from that.

The last point I will make is about when the Queen visited Burnie in 1988. I can remember that day vividly because I was one of the many schoolchildren lining the streets, waving to her as she visited our town to proudly make our town a city. That will always remain a very fond memory of mine growing up. The large number of people who turned out to line the streets was simply extraordinary, and represented the great deal of respect and admiration felt for the Queen by our local community. It is a day I will always remember and treasure.

In concluding, I again thank Queen Elizabeth II for her outstanding service. Rest in eternal peace, Your Majesty. You have set an outstanding example for us all.

[3.20 p.m.]

Mr STREET (Franklin - Leader of the House) - Mr Speaker, I do not plan to speak for very long, but I want to make a short contribution.

My priorities were made pretty clear in my maiden speech in this place back in 2016, when I pointed out that I had sworn allegiance to Queen Elizabeth II a few days previously, but that I hoped in my time in parliament I would have the opportunity to swear allegiance to an Australian head of state. I have stated my wish for this country up front.

I also acknowledge that for many members of our community, particularly our First Nations indigenous people, the Royal Family represents a negative in their life and their knowledge of history, and their shared history in this country. We are mature enough as members of this place and as a country to be able to reflect on the life of Queen Elizabeth II, without necessarily accepting everything that goes with the Royal Family.

You do not have to be a believer in hereditary succession to appreciate that Queen Elizabeth II gave her entire life in service of the community and the Commonwealth. I must admit I am a bit of a sucker for the pageantry and everything that goes with it when we have had royal occasions, even though I am not a believer in the Royal Family. I watched the second half of the Queen's funeral in amazement at the detail and extravagance of the ceremony.

It struck me, watching her children in particular grieve - her grandchildren and great-grandchildren as well - but to watch her children grieve, and to reflect on the fact that for King Charles III, the greatest honour that he will ever have bestowed upon him comes at the exact moment of one of the very worst moments in anybody's life, and that is the loss of a parent. You do not have to be a believer in the Royal Family to admire Charles' ability, less than 24 hours after his mother's passing, to front up on international worldwide television and pay tribute to his mother, and also express his hope that he could emulate her life of service towards the people of the Commonwealth.

The other thing that struck me, three or four days before Queen Elizabeth's passing, was the fact that she received the new British prime minister, Liz Truss, at Balmoral. Anyone who has seen photos of that particular occasion, and has watched the Queen over the years, would have undeniably recognised that she was not well, that she was particularly frail.

I understand she is 96 years old, but for me it was one of the first times that I have looked at the Queen and thought, 'she is an old lady'. She was obviously in poor health. We may never actually know for certain, because these things are carefully protected, but it is my suspicion that the Queen got off her death bed to perform that one final act of service in greeting the new British prime minister at Balmoral. It is the first time it has ever happened outside the capital of London, but it says everything about this lady's determination and her dedication to service that at her lowest point, when she was feeling as bad as anybody could possibly feel, she did not delegate responsibility. She did not send for somebody else to step into her place. She got out of bed, got dressed and did her duty to the people she swore to faithfully serve back in 1952.

Regardless of your view of the Royal Family, you can only have admiration for someone who was so dedicated to the oath they took when they came into office. It is a level of dedication that we can all strive to in this place, while also recognising that the Royal Family hereditary succession, and everything that goes with it, is from a time past, and we need to look to the future.

To Queen Elizabeth - may she rest in peace - and to her family who will continue to grieve for some time, I can only say that you have my sympathies for having to do the most private and sensitive thing you can do - grieving the loss of a loved one - in the public gaze.

I thank them as well for their service to the Commonwealth.

[3.26 p.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I rise to make my contribution.

We are all visitors to this time, this place. We are just passing through. Our purpose here is to observe, to learn, to grow, to love, and then we return.

A small, but quite regular, beautiful turn of phrase from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

This afternoon I have the honour in rising to pay tribute to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I would like to quote a few of the many incredible moments that the Queen shared with us around the world, but also in Tasmania and particularly in Bass. I also take the opportunity to reflect on things she said, and moments she shared with us.

From the very beginning she declared:

I declare before you that my whole life, whether it be short or long, shall be devoted to your service.

Throughout our lives in this place, the Queen has been a regular, positive and often sprightly, happy presence in our lives, whether it be as a child seeing her regularly on bank notes, stamps or coins, or as a young adult I would regularly see her portrait hanging in the council chambers or in local RSLs or community halls. On the other side of the world, the Queen was always a constant and has always been a constant in our lives.

In the days since her passing it has been a time of reflection not only on what the Queen achieved in her lifetime but also on the things we can learn about her poise and her grace, as the People's Queen. Reflecting on her 70 years of service:

When it comes to how to mark 70 years as your Queen, there is no guidebook to follow. It really is a first. I remain committed to serving you to the best of my ability, supported by my family.

That is a really lovely reflection in that moment - that although everybody has a different experience of the Royal Family, and the Queen as their leader for so long, who so beautifully and gracefully led not only her family but also the Commonwealth. She did it in such a remarkable way, as a woman from a very young age having to take on such great responsibility, with a balance of conviction and deliberation, and with a balance of poise and grace, but also a little lightheartedness and humour to remind us all that she was very much human, and just like all of us.

I think you can agree, whether you are a monarchist or republican, Queen Elizabeth was someone we all held great admiration for. Elizabeth was never meant to be the Queen. It was the abdication of her uncle Edward that saw her father, a shy Albert, take the throne. Shortly after her father became king, the Second World War began. Throughout the war, Princess

Elizabeth worked as a car mechanic in the Auxiliary Territorial Service, the women's army service. She was the first female member of the Royal Family to join the armed forces full time, and it gave her that natural and quite beautiful common touch. Her marriage to Philip Mountbatten in 1947, the Duke of Edinburgh, was seized as an opportunity to brighten a national life still in the grip of a postwar era.

When Queen Elizabeth became the reigning crown at the tender age of 25, after the death of her father, the monarchy was at a crossroads. Its popularity and political power were flailing, but she declared before us all that her whole life, whether it be short or long shall be devoted to service. She lived by that each and every day in what were tremendously difficult times and also times where she was able to do that with a lightness and a spring in her step.

Regardless of whose company she was in, she could always relate, whether it be a commander or a commoner or a dignitary visiting at one of her residences. She worked with 15 British prime ministers, from Winston Churchill to the most recent, Liz Truss, whom she met just 48 hours before her passing. She danced with presidents and dined with prime ministers, knighted Robert Menzies and made Enid Lyons a dame.

Because of the deep affection we all fostered for the Queen, we grieve in her own words, 'Grief is the price we pay for love', and she was surely loved by many.

Throughout her 70-year reign, Queen Elizabeth visited Tasmania seven times. Queen Elizabeth was the first reigning monarch of Australia to set foot on Australian soil in 1954. On that tour she visited Tasmania and stayed at the historic Connorville wool property at Cressy. It was the only private residence the Royal Couple stayed in during their tour.

In 1970, the front page of the *Sunday Examiner Express* read, 'Children ambush royal Rolls-Royce at Exeter' as the Queen walked through the north. In 1977, during her Silver Jubilee, she met with children at Government House and large crowds gathered in Macquarie Street in Hobart. In 1981 she was photographed with then premier Doug Lowe and attended the Launceston Show, where she presented a ribbon for the best Jersey cow to Jenny Sykes.

On 27 April 1988, the Queen visited TSIT aquaculture senior lecturer Dr Nigel Forteach, and described a crayfish held by technical officer Barry White in Kings Meadows. In 2000, Queen Elizabeth II spoke at Launceston's Albert Hall and accepted posies from schoolchildren in Salamanca, accompanied by our very own, who was then Lord Mayor, Rob Valentine.

In total, she had six royal visits to Bass and attended a reception at Town Hall in 1954; the Mowbray Races in 1970; again, a reception at Town Hall in 1977; visited the Launceston Show in 1981; opened the School of Nursing at UTAS in 1988; and walked through the beautiful Launceston City Park in 2000.

One of the things I have loved as a young woman in community watching her life and the way she delivered her service to community was that she also found moments and created what seemed to be a priority around having a little sense of humour to get through what would have been such a serious life.

There are a couple of moments I wanted to reflect on that many people across the world will not forget.

In 2016, when promoting the Invictus Games with Prince Harry, there was a really nice interchange between the Obamas and the Queen. The Obamas jokingly said, 'Be careful what you wish for', and the Queen responded with a comical, 'Oh, really?', and then Harry's 'Boom!' When you have such a serious position and you are often called on for such strong and difficult decisions, to maintain your grace and have that lightness is something we could all take insight from.

There was also that moment where the Queen officially launched the 2012 London Olympics by parachuting out of a helicopter with Daniel Craig's James Bond as the theme music played, and even the corgis making an appearance. Again, it was a beautiful moment where someone can be so confident in themselves that they can be so light-hearted. Who can forget - and I know others around the Chamber have mentioned this - at her Platinum Jubilee when she took tea with Paddington Bear and delighted people when she quietly pulled a marmalade sandwich out of her purse? I love those moments. With the lightness she also said:

Throughout all my life and with all my heart, I shall strive to be worthy of your trust.

I will finish with a couple of the lessons that the Queen has shared with us. I mentioned family, but it seems that Her Majesty always maintained that her marriage to the Duke of Edinburgh was a big part of their success together. Together they were intensely curious about people. They wanted to understand people, to know what made people tick and what it was within them that could develop human capacity. In this place, having such corporate knowledge or knowledge of a life, is very important and, through her service, visiting 100 countries, travelling and creating an understanding of the world.

On this opportunity, I say, Your Majesty, thank you for your service. May you now rest in peace. God bless the Queen and long live the King.

[3.35 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Minister for Energy and Renewables) - Mr Speaker, I stand in support of this motion of condolence in honour of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. No-one will be surprised when I say that I believe I am one of Tasmania's greatest admirers of Her Majesty. On hearing of Queen Elizabeth II's passing on 8 September, that early Friday morning will forever be etched in my memory with deep sadness but also enormous admiration and appreciation for Her Majesty's long service.

Like others here in this Chamber and other Tasmanians and around the world, I woke to the news of Her Majesty's passing and reflected on this amazing life of 96 years. A double rainbow broke through the clouds in London and appeared over Buckingham Palace just before the Queen's death was announced, a sign, in my view, that the Lord was thankful for the life and service of Queen Elizabeth II, a good and faithful servant.

During her 70-year reign as our Queen, and particularly so over these past two years a constantly changing world with the pandemic of the last couple of years, Her Majesty remained steadfast in her beliefs and her values. The Queen was a dutiful servant to her country, the Commonwealth and all its people. She was gracious and kind, a role model who embodied the values of a servant leader. It was a role that was never intended for her but due to the abdication of her uncle, Her Majesty was destined at the age of only 10 years. At the celebration of her twenty-first birthday, she said:

I declare before you all that my whole life, whether it be long or short, shall be devoted to your service and the service of our great imperial family to which we all belong, but I shall not have strength to carry out this resolution alone unless you join with me as I now invite you to do. I know that your support will be unfailingly given. God help me to make good my vow, and God bless all of you who are willing to share in it.

Such words demonstrated even her commitment and dedication to duty. Nor was this point lost on our second longest-serving Prime Minister, John Howard, who recounted the day after her passing how true her twenty-first birthday speech came to be. He said her last duty in receiving the new UK Prime Minister, Liz Truss, only two days before her death was, 'in many ways, a metaphor for her whole life'. So true.

The Queen had a strong Christian faith and values, knowing full well she held a position where she could do much good around the world, and she did. It was no secret that the Bible was the primary source of Her Majesty's faith. In her 2016 Christmas broadcast, she said:

To what greater inspiration and counsel can we turn than to the imperishable truth to be found in this treasure, the Bible? Billions of people now follow Christ's teaching and find in Him the guiding light of their lives. I am one of them because Christ's example helps me see the value in doing small things with great love, whoever does them, and whatever they themselves believe.

We were fortunate to have the Queen and Prince Philip visit Australia on 17 occasions and she came to Tasmania's shores seven times, which I believe is a reflection of her true love for our nation and the people of this great country Australia and Tasmania. Sixteen Australian prime ministers served her, and 18 individual Tasmanian premiers - in fact, 20 premierships if you count Premier Cosgrove's twice appointment and likewise Reece's twice appointment.

Two years after becoming Queen she paid her first visit to Tasmania, in 1954, visiting Hobart, the north-west and Launceston. She visited again in 1963, 1970, 1977, 1981, 1988, and the last time in 2000. If anyone would like a tribute to Her Majesty, with photographs of the Royal Couple's seven visits to the state, they are available in the form of a pamphlet from my electorate offices at Deloraine, New Norfolk, Launceston and Hobart. Today I table that pamphlet, Mr Speaker.

In the past couple of weeks, it has been delightful to hear the many stories from Tasmanians of their meetings, reflections and memories of the Queen. I had the pleasure of signing the book of condolence in Parliament House in Canberra while I was there for the housing ministerial council meeting the day after Her Majesty died, just as the world was coming to terms with her passing. This was also where my wife Kate and I had the pleasure of attending a dinner with the Queen to commemorate her 80th birthday in 2006; it is one of the best speeches I have ever witnessed. It demonstrated her understanding of our past history as a nation, her genuine interest and love of our country, Australia's place in the world now, and hope for the future. We left that day knowing we were privileged to have been in attendance for such an historic event. It is a moment we will never forget.

Her Majesty also touched our family, our three children who love their pets, including our pet dog Jack. When my daughter Alice, aged five, wrote to the Queen to ask about her corgis, we never expected to hear back. However, some time later, to Alice's excitement, we

helped her carefully open a letter, stamped in the corner with the Queen's head, all the way from the United Kingdom. It was written by one of the ladies-in-waiting on behalf of Her Majesty, providing details of the health of the corgis, photos and their favourite foods. It is a memory that will not only have stayed with Alice, but also our whole family. This small but tangible connection to our Queen is treasured just a little bit more now.

Like many Australian families, we would all watch the Queen's annual Christmas broadcast and later read about Her Majesty's words of wisdom. Her Majesty's faith would play a prominent role in reflecting on the past year and the one to come. In 2008 she said:

When life seems hard, the courageous do not lie down and accept defeat.
Instead they are all the more determined to struggle for a better future.

The Queen's love of animals, and particularly her corgis, throughout her life is well known. I believe we all felt a lump in our throats as we saw images of Muick and Sandy, as well as her favourite pony Emma, stand by and silently watch the funeral procession pass by on its way to Windsor Castle. They knew their mum was not coming home.

Her Majesty's funeral was watched by billions around the world. It was testament to the high esteem in which she was regarded that, despite whatever one's views might be, people respected her commitment to duty and service.

On our national day of mourning last Thursday, it was a pleasure to attend and participate in Longford's Christ Church Anglican Church service of thanksgiving for the life of Her Majesty. With my wife Kate, it was an honour to join the Northern Midlands Council mayor, Mary Knowles, to plant an English oak tree in the gardens to honour Her Majesty.

I also acknowledge the role the Anglican Church of Australia has played in hosting services around Australia and Tasmania in honour of Her Majesty's life. Now, as we begin the adjustment to a new monarch, with King Charles III as the head of state in Australia - and that includes a King on our own currency, the King's Council, the King's Birthday public holiday, and I expect new buildings in his honour - we will forever remember his mother, our Queen for 70 years. We can only wonder if Her Majesty's reign would have been so long if she did not have Prince Philip, her husband of almost 74 years, by her side for almost all of that time. Prince Philip was her rock, and Her Majesty became ours.

As I said at the start of my remarks on this condolence motion, I am reflecting on the Queen's service and leadership. What a wonderful role model. The attributes she exhibited are ones that we would like reflected in ourselves, in our children, and in generations to come. The question for each of us today is, how can we help this legacy to endure.

Our Majesty, our Queen, thank you for your devoted service, for being a role model and for your servant leadership. I express my deepest condolences to King Charles III and to Her Majesty's broader family. Long live the King.

