

Thursday 5 September 2019

The Speaker, **Ms Hickey**, took the Chair at 10 a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People and read Prayers.⁶

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Madam SPEAKER - Honourable members, I draw your attention to visitors to our parliament. We have grade 6 students from Sacred Heart College. Welcome to parliament.

Members - Hear, hear.

QUESTIONS

Wage Negotiations - Starting Point

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.03 a.m.]

Negotiations for the next round of wage agreements have already begun, with the ink barely dry on the stop-gap agreement that took 18 months to negotiate. The Liberal member for Clark's submission to the Industrial Commission argued that she should be paid the same rate as someone doing the same job on the mainland. Is paying Tasmanian workers the same as their counterparts on the mainland now the starting point for negotiations with hard-working teachers, nurses and park rangers?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Leader for the question. Our starting point has always been to ensure strong financial management and a strongly performing economy. It was confirmed again yesterday that Tasmania is number one when it comes to economic performance. That is a good thing. With strong financial management under the Treasurer's leadership, the Government has delivered successive surpluses and surpluses are forecast across the forward Estimates.

Of course, we need to live within our means. We will be a Government that manages our finances well and that is efficient. It is appropriate that governments continue to do all they can to improve services and to ensure that we live within our means. Then we can reinvest into frontline services, whether it be employing more nurses or teachers or cleaners or park rangers, as we are doing. We have employed more public servants. Under the former Labor government they were sacked.

Our starting point has always been a sensible approach, including to public sector wage negotiations. They have taken some time but we are very pleased with the progress that has been made. We have reached an agreement by working cooperatively with union representatives. A lot of their members have not always agreed with the position taken by their leadership. Famously, the education union executive took a position contrary to the vast majority of the teacher workforce.

We have been very keen to ensure there is the appropriate balance and that our hardworking public servants, who we respect, are paid in a way that reflects their value to our community and in a way that is affordable and sustainable under our Budget.

Tasmanian Industrial Commission - Parliamentary Office Holder Loadings

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.05 a.m.]

In the current debate about a pay rise for the Speaker, you have conveniently overlooked the fact that the Industrial Commission does not have the power to change the loadings given to parliamentary office holders. That requires changes to the Parliamentary Salaries, Superannuation and Allowances Act, which you are responsible for. Can you assure Tasmanians that you will not change the law to give a member of your Liberal team a pay rise?

Madam SPEAKER - I want to make a point of order here. You have not read the submission. You have made some incredible statements in this parliament about what has been asked for. You have no idea. You have been peddling a lot of mistruths. I would prefer you use your language much better than you have. You cannot stand up here making statements that are untrue.

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question. We have no intention of changing the law. We have no intention of interfering with an appropriate process that was established to ensure that parliamentarians' wages, our salaries and allowances, is independently assessed by the Tasmanian Industrial Commission. Hands off, so we do not have politicians setting their own pay, giving the public confidence that this matter is assessed in accordance with community expectations and done so without political interference. I will not be, as the member suggests, interfering nor actively bringing forward legislation to effect this matter.

We have established a process by which the independent Tasmanian Industrial Commission can set these salaries. It was a deliberate decision by our Government to do so back in 2015. We handed the responsibility to the TIC to give the community confidence that it is done at arm's length.

Members are not obliged to accept the recommendations of the TIC. There are ways that the recommendations can be averted or not progressed. In 2016 the parliament agreed to disallow the TICs recommendations for a 10.5 per cent increase. Last year, the Liberal members of this parliament moved to disallow the increase by writing to the Clerk of the House to not accept an increase in excess of the public sector wages policy -

Mr O'Byrne - It is either appropriate or inappropriate that the commission deals with it. You cannot have it both ways.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr O'Byrne, warning one.

Mr HODGMAN - which we thought was a fair and reasonable thing at the time in line with community expectations and what we were asking of our public servants. Members of the Liberal Party agreed to go no higher.

We have since learned, demonstrating the hypocrisy of Labor, that it was all fine for them to accept in excess.

Ms White - On the one hand you say you accept the ruling and the other hand you subvert it.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Leader of the Opposition, warning one.