[3.45 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Mr Speaker, I rise today to mark the passing of Her Majesty the late Queen Elizabeth II, and with her passing the end of the second Elizabethan age. There are people who were born, grew up and grew older knowing only one Queen. Indeed, to remember any other ruler, they would have to be an octogenarian themselves. The duration of her reign

is in itself a remarkable testament to her commitment to duty. That commitment, as she promised, was kept to the very last, and of note was the Queen's perpetual manner.

Hers was a long life that bore witness to one of the most dynamic changes in recent history. The Queen was a guiding constant to many lives, a welcome anachronism that enabled a sense of stability, tradition and continuity in a rapidly changing world. One need only count the number of prime ministers or presidents who have come and gone under her reign. From her first prime minister in Winston Churchill through to her last in Liz Truss she was that one guiding constant that could, according to those who knew her, always be sought for advice.

In Australia, there was a genuine respect - and, for some, love - for the Queen, and a great sense of loss at her passing. My nanna adored the Queen; I have inherited special edition commemorative books from the Queen's Coronation, which my nanna told me to keep immaculately. She advised at the time that, 'These will be very valuable one day, so do take care to look after them properly, dear'.

In contrast, I was not raised as a monarchist. In fact, my great-grandmother, a strong Scottish immigrant, was questioning of the Empire, colonisation, and what it represents. Growing up, we were always taught to question. I believe as a community it is important, when the time is right, to continue this path, and as we grow up as a nation, that we define the direction in which we would like to move in the future.

The Queen did have something incredibly special about her, whether it was the pomp, the privilege or the tradition. I am aware that when she visited Bridgewater to open the new high school in 1977, it gave the community a huge boost and a tremendous feeling of pride, which has lasted decades and decades.

I have a copy of the Bridgewater High School 20th anniversary supplement, 20 March 1997, where two grade 10 students, Louise Broadbury and Dianne Oakley interviewed Tanya Gunn, who was working as a teacher's assistant when the Queen visited in 1977. This is some of the dialogue from that interview, which deals with an encounter with the late Queen and the late Duke of Edinburgh. It reads:

What was it like when the Queen came to the school?

It rained. We had to be at school very early before the police blocked off the roads. It was a public holiday, but Bridgewater High people had to come to school. There were lots of people outside waiting to meet the Queen before she came into the school and it seemed like a long time for us waiting inside, but when she did come it all went very fast.

Where were you at the time?

I was between the grade 7 and 8 areas in what was then one big art room. The Queen walked from the grade 8 area into the cooking room, then through the other end into the grade 7 area.

Is it true that the Duke spoke to you?

Yes, the Duke of Edinburgh did not go into the cooking room with the Queen, but instead stood outside where I was and asked me a few questions. I told him about the good-quality artwork the students had been doing, but I did not tell him that among the students before him were some teachers' primary school children who had joined the class to get a closer look at the Queen. I remember thinking he was very tall and quietly spoken.

The Queen then wrote to the Bridgewater High School some 20 years later, which is such a lovely completion of that loop. It is something that the Royal Family does very well. They are very good at those details. It states:

A message from Queen Elizabeth to Acting Principal Anne Caversung.

I have great pleasure in sending to all at Bridgewater High School my sincere congratulations on the school's 20th anniversary. I have the happiest memories of your opening in 1977 and I understand that the school has thrived in the years between. I hope that prosperity long continues and I send my heartfelt wishes to you, the staff, the pupils and to Rocky and others at the farm.

Elizabeth R
7 March 1997

As we look to the future and begin a new era under the Queen's son, King Charles III, it is worth remembering that should we choose, as a nation, to strive for a different model of governance with an Australian head of state, we can still recognise the attributes of the Queen and the strength of the Commonwealth system of government.

Finally, I am reminded of the words of poet Philip Larkin, who devised a small quatrain to be inscribed before the Silver Jubilee Urn in London. Of all the words set down to describe our late Queen, these few do it best and most simply:

In times when nothing stood
but worsened, or grew strange
there was one constant good:
she did not change

[3.51 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Education, Children and Youth) - Mr Speaker, I, like others, rise today to add my personal reflections on the life and legacy of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and to extend my sincere condolences to her family on her passing. I do so not as a monarchist but as someone who was raised with deep respect for the presence of this queen in the life of my family and my country.

Throughout my own life, there have been a series of coincidental, symbolic personal touch points with the Queen and her Royal Family. Some of you may know my middle name is Charles, which I am told is an old family name, but my sisters' middle names are Elizabeth and Margaret. These were apparently popular middle names at the time they were born, or so

we are told, but there is a pattern emerging. Only last week, I learned that my eldest daughter's name, Alexandra, was also Queen Elizabeth II's second name. and so the pattern continues.

My first dog was a corgi, a stray who joined our family when I was about five - another coincidence. We did not choose her, she chose us. I am the custodian of two old green Land Rovers: a Series One Land Rover similar to the Royal Review model the Queen used on her 1954 trip to Tasmania; and a 1971 model with a Land Rover six-cylinder engine, which was apparently introduced at the suggestion of Prince Philip, whose own specially modified Land Rover carried him to his final resting place at his funeral just last year.

As a Boy Scout, as a member of parliament, as a minister of the Crown and as a frequent visitor to RSL clubs, the Queen has been invoked in some of the most important oaths and promises I have made and responsibilities I have undertaken in my life. These random, small symbolic connections have been my touch points with our Queen in my life growing up on the other side of the world. They point not to a particularly royalist upbringing but to the real presence and recognition of the Royal Family in our general society and popular culture where and when I was growing up.

For others, this presence has been more personal and more important. My parents were children when Queen Elizabeth was crowned in a world that was recovering from war. Her youth and potential embodied hopes of new beginnings, peace and stability after the recent turmoil and tragedy of that time, which people of my parents' generation shared. Through the milestones of her life and theirs - marriage, parenthood, grief, loss and celebrations, the Queen was a constant. She existed on a completely different plane from ordinary people but her life progressed through its stages in parallel with theirs and she was always there.

You only get this with an actual person in a lifelong role. It is hard to imagine any other model of a head of state that can offer this quality of continuity and this sense of a lifelong relationship between a leader and their subjects.

For most of the Queen's life, social and tabloid media did not exist. The images and insights into her life were selective and highly curated. However, they were always there and they were consistent. The brand and the personality have not changed despite the changing scrutiny and penetration of the media over time. While most people could never claim to have known our Queen personally, we have had a sense of who she was for us. We might only have seen her in official images and footage, and heard her speeches, but those images and messages have been consistent through a lifetime. That is hard to fake. In a world of change, uncertainty and rampant fakery, that has to be worth something.

A commentator covering the Queen's funeral procession last Monday night our time referred to her as having been 'like ballast for her nation'. Ballast is heavy material that is loaded into empty ships so they sit down in the water and are stable, and do not get tossed around by waves and storms, and they stay safe. Through global and local events, terrorism, and the pandemic, the Queen has provided a level of continuity, stoicism and calm through otherwise tumultuous times for her people and her community of peoples around the world.

At the same time, she has experienced family events and tragedies similar to those many of us will encounter in our own lives. That proved she was a human person too. There was a combination of her majesty and her humanity on show through the funeral procession, and the

commentary and coverage of it. This proved that people understood and valued her contribution and worth at these many levels.

My parents grew up with the Queen and grew old with her. She has been our queen all of my life. Maybe ours will be the last generation who can say that. Like many Australians, I look forward to having an Australian head of state one day. However, I look back on the constant, positive presence of Queen Elizabeth II in the lives of generations of my family and I give thanks for that. Rest in peace, Your Majesty.

[3.59 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I stand this afternoon to give my support to this motion of condolence for the passing of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I pass on my sincere condolences, especially to her family but also to all those who loved her and all those who grieve her passing.

Just imagine, for a second, 70 years of meet-and-greets, meeting everybody from presidents to schoolchildren, to heads of state and other royals, day after day, year after year. We have to thank Her Majesty for her 70 years of service. She was born on 21 April 1926 and died on 8 September 2022, aged 96, having reigned from February 1952 until her death.

I do not share much in common with the Queen, apart from perhaps one thing which is a love for corgis. When I say corgis, I mean real corgis, which are the Pembroke Welsh corgis. What happened to our family was, on a dark and stormy night after a thunderstorm, a corgi arrived at the farm. We looked after the dog for three or four days until it just as mysteriously disappeared. We do not know where that dog came from and we do not know where it went, but it sparked a love of corgis.

In subsequent years we had many corgis and each of them had a royal name. We started off with Queenie, then we went to Charlie, Fergie, Andy, Teddys 1 and 2, Georgie and so on. This family tradition has carried on with my brother James, whose current dog is Alfie, named after Alfred the Great. You can get the picture here that we have had so many corgis that we are running out of royal names. Next thing you know we will be down to Athelstan and Sweyn Forkbeard. Corgis are magnificent dogs and we definitely share that in common with the Queen.

On a more serious note, there is one thing the Queen said that has really moved me and I have reflected on a number of times in my life. They are the words the Queen gave the public in the wake of the death of Princess Diana, which were, 'Grief is the price we pay for love'. That is something we can all use in those moments when grief is the price that we are paying for the love of somebody close to us. I have reflected on that and I thank the Queen for those words.

It has been reflected on already in this place, but Her Majesty gave a lifetime of service and was a steadying influence, not only on the Commonwealth but on the rest of the world. She saw enormous change over her 70-year reign. She saw enormous changes within the Commonwealth with countries becoming independent and some becoming republics. There has also been some dysfunction in her family yet she carried on with grace and it never impacted her duties.

Imagine 70 years of meets and greets. We had weeks of media coverage in the wake of the death of Her Majesty the Queen and the one thing we did not hear from were people who said that when they met the Queen they did not feel special, they felt like she brushed them off and did not care. In performing her duties, the Queen made everybody feel special, whether it be the child handing her flowers at a meet and greet along the road for something somewhere, there is nobody who said she did not make them feel special because she went that extra effort every time for 70 years. We all need to reflect on that sense of duty and the performance of that duty, rain, hail or shine, and always in the public spotlight.

She said that her whole life, whether it be short or long, would be devoted to public service. There is absolutely no doubt that is what happened, right up until her passing. She saw 15 British prime ministers, she was seven times in Tasmania, but we have very little understanding of the amount of work she would have done day in, day out, whether it be signing papers, signing letters, meeting people, going to official openings, official events, attending an organisation she was patron for, organising other royals and signing papers into law. This would have happened continually for 70 years without batting an eyelid, without anybody thinking it was any trouble.

Once again I express my sincere condolences on the Queen's passing. May she rest in peace.

[4.04 p.m.]

Ms OGILVIE (Clark - Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries) - Mr Deputy Speaker, the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II was a very sad and serious moment that was felt by the Royal Family, Tasmanians, Australians and many across the Commonwealth and the entire world.

As many have rightly expressed, Elizabeth II dedicated her life to serving the Commonwealth. She undertook this role with honesty, integrity, a sense of duty, dignity and authenticity. The Queen provided stability and rarely, if ever, put a foot wrong.

At the same time, she had a family. She was a remarkable mother to four, grandmother to eight and great-grandmother to 12. All eight of the Queen's grandchildren kept vigil by their grandmother's coffin at Westminster Hall and it was very touching.

Many Tasmanians visited Government House and other spots across the state to sign a condolence book to inscribe their sentiments, to lay some flowers and share their thoughts and stories. We have heard many personal anecdotes today in relation to people's connection with the Queen. I would like to share some of mine and also those of my family. It seems that history is interwoven over a number of generations and it is lovely to reflect on these moments at these times.

I was very fortunate as a younger person, a young lawyer, to be invited to the Trooping of the Colour in London at the Horse Guards in the presence of Her Majesty. It was quite an event for a young colonial lawyer to be in London to see such a spectacular display of horsemanship and pride that is taken in the forces and the presentation of many of the units we saw at the funeral, which I will turn to in a minute, but to see them in action with the horses, the carriages, the fantastic digital displays and, of course, the impeccable British manners which are something to behold. It was quite lovely to be 'ma'amed' by the attendants at that incredible event. That experience has stayed with me my entire life. I remember it so vividly

and it was such a wonderful time. To see the British love of horses and horse riding and all things equestrian in full flight was quite magnificent.

The Chamber may or may not know that I have English relatives. My sister lives in London and my nephews, Henry and Ralph Lopes went to Eton College. They have sent me Eton's note on the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, which is a sermon delivered by Lord Waldegrave of North Hill, Provost of Eton College, at their college chapel on 11 September 2022. I would like to read some parts of that into the *Hansard* because it captures some of the moment in the most beautiful way. It starts:

Lord, now let thou, thy servant, depart in peace.

An old lady, a very old lady, has died, and as you might expect, her children, her grandchildren, her great-grandchildren, her friends and relations mourn her. They find consolation, no doubt, in the old lady's unshakeable Christian faith and perhaps they remember the words of the preacher in the book of Ecclesiastes we have just heard read, whose magnificent poem echoes down through the centuries and find solace after a long life well lived, in his words, from which none of us can escape: there is a time to die. Thus a beloved person is lost to those around her who loved her, and is mourned, as we all may hope and wish to be mourned. That is perfectly normal.

So what is it that is happening to us and to many, many millions of people, not just here in the United Kingdom but around the world, which makes this old lady's death leave us feeling so profoundly moved and so bereft? Why is it that we feel such genuine and heartfelt grief? This is not normal; this is extraordinary.

It is not that the old lady was some titanic writer or scientist, some politician or soldier who had led nations to triumph or glory, some Mandela or Tolstoy or Newton or Napoleon. Not at all. She was an honest, decent, hardworking woman with a sharp sense of humour and a heavenly smile; an iron memory for faces, a fascination with people, a great expertise in bloodstock, an affection for this place which she often visited, and a quiet but profound Christian faith, the rock upon which she built her life. Could we find other people, whom perhaps we know and love ourselves in our own families with similar qualities? Yes, we could, though we would be very hard pressed to find someone who was her equal in expertise on breeding racehorses.

So what is going on? Why is the death of this one old lady, our late Queen Elizabeth II, so profoundly moving, not just here in Britain, but around the world? Because it is profoundly moving, and if you do not feel it, there is perhaps something a little missing in you.

I will halt the quote there because it does go on. I felt that those words coming directly from Britain really spoke to the depth of love and regard that that nation had for their now departed queen.

Regarding her visits to Tasmania, we know that there are photographs. We can see them in the Tasmanian Archives amazingly digitised so that everybody can look at them now.

Photographs of the Queen's visits to Tasmania show how many people she met during her visits here. Many still have their own stories to tell of those visits, some of those which we have heard in recent weeks as it has been a topic of great discussion. Around Tasmania there are physical reminders of her visits here, for example, the Queen's Trees at Government House commemorating her royal visits to Tasmania, which are now living memorial symbols of her own strength and longevity. She planted a lovely oak tree on her 1954 visit which is growing large and standing boldly at the front of Government House. Recently, at the proclamation of the new King, the Premier and the Governor laid wreaths over the oak tree. She had also planted a blue gum, a silver birch, and a Huon pine in 1954, 1963, 1977, and 1988.

Another example is the 150th anniversary of the foundation of the Hobart Memorial, which was unveiled by Her Majesty on 20 February 1954. The memorial can be found down the road on Hunter Street, quite close to where we stand today.

Those who have been in this Chamber for some time with me will recall we had a condolence motion in this place for my stepfather, Peter Underwood, who was Governor of Tasmania. He was appointed by the Queen and they had a direct and friendly relationship. I know he took his role in regard to that very diligently indeed. It would be remiss of me not to also mention my mother, Frances Underwood, who supported him so ably in that role, because it is a job for two people. My mother took the time to show me recently a letter she had received from the royal household which she treasures to this day.

Elizabeth II not only served the Commonwealth of Nations but she was a ruler who dismantled her own empire and she created the Commonwealth of Nations. As head of the Commonwealth of Nations she served 54 independent countries with approximately 2.3 billion inhabitants. We all are somewhat children of this now faded empire. To this, the Queen was personally deeply committed and, in doing this work, she gained a great understanding of different countries and cultures, always having a great fascination with people from all over the world.

In fact, my relatives on my mother's side were very much engaged with the Queen's armed forces. My grandfather, Colonel Victor Palser Northam, was a colonel in the British Army, a colonel of the 16th Punjab Regiment in the Punjab in India, and he was tasked through the chain of command by the Queen with engaging and assisting with the partition of Pakistan and India. It was after those very tumultuous times, and the bloodshed that was seen during that time, that they took up the then Tasmanian government's offer of moving to Sheffield in Tasmania, where they started their new life.

The Queen herself put on a military uniform in World War II and after months of pleading with her parents, she was given permission to join the military, taking a six-week intensive training course and joining the Women's Auxiliary Service. I think she was quite a feminist.

On the historic State Funeral at Westminster Abbey, who could not be moved by the fact that it was the host of major events for Queen Elizabeth II including the Coronation on 2 June 1953, her wedding and, sadly, our beloved Queen's funeral on 19 September. The attendance of the world's leaders showed that she was much loved and we will all miss her very much.

[4.15 p.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Mr Deputy Speaker, on the day that Queen Elizabeth II passed, I was at a West Tamar arts event and one of the people there - as many people have now -

started telling their stories and recollections. This is a story that I had not heard from anyone else.

A very young Queen on her first visit to Australia was departing Fremantle. As the ship was going out of the breakwater, the people of Fremantle and surrounding areas lined the breakwater and sang *You are my Sunshine* as the ship departed. It made me think about all the different memories that individuals have and the connection with the past that the Queen identified to them.

My mother tells a story of when the Queen and Prince Philip drove through Westbury when they were very young and new to her reign, and that they were both such amazingly good-looking people that all the women lined one side of the street so they could see the Duke of Edinburgh pass by and all the men lined the other side of the street so they could see the beautiful young Queen. People had little memories like that that we have all heard over the days. I also have a friend who used to ring the palace every Christmas to wish the Queen a merry Christmas.

In 1977, I, and my brother who mentioned it before, were dragged up to St George's Square by our mother to see the Queen. I remember being somewhat disappointed that whilst I now look at her fashion as fabulous, she was not wearing what I assumed at that age would be her Queen clothes. In 1981, I joined with school friends outside Queechy High School as the Queen passed by and, in 2000, I was lucky to be one of those guests at the reception at Albert Hall in Launceston with the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh.

I did not think when I was talking about the Queen that I would ever quote Billy Bragg. Neither of us are particularly strong royalists, but he wrote something after the passing of the Queen that really struck a chord with me. He said that the importance of the Queen in her role was made clear to him in 2007 when he saw a news report of the dedication of the Armed Forces Memorial, remembering those who had lost their lives in conflict since the Second World War. He said:

Watching the Queen walk along a line of ex-service personnel who had fought in every war from Korea to Afghanistan, I was struck by the thought that there is no-one in British public life whose presence at an event could be equally meaningful to an 80-year old veteran as well as to one in their twenties.

Obviously, this is a product of her record-breaking longevity of her reign and very few alive today can have any memory recalling someone else sitting on the British throne. He talked a bit about what that meant to families for all of that period and it caused me to reflect on my own grandparents. My grandmother loved the Queen very much and when you think about it, it is because they were of an age. They grew up together, they had war service together, they married together, they had their children together and their grandchildren together. Whilst my grandparents passed some time ago, the Queen provided that kind of link and you do not think about that until you lose someone.

That was the message Billy Bragg was saying, that there is an indelible link with a generation that was represented by the Queen that cannot be represented by anybody else. There is no-one else who has shared that longevity. He said that he would mourn not so much the passing of a monarch but the passing of a generation.

Former Prime Minister Paul Keating famously touched the Queen's back and caused all sorts of drama in the British press. I want to read into the *Hansard* his comments on her passing. I thought they exemplified her life of service. He said:

In the 20th century, the self became privatised, while the public realm, the realm of the public good, was broadly neglected.

Queen Elizabeth understood this and instinctively attached herself to the public good against what she recognised as a tidal wave of private interest and private reward. And she did this for a lifetime. Never deviating.

She was an exemplar of public leadership, married for a lifetime to political restraint, remaining always, the constitutional monarch.

To the extent that a hereditary monarch can ever reflect the will or conscience of a people, in the case of Britain, Queen Elizabeth assimilated a national consciousness reflecting every good instinct and custom the British people possessed and held to their heart.

In her seventy-year reign, she was required to meet literally hundreds of thousands of officials - presidents, prime ministers, ministers, premiers, mayors and municipal personalities.

It was more than one person should ever have been asked to do.

But Elizabeth the Second's stoicism and moralism welded her to the task and, with it, the idea of monarchy.

Her exceptionally long, dedicated reign is unlikely to be repeated; not only in Britain, but in the world generally.

With her passing, her example of public service remains with us as a lesson in dedication to a lifelong mission in what she saw as the value of what is both enduringly good and right.

There have been many things written and there will continue to be many things written about the Queen, but the quote a number of people have mentioned already, that 'grief is the price we pay for love,' is one we will probably identify with her for some time.

I give my deepest and sincerest condolences to those whose hearts are filled with grief at her passing. For those of us who have cause to reflect on the passing of a generation, I give my deepest respect to you as well.

[4.21 p.m.]

Mr WOOD (Bass) - Mr Deputy Speaker, it was only a few months ago that I had the privilege to deliver my first speech in this place. I was particularly proud to have had the opportunity to pay tribute to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II on the occasion of her Platinum Jubilee to mark the 70th anniversary of her accession to the throne as Queen of England and Queen of Australia. I rise now to speak on the occasion of her passing. I do so mindful of the

genuine and unprecedented feelings of grief, heartfelt sorrow and yet gratitude that her death has engendered not only here in Tasmania but around the globe.

Regardless of people's personal views around the monarchy and its role, Queen Elizabeth was a woman universally admired. She was Queen of Australia for an astonishing seven decades, more than half the time we have been a federation. As our longest serving monarch, she saw 15 Australian prime ministers come and go. Most Australians until recently have never heard the anthem *God Save the King* sung at all and have never paid money for goods and services in this country other than in a currency that bears the profile of the Queen.

As many commentators and dignitaries have noted, she was a constant and reassuring presence in a changing world for the great majority of Australians. To a certain extent, the depth of feeling arising from her passing is due in no small measure to the shock in realising that she will no longer be there.

Throughout her reign, Queen Elizabeth maintained an air of unflappable dignity, responsibility, commitment and focus that is truly admirable. We are all aware of the vow of service that Princess Elizabeth took at her coronation where, as a very young woman, she made the following pledge:

I can make my solemn act of dedication with the whole empire listening.
I should like to make that dedication now. It is very simple. I declare before you all that my whole life, whether it be long or short, shall be devoted to your service and the service of our great imperial family to which we all belong.

Service to the Commonwealth and her people was her focus. For me, perhaps this focus was best illustrated during the speech the Queen made on the 75th anniversary of the end of the war in Europe. On the desk she sat at to make that speech were two items: one a photo of her beloved father, the late King George VI; the other the service cap belonging to the Queen herself which she wore during the war as a mechanic of the Auxiliary Territorial Service. She was the first female of the Royal Family to be an active duty member of the British armed forces. In fact, the young Princess Elizabeth apparently nagged her father to allow her to join so she could serve in uniform during the war. That was her ethos even then.

She fulfilled that promise of service, working virtually until the day she died. It was interesting and reassuring to note that King Charles, in his first speech, renewed that promise of lifelong service and devotion to duty, also vowing to serve with loyalty, respect and, importantly, love. Queen Elizabeth's legacy of service and commitment to her people was truly remarkable and she was a remarkable woman.

I read somewhere that the Queen had a liking for tradition and a dislike for change. That may be so but it seems a bit out of place if that was the case, given the fact that she so skilfully guided her family, her country and, indeed, the Commonwealth through what can only be described as truly momentous, far-reaching periods of turmoil and change. That she was able to do so largely successfully while maintaining the respect and adoration of most people is testimony to her skills and strengths as an individual and as a leader.

I have no doubt at all that the Queen herself realised the importance of traditions and ceremonies of the monarchy, and that the continuity that she represented provided comfort to

a great many people around the world. Perhaps the most appropriate action in remembrance of the Queen is to simply say, 'Thank you'. Thank you for your dedication and devoted service to the Australian people and to our family of nations that make up the Commonwealth.

Vale Queen Elizabeth II.

[4.28 p.m.]

Mr ELLIS (Braddon - Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management) - Mr Speaker, I rise to speak on the recent passing of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

A characteristic that has come out clearly in most contributions has been Her Majesty's enduring service and commitment to duty over the last 70 years. During that extraordinary reign Australia has had 16 prime ministers and Tasmania has had 17 premiers. For most Tasmanians, including me, Her Majesty was the only monarch and Australian head of state they have known. She was the head of state of 32 different Commonwealth countries and head of 15 realms at the time of her passing.

Throughout her reign, Her Majesty personified grace, dignity, duty and service. For many the longevity of her reign represented stability in an unstable world and a source of strength for the institution. She provided strength and inspiration for the community, particularly during times of crisis and war. She played her constitutional role in our country with a great sense of responsibility. Although holding a privileged position, her commitment to duty and deep love of Australia ensured that she was held in great esteem in this country.

It is arguable that her commitment to duty was caught at a young age from some fine examples. You may be aware that little more than a year after her birth her parents, then Prince Albert, Duke of York, and wife Elizabeth toured Australia. During the tour the infant princess had to remain at home with her grandparents in the United Kingdom. While the tour was a huge success, the princess's mother was, in her own words, 'very miserable' at leaving the baby. As I reflect on this, as the father of a young child myself, I understand the pull that would have been there, to avoid the separation from family. While times and attitudes have changed, the commitment to service, to community, and others, is a powerful example. I am sure that across the course of her extraordinary life, the sacrifices that she made were felt keenly also by others within her family. To that we owe a great debt of gratitude.

The young princess's life changed forever with the abdication of her uncle, King Edward VIII in 1936. Her father, whose own challenges were so movingly portrayed in the Academy Award-winning film *The King's Speech*, was then made king, and then led the Empire through the horrors and privations of the Second World War. Even when Buckingham Palace was bombed during the Blitz, they did not leave their station, preferring to instead remain in London, such was the commitment of Her Majesty's family to duty and their community. It was the commitment that she herself shared and modelled during her entire life.

As has been mentioned, Her Majesty visited Tasmania on no less than seven occasions, the first being February 1954. During that visit, the first by a reigning monarch to Australia, Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh toured Tasmania visiting Hobart and Launceston, and touring the north-west. Reading the papers of the day, the excitement of the Tasmanian community on and leading up to the visit is clear. The day after she first set foot in Hobart, the *Mercury* devoted its first 20 pages or so to her visit. The pages were full of advertisements from companies, some gone and some still with us, welcoming Her Majesty to our shores.

Photographic spreads tell the story of a stunning summer's day, with a bright sun shining from a clear blue sky on the Royal Yacht as it sailed up the Derwent, surrounded by a flotilla of small boats and yachts from Hobart and surrounds. The Derwent was described as being:

... as still as a millpond with a zephyr-like breeze. The heat was such that around 200 of the vast crowd that had gathered, some since the night before, collapsed and had to be treated for heat exhaustion.

In my own electorate of Braddon, *The Advocate*, several days before the royal visit, reported on details as varied as the Burnie CWA had been selected to cater for the Queen and the Duke at the Burnie Courthouse, with details of the menu provided, and a note that:

... crystal and silver were loaned by Burnie businesses, and cutlery and crockery loaned by Parliament House in Hobart ...

with a follow-up piece on the caterers after the visit, and how mobile cranes were busy hoisting 'Welcome' arches to Burnie and other centres. On the day of the visit:

The country centres become ghost towns as residents flooded to the cities to watch the royal tour.

In some cases, the policeman's wife, and the postmaster or mistress, were the only residents who stayed behind - and congratulations on that commitment to duty.

On the front page of *The Advocate*:

Sunny day, sunny greeting for the Queen in north-west.

It makes note, in a very different time, of the Queen's:

... womanly gesture of putting her hair in place leaving Bells Parade in Latrobe ...

with then Premier Cosgrove - and the interest that her visit attracted:

A crowd of between 7000 and 8000 people welcomed the royal couple at Devonport oval

And:

... 10 000 people lined the procession through Ulverstone.

which I think may have been the entire population of Ulverstone at the time. Even remissions of jail terms were announced to mark the Queen's visit:

Remissions of sentences for prisoners in Tasmanian jails granted to mark the Queen's visits were announced yesterday by the Attorney-General, Mr Fagan. Tasmanian prisoners who had not previously served sentences of three months or more, will be allowed 12 days off their term for each year of

sentence. In all other cases, eight days for each year of the sentence will be allowed.

Truly a royal pardon if ever you have seen one.

The Advocate's editorial on the day of the visit welcomed the Queen in glowing terms, saying that today is a great occasion, history-making for the north-west of Tasmania, in common with the experience of all the lands beneath the Southern Cross, which for the first time have had the honour of receiving a reigning monarch: that she provided a personal message to the Commonwealth's oldest veteran, who at the time lived in Penguin, although she did think it was appropriate to not see Mr William Hunt on the day, because she felt the excitement might have been too much for Mr Hunt had she stopped and talked to him. Her best wishes and those of the Duke were conveyed later to Mr Hunt.

While I never had the privilege of meeting the Queen personally, what I saw led me to believe that she took her role as our constitutional head of state seriously, and was aware of the issues facing our state and the nation of the day. Her Majesty knew of Australia's place in the world in the context of history and admired our growing confidence as a nation.

I am personally honoured to have received what were some of the last ministerial letters patent granted in our Commonwealth with Queen Elizabeth II's name and seal. She issued those to her ministers, premiers and prime ministers around the world since the time of Churchill, Menzies and Rhys. It is hard to contemplate the scale of her devotion to duty. In my office with my little letters I think about all those commissioned to serve during her reign over these many years. That line has now been broken, but her extraordinary legacy will live on. Thank you, your Majesty.

[4.37 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Mr Speaker, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II reigned as the queen of Australia for 70 years. Her death has provoked an outpouring of feelings across the 15 countries of the Commonwealth over which she ruled supreme, as well as in so many countries beyond. The global expression of mourning we have witnessed and been part of ourselves to some degree, formally and informally, over the past fortnight is surely unprecedented in human history. Never before have so many people been so engaged with the passing of one person, and paused to reflect on its meanings personal, social and democratic.

I pay tribute to the Queen as a person. I admired her service to the community and her role; her kindness, and her steadfastness. I greatly respected her as a person who endured the public spotlight and the enormous personal privations, including the distancing her role necessitated to a great extent from her own husband and children.

I honour the calmness and gentleness of the manner with which she approached every public occasion over seven decades. She was the longest-serving monarch in English history, and she had a great commitment to the countries of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Now is the time to reflect and understand why there has been such widely different responses to the Queen's passing. It is incumbent on us all, Independents and members of parties, committed as we all say we are to lutruwita/Tasmania's support for truth-telling, treaty and justice with palawa/pakana, to listen to and take on board the expressions of outrage the Queen's death has provoked.

Queen Elizabeth's predecessor, George III, was King of England when that country invaded Australia, dispossessed the First Peoples of their land, and put in train a process of colonisation that continues to this day.

Under his successor George IV's reign, in lutruwita/Tasmania a Black Wall was sanctioned, and communities of palawa/pakana men, women and children were systematically hunted by men and dogs, flushed out and shot, or lured away from their homelands to make way for the gifting of lands to colonising pastoralists.

Some remaining peoples were withdrawn from their lands, of which they had been the custodians for tens of thousands of years, with the false hope and the false offer of a new home. Instead, they were left to rot, and died of grief and disease in a freezing island prison.

Despite these horrors, the palawa/pakana survived, and notwithstanding the nearly 200 years of abuses and silencing that they have suffered since then, they thrive in our community today.