Mr HODGMAN - While the first question this morning was about how important it was for hard-working public servants to get paid more, the first thing the Labor Leader of the Opposition and her colleagues did -

Ms O'Byrne - Is there an independent process or not, Premier?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Byrne, warning one.

Mr HODGMAN - when a recommendation came down from the TIC to accept the pay rise was to take it.

Federal Religious Freedom Laws

Ms O'CONNOR question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.08 a.m.]

Today landmark human rights reforms, which your Government fought every step of the way and Labor now is sadly distancing itself from, come into effect and transgender Tasmanians are celebrating.

Ms Haddad - How have I distanced myself?

Ms O'CONNOR - You are not Labor, you are Ms Haddad.

Premier, the religious freedom laws being introduced by your federal colleagues will override Tasmania's anti-discrimination law and hurt this community as well as people with disability, women and members of racial and religious minorities. You have received a letter from Equality Tasmania respectfully asking that you convene a round table to hear concerns about the bill before you resolve and announce your Government's position, and formally requesting the federal Attorney-General, Christian Porter, to conduct a consultation about the bill in Tasmania and hear from representatives of affected communities. Will you commit to taking these actions on behalf of the vulnerable Tasmanians you are elected to represent?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the true leader of the opposition for the question. As I have said in relation to the federal draft exposure bill that has been circulated across the nation, we will, of course, consult appropriately with Tasmanians and those who represent groups with a direct interest in this area. We will respond formally to the federal government with our views on their legislation, but also importantly how it intersects with Tasmanian law as has been flagged.

In relation to gender recognition on birth certificates, yes, we did, as the law makers, as the responsible government that we are, express our grave concerns as to how the legislation that was brought into this House was handled. These are important laws. We respect the fact that they have a direct impact on Tasmanians. Many people do not agree with them. There are certainly contrary views. It is important that legislation of complex and significant legal consequence is appropriately debated and considered through this parliament.

We had a heavily amended bill, received back from the Legislative Council, which we were expected to debate immediately. In the absence of the responsible minister, I took carriage of the bill and handled it well, I thought. It is an unusual process, to say the least, for a bill such as this, as important as you say it is. The Justice and Related Legislation Marriage Amendment Bill was fundamentally different to the one that Labor and the Greens pushed through the House of Assembly last year.

Ms O'Connor - Not fundamentally.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr HODGMAN - Yet they rushed through that bill, which was a complete re-write of what they claimed last year was sound law. It was rushed at every stage. It was another example of Labor and the Greens working very closely on this.

Ms O'Connor - It was a six-month process.

Mr HODGMAN - It is not that long ago that we saw the by-product of Labor and the Greens working together. I know the Leader of the Opposition wants to distance herself from all that now but at the time it was very much a team effort by Labor and the Greens which, unfortunately, in our view -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, please.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I urge the Premier, given that we are talking about marginalised people to be careful with his language and not needlessly create division over this issue, please.

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - There are people who are celebrating today over at Rosny.

Madam SPEAKER - It is not a point of order, but I know the Premier will be respectful.

Mr HODGMAN - We thought it was an inappropriate way to progress law reform of this nature in such a fashion. We have had, as a government, referred these matters to the Tasmanian Law Reform Institute before the marriage bill was even debated in the House of Assembly, so it demonstrates our commitment to good process and getting expert input.

Members interjecting.

Mr HODGMAN - We did have strong representations from some of Tasmania's leading legal experts about the legislation. Because the Greens and Labor were not prepared to consider those consequences, we did say very strongly that we anticipated circumstances that might arise from the legislation. Indeed, we have committed to undertake or consult and then review its implementation, as is required.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I am not interested in what the Premier is saying. Standing order 45, relevance. A question has been put to you about a letter from Equality Tasmania about convening a round table and asking Christian Porter to do the same.

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order, but you have it on *Hansard*.

Mr HODGMAN - I answered that in the very first part of my question. Of course, I will appropriately respond to correspondence received.

Economic Management and Performance

Mr TUCKER question to the TREASURER, Mr GUTWEIN

[10.14 a.m.]

Can you update the House on the benefits of the Hodgman Liberal Government's strong economic management and Tasmania's brilliant economic performance?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr Tucker for the question and for his interest in this very important matter. I am very pleased to announce that it is now officially confirmed that Tasmania, once again, has the strongest growing economy in the nation.