These abhorrent acts did not occur during the Queen's lifetime and she was not directly responsible for them. However, in the time since she was crowned monarch in 1952, Australia's First People have endured further acts of violence and attempted cultural erosion. During the Stolen Generation, children were ripped from their mother's arms or taken during school, never to return to the warmth and love of their families and communities. For their comfort, the state provided them with sexual and physical abuse in the institutions to which they were taken, left to suffer with their loneliness and fear alone, and then released as traumatised adults to a lifetime of neglect and systemic racism, without employment and housing options, separated from communities and destined to addiction and crime to survive with their unbearable pain.

There is still so much systemic injustice and embedded cultural racism that exists in Australia, including on this island every day. This morning I woke to the news headline that an inquiry found systemic racism in the Northern Territory police led to the police shooting and killing of 19-year-old Kumanjayi Walker. They also found that this racism in the Northern Territory police is a microcosm of the Australian community. Aboriginal people suffer the highest incarceration rates and the highest death rates in this country so we cannot be surprised or expect otherwise that Australia's First Peoples do not mourn the passing of Queen Elizabeth II.

You cannot have it both ways. Some have argued that Queen Elizabeth bore no responsibility at all for the actions that caused further damage to the First Peoples during her reign. They argue she is just a figurehead with no real power to change the decisions of governments across the parliaments in all of her many western Westminster jurisdictions. However, in very real terms, Queen Elizabeth in her lifetime was also the supreme head of power for every law made in this parliament and every other Commonwealth one. These were the laws that enabled the stealing of children and the loss, exploitation and degradation of sacred traditional lands.

Today, the head of power for the making of all laws in this place is King Charles III. I and we pledge allegiance to his rule and to the Westminster system of laws that structures our democracy and the representation of all people in the process of making those laws. King Charles III is a kind man. He is intelligent. He understands the importance of science.

He is a climate activist and a lover of nature. We are fortunate to have him as our monarch but, despite his excellent character, it is now time to talk about the future.

Australia chose not to pursue independence in the republic referendum 23 years ago but the death of the Queen and the end of her era makes this the right time today to talk again about the many reasons why Australia should have its own head of state and should be represented and accountable to Australia and its people. We could choose to remain forever tethered to that foreign country but I say, Mr Speaker, vale Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, long live King Charles III of England and bring on the republic of Australia and a treaty for its First Peoples.

[4.44 p.m.]

Mrs ALEXANDER (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I rise today to also add my words to those expressed by many around the world, words of deepest sympathy and sorrow at the passing of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and to convey my condolences to the royal family for their loss.

As members know, I was not born in a Commonwealth country. I was born in a country that did not have a king or a queen. However, from a young age, for me the Queen has represented a symbol of majesty, stability, an example of duty and sacrifice for country, and a great symbol of selflessness that when you are entrusted to do a job, you must do the job well. Her Majesty was a woman in a position of power and influence. She was and will remain for me a great role model to follow.

Queen Elizabeth II always put personal feelings aside and did her duty graciously. One perfect example comes to mind, a story that has been told in Romania but also abroad, as I read other publications. In 1978 the communist leader of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, visited the United Kingdom together with his wife, Elena. It was the first official state visit of a communist leader to the United Kingdom. The Queen did not like the couple, was reported as having said so, and was not at all happy about the visit. However, she understood the United Kingdom wanted to sign economic deals with Romania and get some traction in Eastern Europe so she received the couple. The Ceausescu couple were staying at Buckingham Palace and one morning when the Queen was walking the corgis in the park she saw the couple also walking in the park. It is reported Her Majesty later said it was for the first time in her life that she actually hid behind some bushes to avoid visitors. The visit was not to the Queen's liking, but she did her duty of receiving the couple.

To many Eastern European people like me - and I know this from speaking recently to family and friends following the death of Her Majesty - Queen Elizabeth II was a great symbol who engendered respect. Respect is earned and cannot be commanded. It is not achieved through shouts, tantrums or threats. Some of the Eastern European countries, including Romania, have reopened their relationships with her former monarchy, inviting royal families that had been thrown out of the country in the 1940s following the communist takeover to return. In some instances agreements have been reached to recognise them as owners of properties that were nationalised at that time. One of these examples is Bran Castle in Romania with its grounds, which is better known to the outside world as Dracula's Castle. That property was returned to the former Romanian royal family.

Why do I talk about this now? It is because I want to emphasise that for many of us born in other countries but who are now also part of the fabric of Australia, we embrace the idea of

monarchy and have looked up to Queen Elizabeth as a great representative of this institution. When I became an Australia citizen, I felt a sense of pride and reassurance not only to become a citizen of this beautiful country but to be part of the Commonwealth that had this great Queen as its head of state.

I, like many others, have mourned the loss of this wonderful human being, a person of tremendous integrity. I consider myself blessed to have had the opportunity to live in a time that allowed me to witness Her Majesty's life and work and not just read about it in a book. People of such moral integrity, strength and dedication as our late Queen Elizabeth do not come into our life often and this is what makes our loss greater.

Queen Elizabeth II, may you rest in peace. God bless you and we pray for you.

[4.49 p.m.]

Mr SHELTON (Lyons) - Honourable members, it is rare for the Speaker to present to the parliament but I will take that opportunity. Our House and our Parliament have expressed its deepest sorrow at the passing of our late sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Australia, whose reign, unprecedented in length, was characterised by her unfailing devotion to duty and to her people.

I concur with the positive comments that have come from around the Chamber about her devotion and loyalty to serve and to her people.

I thank members for their contributions and reflect on our democracy. It is a beautiful thing that allows contributions from across the political spectrum. I appreciate how wonderful it is that there has been a peaceful transition from Elizabeth II to Charles III. It was not always that way, of course, back in history, but now it is and we have much to be grateful for because of that.

We have heard a tribute from the Premier to Her Majesty on behalf of all Tasmanians. I thank members of the Government, Opposition, Independent members and the Greens for their contributions. I will highlight some of these contributions.

From the Leader of the Opposition who reflected on how the Queen was a pioneer, a working woman and how Her Majesty fulfilled her responsibilities while also caring for her children.

From the member for Clark, the Leader of the Greens, about the service the Queen gave to her people and the history of our colonial past, that not all would find it easy to mourn the passing because of the institution she served.

However, I stand here in this place with all of you in our Westminster system of government and parliament, with laws that have their foundation in the democratic principles that we see here and we swear to uphold. That democratic Westminster system came from the Queen's forebears.

From the member from Franklin, Mr O'Byrne, who talked about what the future holds and that there should, quite rightly, be a mature and reasonable discussion in this country about the passing and what it means to our nation, knowing that the appropriate time is not now. For

now, we should simply reflect on the good life, a life of commitment, dignity and service to others.

The member for Clark, Ms Johnston, spoke about the life of service. Here was a woman who knew her duty and was not going to shirk one inch from that duty. She gave us her heart and devotion, and we are all the better for it.

How remarkably connected people were to the Queen, even those who lived halfway round the world. My dear old mum, only a few years younger than Queen Elizabeth II, followed her life and was a devoted monarchist, and always loved to keep up with what was happening in the Royal Family.

I would like to make a connection from a local point of view to the tour in 1954, when Her Majesty and Prince Philip stayed at the historic Connorville property, one of the state's best-known farming properties, near Cressy.

In order to gain an insight to back then, as I was not born then, I had a discussion with the current Roderick O'Connor whose father and grandmother were the host and hostess of the Queen at Connorville at that time. Mr O'Connor, Roderick, was not married and, therefore, young Roderick was not on the scene. He talked about how the family property was updated, and was cleaned up. The house was renovated and painted, the gardens were all cared for to get it to a point where it was spick and span for the new queen.

History tells us that the Queen and Prince Philip were actually heading to Connorville two years earlier, in 1952, and that trip was postponed because of the death of Queen Elizabeth's father, the King. Queen Elizabeth II made it to Connorville with the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Philip. He had visited Connorville several times prior to that when he was part of the British Navy and had some leave from Melbourne.

From a personal point of view, Merrilyn and I, with our family, are connected in a sense that William and Harry are approximately the same age as my two sons. There has always been a connection and there is always a connection that people grab onto when we are talking about the monarch and those stories.

Of course, the scrutiny around their family has always made for news and, unfortunately, people never had enough of it so the media scrutiny has always been intense. Her Majesty, not only the monarch but the matriarch of the family, played a critical role in making sure the family was in the best position to cope with it at that time.

When they were at Connorville, Her Majesty planted a golden elm tree in recognition of the visit to Connorville. I also learnt that some of the stories were not quite true because I was always told that the road from Cressy to Connorville was upgraded and sealed for the Queen. Mr O'Connor informed me that it reached the point where they upgraded the gravel road but they never got around to sealing it until later on, and so some of the stories I heard were not quite true.

My father-in-law, Max, grew up at Connorville and he was that age when out working. His best mate, who also grew up at Connorville, Kevin Hayes, when I was talking to him, reflected on the fact that he went home one day after working at Longford, where he boarded away. His father, by the way, had 60-odd years of service with the Connorville family, working

for 60-odd years at Connorville. When he was home, Kevin had a job to do one Saturday morning and that was carrying the Queen's bed, the new bed that had been purchased for the room. They had to get it inside and he was one of a couple of guys who carried the Queen's bed into the bedroom.

His wife, Shirley, also in the conversation, was teaching at Longford at the time and they took her grade 2 students across to Western Junction in Launceston Airport, where they met the Queen. Kevin, at the time, was part of the Commonwealth Military Force and formed a guard of honour at Western Junction on Her Majesty's arrival. There are all these connections that connect the local people to the Royal Family over the years and they have had a lot of interest in the Royal Family and how much that means to them.

Queen Elizabeth has now passed and she joins her long-term partner and husband in Prince Philip. I make the point that the old saying where they complement each other and the whole is greater than the individual parts. Together, Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and Queen Elizabeth II were that magical couple who helped each other through a long life of reigning over the Commonwealth. We thank them very much for their service together.

May she rest in peace. Long live the King. Long may he reign over us.

I ask the Chamber to stand with me for a short moment to recognise and pass the condolence motion to go to the Queen.

In standing, we signify our respect.

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

Second Reading

[4.59 p.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Minister for Planning) - Mr Speaker, I move -

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill proposes a number of amendments to the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, which I will refer to as the LUPA Act. These amendments aim to refine the major projects assessment process in the light of our practical experiences during the assessment of the new Bridgewater bridge. The amendments are intended to make the process more efficient and responsive to the nature of future projects, which are increasingly characterised by evolving designs as a result of contractual processes, while maintaining the fundamental core elements of independent assessment, appropriate checks and balances, and opportunities for public engagement.

Importantly, the amendments will assist the regulators and the Tasmanian Planning Commission in their assessments, the proponents of major projects through more flexibility, and interested members of the general public through better communications.

The bill was released for a five-week public consultation period, and has since been refined following advice from the Bridgewater Bridge project team; local councils; state

agencies and authorities; professional, industry, environmental and community groups; and importantly, the regulators and the independent Tasmanian Planning Commission.

The amendments cover four broad themes. These are: clarifying the original intent of the process; aligning and updating the process to match the current legislative situation; modernising to reflect contemporary circumstances; and introducing flexibility to allow the assessment process to accommodate changes as the project design and details evolve. These themes are addressed in 10 discrete areas, which I will now explain in detail.

Sensitive information in the wrong hands could lead to the destruction or harm to a culturally sensitive site or relic. In fact, the public display of culturally sensitive information is also offensive to Aboriginal culture. While the planning processes need to provide adequate information for the appropriate assessment of projects, they should not unwittingly offend certain cultural groups.

In relation to information that is in this way considered sensitive, the major projects assessment process can be improved by preventing the public display of that information, if relevant to the site of a proposed major project, while still allowing the regulators to assess the impacts on those areas and values.

While the draft bill included in the scope of sensitive information the potential for inclusion of threatened species information, the advice received during the consultation period indicated that this would be unnecessary, given that section 59 of the Nature Conservation Act already effectively provides for the control of sensitive information of this nature. Consequently, the final version of the bill seeks only to control sensitive information relating to Aboriginal heritage.

The bill proposes to require proponents to seek advice from the regulator for Aboriginal Heritage before they lodge their major project proposal with the minister, to ensure that any sensitive information is treated appropriately. This will provide the regulator of Aboriginal heritage 35 days to advise the proponent and the minister if the major project site has, or does not have, sensitive cultural issues or other sensitive site issues that should not be publicly disclosed.

The bill defines sensitive information as information that is culturally sensitive, or information that may, in public hands, risk harm to an object or relic to which the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975 applies. Where such sensitive information is identified, that information must not be included in a document given to another person prescribed in the Act; must not be disclosed in any meeting or hearing that the public can attend; must not be disclosed in discussions between a member of the public and the minister, a regulator, a member of the assessment panel or the commission; and must not be disclosed during proceedings of the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal or a court.

The regulators will, of course, still receive the sensitive information, and must assess the proposal's impact on those matters. Any information that is not of a sensitive nature will still be available for public viewing, as under the current legislated assessment process. This aligns the major projects process with the current processes carried out by Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania in accordance with its normal legislative requirements.

Currently, land outside the area declared for a major project cannot be used for the major project. Contemporary design and construct processes for significant infrastructure projects

often mean the design of the major project evolves in response to site works and discoveries and engineering documentation. This may result in the project seeking to extend beyond the area originally declared, if the project requires or would be improved by using additional land. The need for additional land outside of the area initially declared may in fact emerge as a consequence of the proponent addressing the assessment criteria, or responding to issues raised during the public hearings, or perhaps when preparing a detailed design to address the conditions on a major project permit.

Currently, once a major project is declared, the area of land nominated in the major project declaration notice cannot be added to. The only way to add land is for the declaration of the major project to be revoked, and a new major project declaration made with the additional land. This is an administratively cumbersome and time-consuming task, and effectively requires the process to start all over again.

The bill proposes to allow the assessment panel or the commission to consider small additions to the declared area relative to the area originally declared. The bill proposes that an application to amend the declared area can be made at any time after declaration; however, whether that amendment can actually be made to the proposal will vary depending on the exact point that the assessment process has reached.

If the amendment is proposed prior to the assessment criteria being finalised, then it will trigger a new request to the regulators to determine if they have new assessment requirements to cover the additional land. This includes the possibility that a new regulator may now decide to become engaged when previously it determined it did not have an interest.

If the amendment is sought after the assessment criteria have been made, then it can only proceed if the regulator's advice that the assessment criteria do not need to be revised, or those regulators previously not interested confirm that they do not wish to become a regulator for the assessment. Under these circumstances, an amendment MPIS - Major Project Impact Statement - to cover the impacts on the additional land can be submitted up until the stage that a permit is granted. The final opportunity for adding land is after the permit is granted and in conjunction with a request to amend the permit.

Mr Speaker, it is important that the provisions to amend the declared area are not used as a way to sneak additional land into the process which is unsuitable, and would not have been declared if it was not included in the original proposal. The bill proposes the same checks and balances for amending the declared area of land as are applied to the area of land in the first declaration. The minister can only amend the declared major project area if they have determined it is reasonable to do so, and only after consultation with affected landowners, and receiving advice from the assessment panel, or the commission and the relevant regulators.

The minister can only amend the declared major project area if they are satisfied that the additional area of land would be eligible under section 60N of the act; that is, the same requirements as declaring a major project in the first place.

Similarly, if the additional area of land is government, council or Wellington Park Management Trust managed land, the minister cannot amend the declared major project area without their consent. Once the declared major project area is amended, notification is also given to the same parties and in the same manner as for the original declaration.

The current legislation is not entirely clear in relation to what landowners - whose land is included within an area of land declared for a major project, and who are not the proponent - can or cannot do on their land while the major project is being assessed.

The intention of section 60S of the act is that once a major project is declared, a proponent of a major project can only develop the land for that major project by receiving a major project permit, and not by pursuing another planning application process. It was not the intention to prevent unrelated developments by the landowner from receiving planning permits or being developed on the same land as the declared major project. For example, the declaration of a wind farm proposal over many hectares of farmland should not limit the landowner from seeking approval for a new farm shed if one is required. However, the current wording is somewhat ambiguous and has been read to suggest that no development at all can be carried out while the area is declared for a major project.

The major projects process can be improved by providing more clarity around this issue, by reasserting the original intent that development for a major project can only be undertaken in accordance with a major project permit and not a permit issued under another planning process. An exception to this is that any existing permit issued prior to the major project declaration can still be acted upon, even if the content of the permit relates to the major project.

In relation to what the requirements are for landowners and proponents for future developments once a major project has been completed, it was always intended that the normal planning processes would be available. To clarify at what point the normal planning regime recommences, the bill proposes that the commission can issue a completion certificate once it is satisfied that the major project is completed or where the proponent advises that it will not proceed with a part of the project, or it is being developed in stages.

The bill is being modified following consultation to provide the commission with 21 days to respond to a request from the proponent for such a certificate. The commission is also able to issue an enforcement certificate to a local planning authority which designates that the authority will become responsible for monitoring and enforcement in relation to the conditions on a major project permit that is transferred to it.

There are some minor consequential amendments relating to enforcement where some corrections to references in the act need to be made because the major projects assessment process has reused sections of the act that had previously been assigned to private planning certification. For example, sections 63B, 64 and 65C refer to section 60ZB, which were references to processes which are not part of the legislation. Section 60ZB now relates to major projects.

Early permissions for site investigations are beneficial not only for the timely assessment of projects but so that important environmental issues can be surveyed and researched to the fullest degree possible, and in alignment with critical times of the year relevant to the issue.

While some site investigations may be exempt under the relevant planning scheme, others may require permission from the commission or the other regulators. Currently, permission cannot be granted for investigation until after the assessment criteria have been made. This is despite the proponent potentially being aware of an environmental issue and method of study required. For example, the seasonal timing of a survey may warrant an earlier start to ensure appropriate data is collected at the best time. Currently a proponent must wait

for the assessment criteria to be prepared, which is 98 days after a declaration of the major project, before they can apply for the necessary site investigation permissions. That may mean missing a seasonal event and delaying assessment for several months or a year.

To fix this, the bill proposes that where the proponent has identified, in its major project proposal, the need for an early site investigation, it can request a relevant regulator, the commission or the panel, to issue, at its discretion, an investigation permission. The bill sets a 21-day response time for such requests.

Perhaps the most significant part of this bill is the proposal for further options for amending a major project permit. Currently, the act provides for amendment of a major project permit as either a minor amendment under section 60ZZW of the act or through the long and complex process which involves the submission of an entirely new major project proposal, effectively starting the assessment process all over again. There is no middle ground available when the changes proposed are relatively simple but still ought to be subject to public exhibition and detailed scrutiny.

The bill proposes to provide for an additional major project permit amendment process that caters for adjustments to the major project with an appropriate level of scrutiny and assessment relative to the scale of the project, and public involvement including public hearings.

The proposed amendment process may only be used where the panel and the regulators determine that the proposed amendment is, in their judgment, of a scale that is appropriate to consider through this new process and that the earlier prepared assessment criteria are suitable to assess the proposed amendment and do not need to be rewritten.

As the process involves changes to the major project permit of a relatively small scale, it is also proposed to reduce some of the process times where appropriate. This includes reducing the public exhibition of the proposed amendment to 14 days, which is the same as for normal discretionary planning applications. When this additional amendment process is used, the following sections of the act have altered time frames:

- (a) section 60ZV(1) is 14 days instead of 21 days. This relates to the period that regulators have to request a revised impact statement.
- (b) section 60ZW(2) is 21 days instead of 42 days. This relates to the period of time that the panel has to seek additional information from a variety of parties after it receives the impact statement.
- (c) section 60ZY(3)(b) is 28 days instead of 42 days. This relates to the standard period for regulators to provide the panel with preliminary advice.
- (d) section 60ZZB(5) is 14 days instead of 28 days. This is the exhibition period but is a minimum requirement and can be extended.
- (e) section 60ZZF(1) is 14 days instead of 42 days. This relates to the period of time for a regulator to give the panel its final assessment advice.

- (f) section 60ZZM(1) is 49 days instead of 90 days. This is the period the panel has after the exhibition period to give its decision to the proponent.

Importantly, the regulators may advise that any or all of those time frames should not be shortened if an additional area of land is also included and they consider the amendment will require a longer assessment period.

Currently, if a regulator does not provide a response when required to do so during the major projects assessment process there is confusion about whether the process can continue until a response is received. In accordance with section 60ZA, the major projects assessment process has a rigid requirement that the regulators must give notice of their assessment requirements, or a notice of no assessment requirements, or a notice recommending revocation of the major project. If a regulator does not provide any form of notice at all, the assessment panel is placed in a quandary as to whether it can continue with the process because this requirement has not been satisfied.

The major projects process can be improved by clarifying that the process continues if a regulator does not respond. The bill proposes that if a regulator does not respond as required under 60ZA, then that non-action is taken as a notice of no assessment requirements and an indication that the regulator does not wish to become a participating regulator in the assessment process.

In response to submissions made during consultation on the draft bill, there is now a requirement for a reminder notice to be sent to the regulators before this assumption is made.

The assessment panel is only given a small amount of time to complete two significant tasks that are key elements of the assessment process, placing it at risk of not meeting a process time line or rushing its deliberations. These are the tasks of preparing the assessment criteria and preparing the initial assessment report after receiving the major project impact statement. These tasks require the assessment panel to collate and decipher responses from up to six different regulators. Feedback from the commission suggests that if a little extra time is available to the panel to clarify matters raised by the regulators, that will provide proponents with clearer advice and certainty in what they need to do in the assessment process.

The bill proposes to provide the assessment panel with extra time to complete its required tasks by amending section 60ZN of the act to extend the 28 days to 42 days, but only if the panel considers it necessary to seek clarification from a regulator in relation to its notice of assessment requirements or alteration notice, and extending the time in section 60ZZA from 14 to 28 days in all circumstances.

Administrative errors in complex assessment processes, such as the major projects parts of LUPA, are a distinct possibility. Currently, there is no ability in the major projects assessment process to rectify any administrative errors that may have occurred. An accidental clerical or administrative error could result in the process being subject to legal challenge, causing delays for the delivery of the project, or even requiring a proponent to start the major project application process again.

The bill improves the process by providing the assessment panel with the flexibility to correct errors, when a requirement to give a notice to a person has not been met, or when the

notice is required to be given within a prescribed time period and that time period was not complied with. In these circumstances, the panel will be able to subsequently notify that person, and seek their views in respect of the proposed major project, prior to making its final decision on the proposed major project.

The draft bill proposed seven days for a person to respond after receiving the notice, but following consultation, this has been extended to 21 days. While the bill introduces this capacity to rectify such an error, it also proposes to ensure that the administrative failure to give notice, as prescribed, does not in itself invalidate the assessment process.

Digital technology can be better used for sharing information with the public during the major project assessment process. Sharing documents by hard copy throughout the major project assessment process - in particular with regard to third-party landowners and occupiers - is an administrative burden, as much of the supporting information involves lengthy documents.

The major projects assessment process can be improved by making better use of digital technology. The bill proposes to enable sharing these documents through modern electronic means, while ensuring those without access to the internet can still participate in the process by being provided with hard copies of the documents.

The Gas Pipelines Act 2000 has been repealed and replaced with the Gas Industry Act 2019. The bill proposes to amend the act throughout, to refer to the relevant section of the Gas Industry Act 2019, instead of the former sections of the Gas Pipelines Act 2000.

This bill proposes a series of beneficial amendments to the major projects assessment process, based on the experience and observations of the regulators, proponents and a range of stakeholders. The amendments streamline processes and address contemporary design and construct infrastructure project development practices, while retaining the independent assessment oversight and appropriate levels of public engagement.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I commend the bill to the House.

[5.23 p.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) - Mr Deputy Speaker, it does not seem that long ago we were here debating the original version of this bill, working through that and all the submissions made to that significant proposal put forward by the Government.

It is interesting that only one project has progressed under this legislation, given that, when I went back and reviewed my speech from my contribution that day on the original legislation, this was going to be the panacea to our COVID-19 recovery. This was the way we were going to build ourselves out of the economic challenges of COVID-19. It is interesting to note that there has only been one project - and that is a Government project: the Bridgewater bridge.

Now we find this legislation coming back to us with amendments. My question is, can we expect to see it again as we see additional projects being undertaken under this particular legislation?

I understand that some of the changes that have been made are due to wind farm developments across the state, and the minister alluded to that in his contribution. It would be good to understand whether this will be a frequent event, this coming back and forth, considering it is coming back after only one project being successful as part of this process.

I thank the minister's office and staff from the Planning Policy Unit (PPU) for the briefing, and for the good work that has been done over the last couple of years on communicating changes to planning across Tasmania. The information provided to us in the briefing was absolutely comprehensive, and it has been one of our suggestions in the past.

Planning is difficult for people to understand. The more you can provide and present information to people, particularly the general public, in a simpler form, when it comes to accessing information about the planning changes they want to see or personal projects they want to progress, the simpler language that we can provide to people is much better. I believe that has been a significant improvement. I congratulate you on that and thank you for the briefing you provided to me as part of this suite of legislative changes before us today.

It is important to look back at this Government's planning record. I had a look at the 2013-14 alternative budget developed by this Government. On page 9, it talked about getting things done. I will read to you a couple of paragraphs from that. It is quite interesting, because, in fact, not a lot has been done. In this document you say you are getting things done, and that in government will put Tasmanian interests first and get things done. A strong majority Liberal government - that is not quite true anymore:

... will get development happening again with one statewide planning system. Tasmania's existing planning system of 36 separate schemes is holding back our state and is strangling economic growth.

We still do not have that statewide planning scheme, and we still have a number of local provisions schedules that are outstanding. That is not the fault of any council around the state; they are working hard to get this additional work done that the Government has put upon them. This Government has not adequately resourced councils when it comes to local provisions schedules across the state, or in fact the work that needed to be done with the statewide planning scheme. It goes on to say:

Importantly, we will crack down on third-party appeals by requiring that only directly affected parties can appeal, muting the power of front groups set up with the express purpose of opposing development.

That is interesting because part of the centrepiece of that policy was the major projects legislation, which there was much fanfare about. It took a significant period of time, six years, to bring that original legislation to the parliament, when there were already provisions in place through the projects of regional significance process that enabled a similar process to take place, and for those larger-scale developments to be assessed through a different process.

Here we are again then with this legislation before us. You have spent a lot of time refining this process. It is not faster, it is not cheaper, it is not simpler, and it is not a fairer planning system in Tasmania. You can see by the very nature of this legislation - by the information that is provided - that it is very complex, and that is what planning is. It is not simple. You might very well have these slogans that you live by as a government, but you are

not going to be able to deliver them. History would show that you have not been able to do that.

We have had a lot of time dedicated to this particular legislation that really should have been committed to working on strategic planning for the state. That is why we are seeing all the problems we are seeing across the state, whether that be housing, planning for schools, population growth, traffic, or infrastructure. You have made many grand promises about delivering infrastructure but to date you have not delivered very much at all. This certainly has not been a vehicle to do that.

Mr Deputy Speaker, those things are really important to put on the record as part of my contribution today. We will be supporting these amendments, as we supported the major projects legislation. I have many questions that I want to run through on each of the proposed amendments in this bill. I ask that the minister, at the conclusion of this debate, provide some further updates to the House on each of these matters.

I would like to understand how the first amendment - which is in regard to sensitive material being prevented from public display during the assessment project, particularly culturally sensitive Aboriginal heritage information - came to be in this legislation, and what prompted that to be in there - it is a good inclusion, and to understand why that was not considered during the first iteration of this bill.

The second point is around the gas pipelines. That amendment is pretty straightforward and does not really need further explanation. I would have assumed at the time that this legislation took its passage through both the lower and upper Houses that information was able to be provided digitally. I am not sure why that has not been the case and why we would need to bring that back to parliament to change that. Nonetheless, it is a good inclusion and we support it.

I still need further clarification around landowners being able to apply for a planning permit on their land outside of the major project application and permit process. It talks about that a little bit in this but I would like the minister to provide further explanation about the need for that clause. You have alluded to the fact that it was to do with what happened with the Bridgewater bridge, with an example of a farmer wanting to erect a shed on agricultural property that is being used, say, for a wind farm development. Any other information or additional examples you could provide of how that might be applied would be most useful.

I would also like to understand the process of preliminary investigations being done outside of a permit process. My understanding, through working through the legislation the last time, was that it was critical to the process that that permit was issued firstly to enable the investigations to take place. It would inform the project's credentials against each of the criteria and whether or not it would be provided with a permit. It would be good to understand how that can occur and how those preliminary investigations are now going to be able to occur under this legislation without the permit being granted to the proponent.

The other question I have is around the land outside the declared area. You make reference to that being only a small parcel of land but there are no criteria around that in here. I want to understand what the size would be and what you could reasonably expect about that. It is in your fact sheet and your questions at the rear but it does not actually detail it. It would be good to have a good understanding of that.

Each of the other amendments are fairly straightforward. I note that with the last amendment there will be the option for the public exhibition, for there to be more public involvement, which can only be a positive thing, so I thank you for including that.

My final question is around the enforcement certificate for the permit - another role local government will assume but, once again, without additional resource to do that. To understand how that will proceed, how these changes will now be communicated from this point if this legislation passes the parliament, and the steps for implementation from here.

In summary, we support the amendment bill. I made some points on the record about some questions we have. I made the case that this Government's agenda around planning reform has not been delivered and that there is still a lot more work for the Government to do. Perhaps their priority should not have been around six years on complex pieces of legislation that have really only been used for one project to date, that being a government project. This legislation has not been the panacea for the economic recovery of Tasmania through large-scale infrastructure development, given that only one project, the Bridgewater Bridge, has been issued a permit. There are a number of outstanding infrastructure projects across the state that have not been delivered by this Government over a significant period of time now.

The last point I will make is that there is a need to look at strategic planning across the state and the work done in conjunction with local councils around that, and the important role they will play. There have been commitments made around the review of the regional land use strategies. I have recently met with councils that have progressed their own work around settlement strategies. Devonport and Circular Head have done that, simply because of the lagging time and lack of delivery from this Government around resources and getting that work done.

It is a significant factor in housing land supply across the state. It is holding up residential development. It is holding up the ambitious targets you have set yourself, which your minister outlined again in the House today, for housing supply across the state. Had priority been given to that and had the resource given to a piece of legislation like this over such a significant period of time been given to that strategic planning across the state, we would not find ourselves in the mess that we are in right now in Tasmania.

[5.35 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Deputy Speaker, this bill seeks to make a whole suite of fixes and general improvements to the LUPA - land use planning and approvals - major amendments bill, which went through just over two years ago in this place. The major projects bill was vehemently opposed by a wide range of people in the Tasmanian community when it came through. People in Tasmania do not want their landscape and lifestyle changed by developments that would, in many instances, change it beyond recognition without having a proper say, a proper conversation, without transparency and accountability from people who are making the decisions.

We have a history in Tasmania, most recently from this Liberal Government, of laying out the red carpet for developers. People who have been watching the planning legislation landscape since this Government came to term in 2014 would understand the big damage that has been done to the opportunity for meaningful community engagement in the planning decisions that are made - local councils' statewide decisions about land, lifestyle, amenity and community, decisions that impact on our natural places. There has been a fundamental

deterioration in the quality, accessibility and cost of appealing, or even making representations to processes that people used to have much more of a say in.

People hate special deals, they hate the siphoning of public money to corporate mates, they hate purpose-designed loopholes and fast-track laws. You only have to look at what happened with pulp mill legislation. Both the Labor and Liberal parties are in this together and have form.

The genesis of this legislation comes, in part, from the period after the 2014 state election when the Liberals appointed the former CEO of the Property Council to take on a hatchet job and create a Tasmanian planning scheme that was meant to be simpler, faster, and cheaper - and it is still not finished. We still do not have that planning scheme in place in Tasmania, and worse, even if it were in place, we have an erosion of the fundamental underpinning of good planning legislation, which is a proper opportunity for consultation with people who have skin in the game.