Members interjecting.

Mr GUTWEIN - I know this is not what you want to hear.

The state final demand grew 3.4 per cent in 2018 to 2019, the highest growth in Australia in trend terms. It was significantly higher than the national growth rate, which was only 1.4 per cent. In fact, it is more than double the national rate. At the same time, we were the fastest growing state in the country on a quarterly basis for the last quarter. Yesterday's result marks the first time in 15 years that Tasmania's economic growth rate has outstripped that of all the other states and territories on a financial year basis.

Ms O'Byrne -What about 6.7 per cent unemployment?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Byrne. Warning two.

Mr GUTWEIN - Importantly, this result is also the first time in more than a quarter of a century that Tasmania's growth has more than tripled that of the nation's power house economy, New South Wales, on a financial year basis. These are outstanding results especially considering where we have come from in the five and a half years that we have been in government. You only

have to cast your eyes back a handful of years to know that under that lot on the other side we had been in recession, 10 000 jobs had been lost; it was all over the budget papers.

Dr Broad - You have lost 5000 this year.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Dr Broad. Warning one.

Dr Broad interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Dr Broad. Warning two.

Mr GUTWEIN - We have worked very hard in terms of our long-term plan. In short, we have confidence in our economy and now Tasmania once again leads the country in confidence across our business sector. That confidence is leading to investment. Importantly that investment is leading to jobs, 13 000 more jobs under this government.

Ms O'Connor - How many of them are imported?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor. Warning number one.

Mr GUTWEIN - The member asked me what does this mean. Importantly it means that we will generate the revenues to invest record amounts into health and education and to looking after the most disadvantaged in this country. You only have to look around the state to see the nation-leading investment occurring. CH Smith redevelopment - after 30 years we have got it out of the ground. Castle Hill and Granville Harbour are leading the country in terms of per capita renewable energy. Aquaculture expansions, hotels like the Marriot, the Crown Plaza, the Hyatt Century, the Vibe, Argyle Street, the Verge, and the Silos in Launceston are all investments driven by confidence in our economy and strong economic management.

When you consider the contrast, 3.4 per cent annual economic growth leading the country. Back in 2011-12 it was negative 3.2 per cent. In 2012-13 it was negative 1.6 per cent. The state was officially in a recession. At its peak, 10 000 jobs had been lost and Tasmania's were leaving the state in droves.

This is a very good result for Tasmania and it is one we have worked long and hard for. Unlike the other side, we understand that the economy is important. We understand that confidence is important. We understand that confidence leads to investment and investment leads to jobs. Jobs will generate the revenue, which will mean that we can invest more into those essential services.

What we have seen recently is a road to Damascus moment. It is going to be a long road for them. We will see whether they can get back on it. It is interesting. After their efforts this week, all they have attempted to do and all they will attempt to do in the future - and it is important to acknowledge the long faces on the other side. I know this is good news. I know you do not want to hear it, but we are doing pretty well.

Tasmanians should be pleased that we are leading the country. In leading the country what we will do is provide more opportunity for Tasmanians. The confidence that is generated will lead to more investment and more investment will lead to more jobs.

Department of Health - Budget Cuts

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.19 a.m.]

While a member of your government urges for a pay rise for herself, your Government's savage plans to slash \$450 million from the Budget is well and truly underway. Can you confirm that from this week, staff from Treasury and from DPAC have been sent across to the Department of Health with clear directives to slash spending? These cuts will have an inevitable impact on frontline services and patient care at a time when people are already dying unnecessarily because they cannot get a hospital bed. Will you finally release the secret details of how much the Hodgman Health razor gang has been instructed to cut from the Health budget this financial year?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question. I do not accept the way in which she frames the question. I say again, as I have done repeatedly, that this Government will ensure we are efficient, productive and delivering services Tasmanians need, including in our health service. We will, as a whole of government, apply appropriate resources and analyses of how that can best be done, in no way compromising essential services to Tasmanians, particularly when it comes to their health care.