We have lost the ability for the community to have a meaningful say about developments that happen in public places. We now have weaker protections for the environment, for heritage, for amenity and local character. Let us face it, they were not good to start off with. We are in a much worse place.

In 2017, the then minister for Planning, Peter Gutwein, ignored the raft of recommendations from the Tasmanian Planning Commission about the changes that should be made before the Tasmanian Planning Scheme was created, recommendations that went to some of the foundations of that scheme. For example, what they said was the importance of improving the biodiversity information on which councils make decisions, the fact that there was not a stormwater code, and the fact that Aboriginal heritage protections were manifestly inadequate.

All of these things, and many others, were ignored by the then planning minister, Peter Gutwein, because they would have been annoying for developers. They would have got in the way of what was a red carpet and a fast track for big development. However, it has proven to be - across all of the planning schemes that have come in, and the interim planning schemes that are still there - a much more expensive, slower and painful process for small families and small business developers. It is now a nightmare of bureaucracy. It is so far removed from what the Liberals promised in that regard, but it is exactly what the community were concerned about when it came to the loss of an opportunity for a meaningful say.

I go to the history of that bill - the major projects early legislation in 2020. For the record, for people who are watching, the Greens voted against that bill because it was a dramatic erosion of the community's right to have a say. It was about a fast-track process that would sideline a whole range of proper planning processes that we believe should be in place in Tasmania to protect public places, and to give people a right about major projects that have huge impacts on communities as well as on natural landscapes.

When that LUPA bill was introduced by then planning minister Roger Jaensch, it was done during a period of a heightened number of cases of COVID -19 in Tasmania, in 2020. Remember that period where we had been in lockdown, and the three parties had made a commitment, an agreement, that the business of parliament would be constrained, so that only urgent COVID-19 bills would be passed? Under the pretence that this major projects

legislation was an essential part of the COVID-19 economic recovery, the Liberals rushed it through. They rushed it through so fast that there were no clause notes and there were no fact sheets attached to the legislation. The 209 pages of that bill did not have information for people to interpret the bill. The submission process was a joke. There were 1755 individual submissions received to the major projects legislation - and that was to a consultation, an exposure draft document of the bill. It was not the final bill.

Of those submissions, only 1549 were made available to us as legislators to look at. There were 206 submissions that never made it to people who were responsible for speaking to and taking carriage of this legislation in the House. Of the submissions we had access to, 98 per cent of them opposed the major projects legislation. Only 12 submissions - less than 1 per cent - supported the bill, and we have to be clear that eight of those 12 submissions were from organisations that had a vested interest in the outcomes of the bill. They were the Department of State Growth, TasNetworks, the Housing Industry Association, the Tasmanian Minerals, Mining and Energy Council, Cement, Concrete and Aggregates Australia, the Master Builders Association, the tourism industry and TasPorts. What a surprise that those interests supported the major projects legislation. What a surprise, not, that the vast majority of the rest of people who made submissions were deeply concerned about the erosions of the community's right to have a say, and the other matters the bill brought forward.

The bill then continued the removal of appeal rights that had been going on for some years under the Liberals. That bill was rammed through with a shoddy consultation process that only went to the draft consultation bill, and it was an incredibly complex bill.

It was argued by then minister Jaensch that it was the only way complex developments could sensibly be approved in Tasmania, but that was not ever true, because there are three existing pieces of planning legislation under which a major project could be assessed. They are the Projects of State Significance legislation, Projects of Regional Significance and the Major Infrastructure Development approvals. They can each do essentially what that major projects legislation ostensibly was required to do - except what they do not do is greenlight a number of processes that the major projects bill does do, which leaves the planning in Tasmania and the community's participation in it the poorer for it.

It means the controversial developments that have already been through a council planning process and been rejected, or have been approved by a council but have had decisions overturned through an appeal process, or those that are currently prohibited developments within a planning scheme - in each of those examples a development could be called in and assessed under this legislation, so it is an opportunity to have a second go.

It is an opportunity for big developers to wear down, yet again, the community through another process if they have been successful in the first place. For example, Cambria Green - that enormous and grotesque development proposal for the beautiful east coast of Tasmania - has been in train since May 2018. It has been four years now.

I will digress slightly to put on the record that I went to the fourth AGM of the Cambria East Coast Alliance, which formed four years ago specifically to fight that noxious development from the Chinese investors who planned to have what is essentially a Chinese retirement enclave, which would be fully staffed and maintained by Chinese people, for Chinese people. It would put an airstrip, crematorium, development of hotels and retirement villages and shops and all the other things that go with a little township, on one of the most

beautiful parts of the east coast, on a wetland area which is naturally incredibly significant, and on an area that is also of historic significance. The president, Anne Held, and the rest of that group are so strong, and they are going to continue until the bitter end.

This is something the Liberals do not get. Communities are outraged at having no say over this incredibly enormous development that would utterly change the landscape, not just of the local environment, but of the whole lifestyle of people who have something they are prepared to defend - and this community has been defending it.

There are 700 people on their supporters list. They have raised tens of thousands of dollars. They have been in the Tasmanian Planning Commission - and we have been waiting to hear the outcome of the planning commission for years now - spending tens of thousands of dollars of money raised by individual donations to fight that development, because the way the planning scheme exists, and the way that it has been written, is as an opportunity for an investor to carve out a huge area like the Cambria Green area does, and call it a Specific Area Plan and enable an enormous development of any sort that they would like essentially. What ends up being approved is not what has to be built and that is the rub. The community can never be confident that exactly what gets built is what gets talked about by the developer and that is a problem in itself.

Cambria Green is just one example of an enormous concept outside of Swansea, but the Hobart City Council and community have also, collectively, been crystal clear they do not want their public land to be used for a cable car on kunanyi/Mt Wellington. They are also clear that even if the council rejects the current development application, it could still be assessed again under the major projects act, despite what the minister tried to pretend at the time. Those residents who love kunanyi as the wild place that it is and who want it to be protected, have not stopped in their fierce battle over the past seven years, to protect the character of that place. Also, the residents who have been fighting to protect the mantle of kunanyi and the character of our city from being overwhelmed by skyscrapers. People will stand up, despite bad laws.

The bill that was rushed through two years ago is the reason we are here today. That bill had shoddy drafting and it was called out by the Tasmanian Planning Commission in their submission in the consultation process. I will read what the Planning Commission said:

The drafting style of the bill is extremely prescriptive, complex, and at times, circuitous. It is difficult to follow, and contrary to the desired outcome of simplifying processes and procedures, it confounds and compounds the levels of complexity.

Who would have thought, that given then minister Jaensch, at the time, promised it was a terrific piece of legislation and rubbished us for calling into question the quality of the drafting. Clearly, no reference to OPC, but to the Government's agenda to ram through legislation under the cover of the so-called 'COVID-19 period' where we were not to be debating matters like that.

What we have is that the body responsible for overseeing the development process for major projects was very clear it was a dog of a bill, and it was going to make their process much longer and effectively more expensive. Longer processes cost more and they will be slower because they are more obtuse.

It was not just the Tasmanian Planning Commission who made those points about the existing underlying legislation that, effectively, we are here today to fix, it was also a member's leaked information from people in the Department of Parks and Wildlife. The ABC reported in June 2020, that a policy adviser in the Parks department had privately criticised the Government's controversial bill as being, 'Overly complex and failing to actually speed up assessment processes'. The leaked email had the DPIPWE manager in the policy branch questioning whether what, if any, advice previously provided by the department had been incorporated into the bill? That person said:

From a quick scan of it, it appears overly administratively complex. There is no clear demonstration that the bill will actually provide any efficiencies over the current legislative framework.

That person also added that it was unclear how the proposed amendments would apply to reserved land; in general terms, to land that has been protected. The department had not been consulted on the laws since 2017 - three years before.

The history of this bill that we are here today to fix, was that it was a thought bubble in 2015, it was talked about in a draft first version in 2017 and there was a first draft of the bill, which was available for people to look at. That was effectively and utterly different from the bill that ended up going through the parliament.

What people saw and got to comment on, the 209 final page length bill, they had seen for six weeks. We are talking about a bill that is not only in the first instance a planning bill, so by definition it is a complex bill. It is the most complex bill and obtuse and senseless creation that the Tasmanian Planning Commission itself has seen.

That was not a consultation process and we are not surprised we are here today to fix up and amend the problems that the Government was trying to pretend were not there in the first place. They were all pointed out mind you, by the way, for the record.

What we have in front of us in Tasmania is a huge range of projects that are being rolled out, particularly in northern Tasmania. Wind farm projects, green hydrogen proposals and a number of these have already been flagged as likely or will go through the major projects process.

We have to be clear: that is an enormous level of industrialisation happening in northern Tasmania or is proposed to happen in northern Tasmania. It has incredible impacts, not only today but for 30, 50 or 100 years on landscapes, some of them that have never had development on them at all. They ramble through parts of wild areas and through communities and it is critically important there are processes in place for the assessment to be undertaken in a full and rigorous way and a process that provides meaningful consultation for the community.

The existing legislation was a dog. We voted against it on principle. The bill we have before us today that minister Ferguson, the third in the line of planning ministers has brought on, seeks to substantially improve that bill. We support those improvements and we will go into Committee and have a conversation about some of them in more detail. It is important that much of this bill is fixed up.

We do not support the principle of the major projects legislation in the form it was in but we do support the improvements that have been made to what is a terrible process as the legislation currently enables to occur. There are a lot of damaging elements to it that need to be improved and we will speak about some of them in a bit more detail in the Committee stage of the bill.

Shame on the Government for trying to pretend that this bill was anything other than a shabby attempt at rushing through something that they and a number of developers and other big vested interests in Tasmania actually want. Clearly, they think it makes their life easier and that, on its own, would be concerning for many Tasmanians who have seen the way that the Labor and Liberal Parties get together with vested interests and try and fast track legislation to suit their interests despite the impacts it will be having on the environment and the communities of Tasmania, the representatives of people in this place they ought to be taking care of.

We look forward to asking some more questions of the minister in the Committee stage.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Iran's Feminist Revolution

[6.00 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madame Deputy Speaker, Mahsa Amini was a 22-year-old Kurdish woman who was visiting her family in Tehran when, for the crime of showing her hair, she was bashed and murdered by the morality police of Iran. At her funeral we saw the most extraordinary sight. We saw those brave Iranian women rip off their hijabs and wave them in the wind, grieving and in solidarity with women looking for freedom in Iran. The cry of the Iranian women is 'Jin, jiyen, azadi', which means 'Women, life and liberty'.

Since the murder of Mahsa Amini, more young women have lost their lives to the morality police and the Iranian security forces. Hadis Najafi was 20 years old and there are pictures of her dancing on social media with her hair swinging free. She was shot by six bullets for the crime of liberating her hair. Also killed in these protests for freedom have been Ghazaleh Chelavi, Hanan Kio and Mahsa Magoi.

In Tehran over recent weeks we have seen some extraordinary pictures: a young woman standing on the roof of a car surrounded by protesters, male and female, whirling her hijab around her bare head. In south-east Iran a woman quietly removes her head scarf and she waves it around in a town square with her two young daughters standing beside her. In Tehran again, the most extraordinary pictures of a woman, bare head, bare shoulders, skirt just to her knees, walking through the streets in an act of the most extraordinary courage. A man comes up to her and asks if she is okay with him filming her. She said, 'yes', and he said, 'We are proud of your bravery and we will protect you'.

We have seen flags made of women's hair flying in Iran. It has been good to see so many Iranian men standing with those women crying for freedom because Iran has been a place that

has instituted gender apartheid since the Islamic Revolution in 1979. Before that, the women of Iran had freedoms and liberty. However, in the 43 years since then they have been required to cover their heads and wear loose-fitting clothing so that the men cannot see the shapes of their bodies, which tells us, of course, that it is a men problem.

Mona Eltahawy, who is a wonderful feminist and writer, wrote this amazing piece about Mahsa and what is happening in Iran:

Glory and power to the women in Iran who have seized the narrative and become object and subject. Women are too often the afterthought of a revolution, rarely its reason for being. Listen to their chants, 'Jin, jivan, asadi' - women, life, liberty. Glory and power to the women in Iran for serving us this challenge. If women and men in one of the most perfect police states are this unscared, then what are you doing to fight your oppressors?

She talks about the history of Iranian revolution which was co-opted by the clerics who then claimed as an achievement the mass covering of an entire nation's women's hair. She says:

Who owns my hair, let alone my body, when a revolution in which women fought alongside men soon after declaring victory enforced hijab. When you shave the hair under that enforced hijab, are you then the revolution of one, defying, disobeying and disrupting? When you rip off that compulsory hijab in public and shave off your hair in public, are you finally completing the revolution that the theocrats and the misogynists stole from you?

She also talks about the importance of hair and why it is about hair:

What does hair have to do with the revolution? There is a scene in Abbas Kiarostami's film, *Ten*, when a woman sitting in a car in Tehran traffic gingerly removes her hijab to reveal a shaved head. When I first saw that scene in a film in New York in 2003, I started to cry. It had been 11 years since I'd stopped wearing hijab and it would be another 17 years until I shaved off my own hair During the Irish Revolution, both sides would forcibly shave or cut off women's hair as punishment as well as a way to control women's bodies.

We should all stand with the women and the men of Iran in their fight for liberty and freedom. I want to end with a poem by a revolutionary Iranian female poet, Simin Behbahani, who was born in Tehran in 1927 and died in 2014. She was known as the lioness of Iran, prohibited by government from leaving the country in the last years of her life. She says, in *For the Dream to Ride*:

You want to erase my being but in this land, I shall remain. I will continue the dance as long as I sustain, my verse as vast as a meadow. Its universe rooted in my homeland, in the world of ghazal, I am a fleet-footed, galloping gazelle. I speak as long as I am alive, fury, roar and revolt. Your stones and rocks I fear not. I'm flood, my flow you can't halt. I don't veil my hair, I am not Gordafarid, nor do I pretend. I am not the woman your deceit can lock up in your fortress end. I am lightning. My silence will not adorn the sight.

I am prelude to thunder, till then I illuminate the night. Your arrow may give my eyes strain, but in chasing me, it's flying in vain.

Madam Speaker, we stand with the women of Iran.

Defence and Veteran Suicide Interim Report

[6.07 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I thank Ms O'Connor for bringing that to the House this afternoon. I have been following that as well and it is absolutely devastating. Those poems were beautiful.

I rise on the adjournment to highlight the Australian Government's formal response to the Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide interim report recommendations, which were tabled in the federal parliament yesterday, 26 September 2022. It is devastating that Australia has lost more serving and former serving personnel to suicide over the last 20 years than through operations over the same period in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is a great tragedy that successive Australian governments have failed those who have served our nation. Governments have also failed the families of those people, families who have carried a heavy burden of their own through the pain and suffering they have experienced. This is why the Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide needed to happen.

The rate of veteran suicide in Australia is a national tragedy. It is a rate that is significantly higher than across the general Australian population. Here in Tasmania, we have the highest representation of veterans living in our state. Our rates of veteran suicides are devastating and we must do more to address these gaps.

According to figures from the Black Dog Institute and RSL Tasmania, female veterans in Tasmania are at a devastating level of risk of taking their own lives. Consequently, we have begun working and meeting with female veterans across the state. We will report back to the House on our progress as we continue this important work.

I would like to read into the record a brief overview of the content of the interim recommendations proposed by the commission and the response by the federal government:

Whole systems for serving and ex-serving members need to be reimagined and re-engineered It is clear to us that Australia's veteran compensation and rehabilitation legislative system is so complicated that it adversely affects the mental health of some veterans, both serving and ex-serving ADF members, and can be a contributing factor to suicidality.

Indeed, as the Law Council of Australia points out, the first principle of the rule of law is that the law must be both readily known and available, and certain and clear. In this regard, we have much to do.

The government agrees to recommendation 1. The government will develop a pathway for simplification and harmonisation of veteran compensation and rehabilitation legislation. Funding will be considered in the context of budget processes and fiscal constraints. The

timing and implementation will be informed by what is required for necessary consultation and the passage of legislation.

Recommendation 2 goes to eliminating the claims backlog. The government agrees to this recommendation. Far too many veterans and personnel are waiting far too long for their claims to be processed. The current backlog is unacceptable and that is why, at the last election, the government committed to employing 500 additional staff for the DVA. This recruitment process is already underway. The government is already seeing positive results. It is the aim of this government to have the claims backlog cleared before the end of 2023.

Recommendation 3 seeks to improve the administration of the claims system. The government agreed to that recommendation. There is no doubt some veterans and families have not had a good experience, and have not been able to access the support they deserve. For that, the government states that we are sorry. We are looking to improve the veterans' experience of the claims system, remove complexity and enhance efficiency in supporting veterans and families as they navigate the current system.

Work is already underway, with the employment of additional staff to support claims processing, as well as internal system changes and upgrades, but there is definitely more work that needs to be done.

The fourth recommendation is that the Department of Veterans' Affairs provides, on a regular basis, advice to government on funding needs. The government agrees to that recommendation.

Recommendation 5 suggests removing the Department of Veterans' Affairs' average staffing level cap. As a Labor Government, we know the importance of secure work. That is why, at the recent election, the government committed to abolishing the artificial staffing cap across the public service.

The work the DVA undertakes is complex, and we need the best trained individuals to work on processing claims and supporting veterans, yet the cap resulted in a counterproductive reliance on labour hire arrangements, with higher staff turnover and higher costs. The cap is now removed. This means staff have job security. It will also mean that staff are processing claims more efficiently as they build their own knowledge base in a complex system.

Recommendation 6 calls for increased protections for people who engage with the royal commission. The government will take forward suggested legislative reforms to the Royal Commissions Act 1902, widely consulting on the drafting of those amendments.

The government will also work with the royal commission to ensure serving and ex-serving Australian Defence Force (ADF) members have protections to communicate information to the inquiry without breaching general secrecy offences in the criminal code. To achieve this, the government welcomes continued engagement with the royal commission.

The government notes recommendation 7, recognising the importance of royal commissions being able to thoroughly investigate and provide recommendations in relation to their terms of reference while protecting freedom of speech.

The government also notes recommendation 8, recognising the need for the royal commission to have access to information they need to ensure their work is efficient and effective. The government will improve policies and practices to streamline and introduce additional rigour around the use of public interest immunity claims in royal commissions.

Recommendations 9 to 13 all relate to improving the release by Defence and the DVA of information to family about deceased family members. The government agrees to these recommendations. There is no doubt that the communication between Defence, the DVA and impacted families has left a lot to be desired. Work on this has already begun, and the government concedes we have a large task ahead of us.

For anybody who is listening, if you are a current serving member of the ADF or family member, you can reach out to the ADF, or our support line available 24/7 on 1800 626 036.

Whale Strandings on the West Coast

[6.14 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Environment and Climate Change) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the tragic natural event that played on Tasmania's west coast during the last week. Unfortunately, whale strandings occur from time to time in Tasmania. It is curious to think that only two years ago, to the day, what is thought to be the biggest whale stranding event on record in Australia happened in a nearby location, involving the same species.

Last week, the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania received a report of a large whale stranding on Ocean Beach, just north of Macquarie Heads. The department immediately initiated an incident response according to its existing whale stranding response manual. Following the mass whale stranding in 2020, the department undertook a comprehensive review of its manual. Work on the updated manual, along with the purchase of equipment following the 2020 mass stranding, was supported by \$150 000 funding from the Tasmanian Government.

Around 220 pilot whales were stranded, with a further 25 detected in Macquarie Harbour. Of the 220 stranded whales reported, the response team successfully released 44 animals to deeper water, although some of these animals did re-strand. Unfortunately, it was quickly apparent in this incident that many of the whales on Ocean Beach had died upon stranding. Unlike the incident two years earlier, the stranding this time occurred along a very exposed coastline, with rough seas leading to high mortality rates.

The response provided an opportunity to trial new methodology as an adaptive operational approach, considering the remote and difficult terrain. This included the assistance provided by salmon companies through the use of a JCB tele-handler that enabled sling techniques to be utilised for the first time in Tasmania. This response meant live animals could be moved to a sheltered location more quickly, and then moved by vessel into suitable waters for release.

I am advised that two of the rescued pilot whales were tagged with satellite trackers, which has allowed us to capture preliminary data that suggest these animals are now well south

of Tasmania. This is positive news, as it indicates many of the rescued whales have been successfully released and are expected to be back in the Southern Ocean.

Carcasses were collected and disposed of in deeper water, approximately 40 kilometres off the coast, using a long line. For anyone who saw the footage of the whales being taken out to deeper water for disposal, it was an incredible operation to watch. Carcasses may wash up on local beaches over the next few weeks from currents and tidal movements, and NRE will be undertaking surveillance flights to monitor this occurrence. The community should report any sightings to the whale hotline, which can be found on the departmental website.

It was my privilege and honour to spend time with the rescuers, working to save the surviving pilot whales from the Ocean Beach stranding last Thursday. In a situation such as this, there is nothing quite like seeing the event first-hand to understand what the responders on the ground are up against. I was able to visit the location last Thursday, to be briefed on the operations, and to see first-hand the skilled efforts of all the amazing responders. The dedication and cooperation of those on the ground to deliver the rescue effort is something all Tasmanians can be proud of. It can be tough and tireless work, but seeing the way the crews worked together, doing everything they could to see the best outcomes for these whales, was truly inspirational.

As with all major incidents, the department will conduct a debrief, review and response, and incorporate findings into future response planning once the incident is complete. Stranding prevention also remains an ongoing focus for Tasmanian experts and the global research community. Data collection, including sampling, is one of the actions routinely undertaken at strandings.

I will take a moment to thank some of those who worked hard on the ground and in the water, and all those who have assisted, including DPIPWE's Marine Conservation program, whose staff are specially trained for this type of event, and are the experts we have been relying on throughout the response. The Parks and Wildlife Service staff, along with other staff from DPIPWE who have so willingly taken a leading role in coordinating the response, especially Incident Controller Brendan Clark and Operations Manager, Chris Carlyon, who led the response efforts on the ground - and the trained volunteers on the ground, or on call, who assisted in the process.

I thank Tasmania Police, who have been there to assist with managing the safety and movement of people in the water and on land around the rescue operations. Huon Aquaculture, Petuna and Tassal have made their staff, vessels and equipment and local knowledge available to assist in the response. They played a pivotal role in the response efforts, and we would not have seen the success that we have without their significant contribution.

I thank and acknowledge Ambulance Tasmania, the West Coast Council, Marine Safety Tasmania, the Bureau of Meteorology and air service contractors and the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery representatives who are collecting samples from dead whales for future research purposes.

I also thank the Strahan community for assisting in the rescue efforts, not only directly, but also heeding the advice of our marine conservation crews and police. I acknowledge they have, again, been at the forefront of another localised event that also takes its toll on those who

live and work in the area and love it and everything in it. I thank those who have been feeding and accommodating and providing general support to the response team.

I am immensely proud of the community of Strahan in my electorate of Braddon for coming together and offering their assistance in a time of need. At times like these, Tasmanians work together to respond as quickly and compassionately as possible. It is especially timely given Mental Health Week. Our thoughts, and probably the thoughts of all of us here in this place are with the response team who have put in the hard yards over a very tough period. I again thank them on behalf of all Tasmanians for the incredible work they have done this week.

Tasmanian Rowers - Tribute

John Lewis Perkins - Tribute

[6.21 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Mr Speaker, I rise on adjournment to give a big shout-out to Tasmanian rowers. I will start off with Henry Youl from the Tamar Rowing Club in Launceston. Henry rowed in the Australian Eight that won a bronze medal on Sunday at Racice in the Czech Republic. It is a beautiful course in Racice. They finished third behind Great Britain and the Netherlands in what was a fantastic race with only seven seconds splitting all six crews. Fantastic efforts.

Henry is not the biggest guy. He especially would not be the biggest guy in that eight but he has a huge heart and great technique. He well deserved his spot in the engine room of the eight in three seat. It has been a journey for Henry and it is a tribute to his perseverance. His last Australian team was as an under-23, way back in 2017. Now 26 and turning 27 this month, he spent years with 4.30 a.m. starts trying to fit in 40-plus hours of work and a full training load while also working through a carpentry apprenticeship. These years of hard work came to fruition on the weekend. He is definitely building toward the 2024 Olympics in Paris. I wish him all the best. He has worked really hard. He deserves this and he deserves everything he gets.

Other Tasmanians performing very well were Alex Viney. She received a silver medal in the PR mixed double, which is a Paralympics event. She also came a very narrow fourth in the PR3, which is a coxed four event and also a mixed crew.

Anneka Reardon, from down south here, from outer Sandy Bay, raced in the very competitive lightweight women's double, which is also an Olympic event. She finished a very credible fourth in the B final, which gave her a position of 10th overall. Tenth in the world, especially in a such a competitive Olympic event, is a fantastic achievement.

Georgia Nesbitt from the Huon Club got fifth in the C final in the women's lightweight single, which is also a very competitive event, which gave her a position of 17th overall.

As a former rower, it is always good to see Tasmanians performing at the highest level. A special congratulations to Henry Youl, who looks like he is on track for the Olympics. There are other Tasmanians who are working hard as we speak, and we would really like to see them perform at the highest level. Next year is a very important year because it is the qualification for the Olympics. Australian rowing needs as many crews to qualify next year so we can get

as many people and as many rowing crews in the Olympics in 2024. I really hope to have as many Tasmanians as possible representing Australia at the Olympics.

We paused parliament because of the death of Her Majesty the Queen and that gave me the opportunity to attend the funeral of a great Tasmanian. John Lewis Perkins was well known to everybody but especially in his home town of Latrobe. It seems like every time I went to Latrobe, I would run into John and he would always give me sage advice. He was always very pleasant. This was a guy who was involved in everything. He was a key part of the community. He will be sadly missed after tragically dying in a horrendous car crash while holidaying with his family in Townsville.

It is just a dreadful situation to be in, but this funeral was a celebration of John's life. He was a larger than life character. I have to say that I believe this would have been one of the biggest funerals I have ever been to. It was held at Latrobe Recreation Ground, and it was so big that he had two grandstands full of people while the ceremony took place on the edge of the oval.

It was a beautiful ceremony. The Master of Ceremonies was Rodney Bishop, who was his lifelong friend going all the way back to his time as a boarder at Launceston Church Grammar School in Launceston. The music was fantastic and the tributes were amazing; the family tributes from his children, Sally Richardson, and his son, Luke Perkins. It was beautiful.

It is so tragic because John was involved in so much in the community. He will be sorely missed. I will sorely miss him. I am almost expecting this stealthy shadow of a giant of a man to suddenly be there, and that was my experience of going to Latrobe. I do not know how he would do it, but he would almost sneak up on you. You would turn and there would be John, ready to give you some advice, some support, and some encouraging comments at times. It is a tragic loss for everybody, but especially for the community of Latrobe. He will be sorely missed. Vale John Perkins.

Members - Here, here.

Workplace Protection Laws

[6.26 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Minister for State Development, Construction and Housing) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I concur with the remarks of the member for Braddon regarding John Perkins, and sincerely support those remarks.

Tonight, I wanted to note the milestone event with the Government delivering on its long-time commitment for stronger laws and increased penalties to protect businesses from workplace invasions. Last week, the Police Offences Amendment (Workplace Protection) Act 2022 received Royal Assent. This has been a long time coming. We have been elected three times - 2014, 2018 and 2021 - with policies designed to protect the rights of workers and to deter unlawful interference and disruption of businesses - small, medium, and large.

The legislation clarifies and increases penalties for the offence of trespass and intending to obstruct a business, or where it caused a serious risk to someone's safety in the workplace. Rightly, there is provision for higher penalties for those repeatedly convicted of causing safety

risks in the workplace. This legislation is necessary, and has been necessary for a long period of time. While we all understand and support the importance of free speech and the right to protest, it cannot come at the expense of the right to go to work. People should be able to get on with their daily work without fear of intimidation and harassment. There is a cost to business from disruption and, more importantly, we need to stop the real risk of harm.

Our productive industries, in particular, know how important this legislation is. When welcoming the passing of this legislation, the Tasmanian Forest Products Association on 8 September said through Nick Steel - and I thank him for his advocacy over many years and before that through the Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association. In their public statement he said:

The TFPA congratulates Minister Barnett on his work in updating our laws and passing important amendments to the Police Offences Act through the Tasmanian Parliament. These strengthened laws keep pace with the changing protest environment and will assist to combat the era of the professional protester. No-one is opposed to people's right to protest peacefully, even if we disagree.

However, the message today to our industry workers and others is that your value to society, your right to work and your mental health, is just as important as the next person. Freedoms of expression and freedom of assembly does not extend to unlawful and unwelcome attacks on individuals in their place of work. Placing workers' safety and mental health at risk, whilst impinging on their rights and freedoms is simply not good enough and the message today is - it must stop.

Despite our differences of opinion, we should all be able to respect the rights of each other and behave in a manner that is acceptable in a modern and democratic society.

I put on record my sincere thanks to all the productive industries over all of that time since 2014 that have supported our efforts to provide greater and better protections for those in the workplace, with the businesses right to operate free from that intrusion and workplace invasion, and the right of workers to go to work, earn a living and return safely home to their families.

To the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry - strong advocates all that time for all of their members; the Tasmanian Small Business Council; and the Tasmanian Minerals, Manufacturing and Energy Council and particularly Ray Mostogl, who has been such a strong advocate over all that time; and the Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association: thank you for your solid support. To the Salmon Growers Association, the Seafood Industry Council, and to all the long-standing workers I met in all those productive industries over that time, it was fantastic. Thank you for your support. You have been steadfast, never relented and you always knew what was right and the Government has now delivered what is a milestone event, a watershed piece of legislation, which is so important.

I pay tribute to Paul Harriss, former member of the Legislative Council but also former member of this House and a wonderful advocate for business and for workers and their right to work. It was in 2014 under his stewardship and leadership as Minister for Resources. Paul

Harriss, I pay you a tribute tonight and thank you for your support. To the honourable Will Hodgman and the former Premier, Peter Gutwein, thank you for your terrific support over all of that time for this milestone: pivotal legislation to protect the right of workers from workplace invasion and businesses from workplace invasions.

Businesses need to operate within the laws set down and they must be allowed to operate without fear of interference. Where required to do so, these businesses go through rigorous planning and approval processes where all those views are considered.

The BBF is still on the hunt and still highlighting that they believe there is one law for them and one law for others. I have seen it in those productive industries, on the west coast, the north-west coast, throughout Tasmania, in forestry, mining, agriculture, fishing, salmon and it goes on. How sad it is that the Labor Party would vote against this legislation. It is a shameful display by a party that is meant to be protecting the right of workers, that traditionally stood up for workers but has now relented and is standing shoulder to shoulder with the Greens to oppose this law to increase and make tougher, workplace invasion laws and increase those penalties.

It is something they will have to talk to their constituents about. We will monitor this legislation to see whatever more needs to be done, and we will protect the rights of workers and the rights of businesses to operate peacefully without undue intrusion. I thank the House.

Hobart City Mission - Sleep Rough Safe Space - Night Program

[6.33 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Not reflecting the vote of the House are you, Mr Barnett?

Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the work of the Hobart City Mission. Earlier this year, I had the pleasure and good fortune of taking part in the Hobart City Mission's Sleep Rough. It was an opportunity to spend time with people who work with City Mission and other passionate community members about the issue of homelessness and people sleeping rough in Tasmania, learn about their work, and also to raise money for the good work that Hobart City Mission does.

Sleep Rough was not designed to have people pretend to be out sleeping rough. It was down at Princes Wharf No. 1, to get people together, and to talk about all the programs that Hobart City Mission provide, particularly in the southern part of the state in responding to the needs of people who are in times of need.

It is a wonderful, educative process that they go through on the night. You get to sleep on the cement floor. You take your own sleeping bag. It is not designed to try and pretend you are sleeping rough. It is a way of bringing people together to raise the important issue of homelessness and to provide you with an opportunity to learn more and to assist in raising money.

One of the programs that they raise money for during that Sleep Rough fundraising drive is the Hobart City Mission's Safe Space program, which is a wonderful initiative and was first launched in 2019. We need to acknowledge that we would hope that in a good world we would

not need to have a Safe Space program; we would be able to provide people with housing and emergency crisis accommodation in times of need. Given the fact that we do, it is important that we have organisations like the Hobart City Mission stepping up to ensure that they can support people through what is a particularly tough period of their life. The Safe Space program is a 24-hour service that offers services for anyone who needs a place of connection, some food and a safe place to be.

The Safe Space - Night Program offers those who are homeless or those who at risk of homelessness with a safe and warm place to sleep at night. Since opening, the Safe Space Night Program has provided over 11 800 bed nights to Tasmanians who likely would otherwise have been sleeping rough. The Safe Space Day Program also provides more than 1100 at-risk Tasmanians with access to key services and supports.

Recently, the Tasmanian Institute of Law Enforcement Studies at the University of Tasmania, in partnership with the Hobart City Mission, was commissioned to evaluate the effectiveness of the Safe Space program. I have visited the Safe Space site and I am sure many in this Chamber have too. If not, I would get along to have a look at the great work that they do.

It came as no surprise to me to read in the report that the program is working well in providing a critically important service to Tasmanians in need. Quotes from the report that all clients reported to the evaluators who attend in Safe Space have said it has had a positive impact on their life. The clients reported the best thing about Safe Space was that it allowed them a rest, that they felt accepted and they were provided with unconditional support, which allowed them to get to know others and make friends. This program provides the crucial stepping stone on the path out of homelessness and rough sleeping for this cohort, and supports those who are already housed and those who are at risk of homelessness.

In my visit there and talking to a number of people who are accessing those services, you could see firsthand the important role that Safe Space provided for them, not only in the middle of winter - keeping warm and dry -but also as a step towards building relationships with other Tasmanians as well as a step towards the other services that Hobart City Mission can provide. There is a whole range of services they provide which people are not aware of, and sometimes the best thing they can do is ask for help, experience it, build a relationship, build up trust and, therefore, the referrals from the Hobart City Mission Safe Space can assist people in making some positive steps and getting back to a point in their life where they are safe and comfortable and in a better environment.

I believe they provide a fantastic service. As I said in the beginning, unfortunately, with our social housing waiting lists and some of the challenges that many Tasmanians are facing because of the housing crisis and the lack of Government response, these services are being leaned on really heavily. The fundraising that Hobart City Mission does to ensure they can provide those services is needed even more because we are in this position.

Politics aside, I want to ensure that people acknowledge the great work of Hobart City Mission and particularly the Safe Space homelessness programs.

Tasmanian Rowers - Tribute
Tasracing - Harness and Greyhound Tracks on North-West Coast
David Sykes - Report into Animal Welfare

[6.39 p.m.]

Ms OGILVIE (Clark - Minister for Racing) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I concur in the strongest terms with Dr Broad in relation to his speech about the success of our young rowers and the work that they are doing. I am familiar with the southern rowers more so than the northern rowers, but certainly they have had a remarkable campaign and everybody is looking forward to seeing the next generation coming through.

I will just touch on how much effort and energy goes into community sport. It is not just the participants, but of course the volunteers, right across Tasmania, every morning, particularly in those rowing clubs, 5 a.m., 6 a.m., people out helping the kids get on the water. These are unpaid positions. This is community sport at its absolute finest and is a pretty big operation. To see the success of our talented athletes who come through in these non-professional sports is really quite marvellous. It happens across a range of sports and having been involved heavily in community football I am very well aware of the work that goes on there but particularly rowing because of the amount of time, the equipment that needs to be moved around and the ability people need to have to go to Lake Barrington, specifically in Tasmania. The effort the parents, the students, the schools, the clubs put into this thing, we cannot support them more strongly.

It always makes me quite sad when I hear some negativity coming from some in this Chamber towards those community-based groups and organisations that need every sort of assistance they can get from all sorts. I know everybody in this Chamber wishes all the students and participants all the best. Thank you, yes, very real, particularly I think everybody has kids doing sport as well.

I will also speak as Minister for Racing. As you are very aware the Tasmanian Government is a very strong supporter of the Tasmanian racing industry, which generates more than \$185 million in economic activity and supports more than 5800 people who are either employed in the industry or are direct participants. I always say in the racing industry there is something for everybody. There are so many different roles. It is a little bit like community sport as well. Managing the animals, looking after them, people love them. All of that work that goes on, there is a place for everybody in racing.

I was very pleased to announce a few weeks ago, because we had that break with the Queen's death, that Tasracing had found a new preferred location for harness and greyhound tracks on the north-west coast. This is opposite the Devonport airport and the proposed site is on a 27 hectare acre of private land on Mill Road, Wesley Vale. The Tasmanian Government is investing \$8 million over two years to Tasracing to build the proposed new tracks. Tasracing will also be contributing funding to the project which would have otherwise been committed to major upgrades at the ageing Devonport showgrounds facilities, so we have a good solution.

Importantly, initial site investigation works have been completed, including geo-technical and agriculture assessment and compliance with a conceptual layout design for the tracks and amenities buildings has also been undertaken and much of the original work, from the Palmers Road site development could be applied to the new proposed site at Wesley Vale. That is also good news.

We are very aware of the impacts of the situation and the setbacks, but the Government has remained strongly committed to this project and we will ensure harness and greyhound racing has a long future on the north-west. The decision to cease work at the first identified site on Palmers Road site in Latrobe was disappointing for participants on the north-west. We felt this very keenly and I was in communication with the relevant stakeholders. The Tasmanian Government acknowledges and thanks participants on the north-west coast for their patience whilst Tasracing identified a new site.

I hope this gives the House a good update on the status of this important project and provide some surety and confidence for participants located on the north-west.

Also, by way of an update, we had some discussion today in relation to racing. I have just been given some information and in relation to the report we were discussing today, which is the independent veterinarian's report, I am advised the Office of Racing Integrity did participate in the review process with the Director of Racing and the Office of Racing Integrity regulatory veterinarian and the racing integrity and steward's manager all participated in interviews with Dr Sykes and through the supply of available information for all three codes of racing. The Director of Racing has requested that this be clarified, so I hope that additional information is also useful to the House.

Hellyer College - *Like You Like It*

[6.45 p.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) - Madam Deputy Speaker, tonight on the adjournment I congratulate Hellyer College on their recent performance of *Like You Like It*. Although this was not a musical that I was familiar with when going along to attend a few Saturday nights ago now, it was a fantastic show. I think you were there the same night, Mr Jaensch. It just outgrew my expectations. It was fantastic.

For those of you who are not familiar with it, it is a vibrant, humorous and fast-moving show based on Shakespeare's *As You Like It*. With contemporary language and characters, it is Shakespeare meets John Hughes, filled with memorable, original tunes, a hip sense of humour, pure joy and a huge heart and it all works out *Like You Like It* if you just take the biggest risk of all and that is being yourself. I think that is a great message for us here in the Chamber as well as in life. I really enjoyed it. I want to congratulate Zoe Lucas as director and producer, Simon McNair as musical director, Sophie Leslie as vocal director and Taylor Rand as the choreographer.

I want to name each of the lead roles because they really did an outstanding job and they were Mia Kennerly as Rosalind Duke, Kieran Corona as Orlando Bateman, Sophie Harvey as Audrey Shepherd, Angela Bryan as Olivia Bateman, Lily Knight as Celia Duke, Jackson Prouse as Walter Touchtone James, Amity Hutton as Sylvie Fieldman and Tom Twining as Phil Lipchitz.

I congratulate everyone involved, the whole cast, the crew and those who were involved in the band and backstage in bringing this great production to life. The crowd loved it the night that I was there. It was pretty much a sell out, I think, for their whole season and I look forward to supporting next year's Hellyer College musical.

Priorities for Tasmania

[6.47 p.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass) - Mr Speaker, I rise this evening on adjournment to send a clear message to this Government, a message being shared by so many Tasmanians that it is not the right time to build another stadium in Tasmania. We are in the grips of a cost-of-living crisis, when members of the Tasmanian community are sleeping in their cars, couch surfing, sleeping in tents, unable to find safe and secure accommodation, and when members of our community cannot access the healthcare that they need. Teachers and nurses are going off the job because they are at breaking point and there are tens of thousands of Tasmanians waiting to see specialists. It is not the right time to build another stadium in Tasmania.

Of all of the conversations that I have been having with many Tasmanians, both north and south, many deep Liberal supporters; many sports crazy members of the Tasmanian community; footy lovers, I have not found one person who acknowledges it is the right time now to build a stadium and prioritise that over the other needs that Tasmanians expect this Government to focus on.

In building this message to deliver to the Government, supported by so many Tasmanians, I have been clear in this last week about my message on this and my conviction on this because people are calling for us, calling for Tasmanian Labor and anyone who has the ability to influence this Government to bring this Government to clarity so that they can now understand that Tasmanians do not want this stadium. They do not want another stadium. We have a perfectly great stadium in northern Tasmania, York Park, and there is an equally good stadium down here in Hobart at Bellerive. It makes no sense in the cost-of-living crisis that we would be prioritising as a state a stadium over the needs of Tasmanians.

In this place this morning I was intentionally misrepresented over my comments about the need to build another stadium in Tasmania and I will say this, at any point that anybody from the Premier, the Treasurer, to other ministers of this state that intentionally seek to misrepresent myself or Tasmanian Labor, they will be called to account. In conversations that I have been having this week about infrastructure for stadiums, I have been very clear and I want to put on the record this afternoon my comments about this.

In the issue of a media release on Monday 19 September titled 'Premier Prioritises Stadium over Cost of Living', I said this:

Cost-of-living pressures are the biggest concern facing Tasmanians right now. So many people in the community are battling cost-of-living pressures while Jeremy Rockliff remains focused on building a new stadium in Hobart. This Government is so out of touch with Tasmanians, they have got their priorities all wrong. Energy and water bills are skyrocketing, and housing affordability continues to get worse. Over half of Tasmanians are worried it will keep getting worse, year on year.

Families and businesses right across Tasmania are making decisions every day about what they can afford now, and what they will need to put off for some time into the future.

While the Liberal Government remains focused on a \$750 million stadium in Hobart, Tasmanian Labor has been out on the ground listening to community, and we are getting our priorities right.

Jeremy Rockliff and his ministers need to get back to basics and start getting their priorities right for Tasmanians.

On that same day I called a media conference to discuss this, to ensure there was no misunderstanding about the position of Tasmanians, or myself and Tasmanian Labor. In a 10-minute interview, focused solely on the stadium, and the need not to have this stadium built in Hobart, I faced 11 questions about the stadium. In my responses, 11 times I spoke about the fact that it is not the right time to build another stadium in Hobart.

In that 10 minutes, and in response to those 11 questions, I said:

It's not the right time for Tasmania to have another stadium. We are here in the beautiful UTAS stadium in the north of the state, and we know that across Tasmania, people love coming to this venue for football.

It's not the right time for Premier Rockliff to determine that, right now, a potentially \$750 million stadium will be built. So right now is not the right time for another stadium in Tasmania.

Right now, there are incredible resources of infrastructure here at UTAS stadium. The task force report always said in the future we would require a new stadium, but when Tasmanians are making decisions day on day, week on week, about how they pay their power bills, how they pay their water bills, how they pay their rent, people are struggling with housing, the health system is in crisis, education is struggling, and the Premier does not have a plan to remunerate those people that are working for us, whether that be our fireies, our ambos, whether it be our teachers or nurses, it is not the right time to be investing in another stadium in Tasmania.

Right now, it is not the time for this out-of-touch Government to be making such a significant investment, when daily, Tasmanians are struggling just to make ends meet.

The task force knew that in the future, maybe a decade down the track, we would need new infrastructure. Now is not the right time to build another stadium in Tasmania. This service is celebrated. People love being here and playing the game here.

Throughout this interview of 10 minutes responding to 11 questions about the stadium, it was very clear what my conversation was, and I will not be misrepresented in this place.

This morning when the Government were asked seven questions about their commitment - their delirious continued commitment - to build this stadium in Tasmania, they misrepresented me 14 times, to say that my statement was, 'We do not support new infrastructure in Tasmania'. That could not be further from the truth.

The Government reeled off a long list of infrastructure projects that they have announced and supposedly - hopefully - will deliver, and indicated or suggested that Tasmanian Labor are not supportive of such infrastructure projects. It is not correct to say that.

I will not be misrepresented in this place, when I am speaking up for Tasmanians from the north and the south, Liberal Supporters, Labor Supporters, footy-mad people, sports-mad people, that none of them see that this is the right priority. I am sending a message this afternoon. Do not continue to misrepresent me.

Get your priorities right. It is not the right time to build another stadium in Tasmania, and Tasmanians do not want it.

Launceston Football Club's Pink Day for Cancer

Mr WOOD (Bass) - Mr Speaker, recently I had the pleasure to attend a very enlightening fundraising event, the Launceston Football Club's Pink Day for Cancer, at Windsor Park, in my electorate of Bass.

This annual event is expertly organised and coordinated by Mel Hodge, who has coordinated its occurrence for many years and does an outstanding job, ably assisted by footy club president Sandra Boland. As you can appreciate, to pull together an event that is really good fun, but also successful in raising significant funds, is no mean feat, but Mel and Sandra found the perfect balance to achieve this.

On the day there would have been 80-plus ladies in attendance who were all eager to support cancer patients through what can be a very traumatic journey.

Breast cancer is the most common cancer in women in Australia, and the second most common cancer to cause death in women after lung cancer. As many of us know breast cancer is the abnormal growth of cells lining the breast lobules or ducts. These cells grow uncontrollably and have the potential to spread to other parts of the body. Both women and men can develop breast cancer although it is not nearly as prevalent in men. That also means that transwomen, the non-binary and our LGBTIQI community can all suffer from breast cancer. It is entirely possible for anyone to get breast cancer but for the purpose of this speech I will refer to the greater proportion of those people, namely women.

It was estimated in 2021 that 19 866 women and 164 men in Australia would be diagnosed with this insidious disease. Pleasingly though, Australia has a very high survival rate for breast cancer if caught early and if uncomplicated by other diseases. The overall five-year survival rate for breast cancer is 91 per cent and higher than that at 96 per cent if the cancer is limited to the breast. From that, people facing breast cancer are able to take significant hope.

This year the Launceston Football Club chose to support a charity aptly named Wiggling It. This foundation has been recently established and it was inspiring to hear the founder of this amazing cause, Hayley Luttrell. Hayley shared with us part of her personal journey from first being diagnosed with breast cancer through to the creation of Wiggling It in support of others going through the same struggles. Wiggling It has been overwhelmingly successful in supporting the Cancer Council's wig libraries. Wig libraries are an essential service for cancer patients as through the treatment process they inevitably lose their hair. The wig libraries give

them a free avenue to reclaim their dignity and pride by simply borrowing a wig, like you would with a book from the library and returning when you are done.

Women going through cancer treatment suffer debilitating side effects, loss of hair, eyebrows and eyelashes to name a few. Understandably, their confidence and self-esteem can take a real battering. Wiggling It meets these women in their vulnerability by empowering them to take back control of the way that they present themselves to society without paying a cent.

A single human hair wig is very expensive to purchase and can often cost into the thousands of dollars. Cancer does not discriminate so often patients can simply not afford to buy their own wig. Wiggling It fundraises through events in order to supplement the current Cancer Council stock with a larger range of new stylish wigs thus helping give women back their confidence and empower them as they undertake their daily activities. Currently around 20 to 30 women across the state access the wig libraries each month so that you can see that there is real need in the community for this service.

Historically it has been younger women who have missed out on borrowing a wig as the libraries traditionally cater for older women's hair styles. I thank Wiggling It for addressing this pertinent issue. It is with their support that this is no longer the case as Wiggling It now suffuse the current stock with relevant stylish wigs for all Tasmanians undergoing cancer treatment.

The House stands adjourned at 7.00 p.m.