Under this Government we have employed more staff, opened wards that were shut, and invested in major hospitals right across the state and in regional hospitals. We have supported more people into our workforce and delivered record levels of budget expenditure into Health, now well over what other states spend. Indeed, a high proportion of our budget is directed intentionally to better health care because we recognise that more needs to be done.

We have announced a \$15 million efficiency dividend or revenue, as the Treasurer has confirmed, from government businesses raised this year, meaning that the efficiency dividend across all agencies this year will be just \$35 million, or around 0.5 per cent. How do you think a government could not seriously make efficiencies to expenditures which are not essential for frontline service delivery? How is it such a foreign concept to members of the Labor Party that that could occur? It is because they do not understand the economy and how the budget works. Their track record is one of deficits and spending more than the state could afford and it is one of an economy in recession.

The Leader of the Opposition has -

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Madam Speaker, under standing order 45. My question to the Premier was: can he confirm that officials from Treasury and DPAC have been sent across to the Department of Health to make budget cuts this week?

Madam SPEAKER - It is not a point of order.

Mr HODGMAN - We will make efficiencies that in no way impact on our health and hospital system service delivery for Tasmanians needing better health care. I make the point again that they have admitted in a headland speech to the Labor membership that they are out of touch and they have only now recognised that the economy is important.

Under this Government, it is the best performing in the country. It allows us to invest more with good budget management into things such as Health -

Ms White - You're cutting \$450 million.

Madam SPEAKER - Warning number two.

Mr HODGMAN - Our record is one of building up our health system, fixing a system that was broken when we came into government, rebuilding health facilities, including at the Royal Hobart Hospital where I was this week with the Health minister, and seeing the progress for health services right across the state. That is our track record. Yours is one of shutting wards and sacking staff.

We will continue to work diligently through how we can make these savings, these efficiency measures, as good governments do, because other governments across the country and possibly even Labor ones are doing it. What it will mean is that we are able to invest more into our hospitals and health services to deliver better outcomes for Tasmanians.

Apprenticeships and Traineeships

Mrs RYLAH question to MINISTER for EDUCATION and TRAINING, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.24 a.m.]

Can you update the House on how the Hodgman majority Liberal Government's strong economic management is delivering more apprenticeships and traineeships?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question and her interest in this matter, particularly for her electorate of Braddon. Under the Hodgman majority Liberal Government Tasmania has seen a dramatic turnaround in economic performance and employment levels. Our economy is the strongest growing in the nation and there are 13 000 more Tasmanians in work than when we came to office.

Ms O'Connor - Half of that labour is imported. It's not 13 000 jobs for Tasmanians.

Mr ROCKLIFF - As I have said before, education and skills remain at the heart of our plan for growing Tasmania and connecting all parts of our community -

Ms Butler - It remains the biggest problem we have in the state.

Madam SPEAKER - Ms O'Connor and Ms Butler, another warning.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I am pleased that I can report to the House today on the latest data from the National Centre for Vocational Education Research released this morning. The data shows that despite a five-year decline in apprentice and training activity in Australia, Tasmania continues to fire ahead and we are bucking the trend. In the last 12 months to March this year, apprenticeship and traineeship commencements in Tasmania increased by 5.7 per cent, while nationally there was a decline of 2.7 per cent - clearly bucking the trend.

When it comes to trade-specific apprenticeships and traineeships such as building and construction, commencements in Tasmania increased by almost 10.5 per cent. This is an incredible performance given the national decline of 0.6 per cent. In Tasmania the number of apprentices and trainees in training has also improved significantly, at 7.8 per cent higher compared to a national drop of nearly 1.0 per cent. I am also very pleased to note that our completion rates, the number of trainees and apprentices finishing their training, are again the highest in the nation. Tasmania has a completion rate 10.0 per cent higher than the national average. This is something to celebrate, yet all we get from those opposite unfortunately is attack after attack on TasTAFE.

These improvements in statistics do not happen by accident. You need a strong economy, you need businesses to be confident, you need a well-supported TAFE and you need a high-performing training system. Not only do we have some of the best training system statistics in the nation but our public training provider, TasTAFE, has achieved seven years of re-registration from the national regulator. This is the maximum term possible.

It has taken the Hodgman majority Liberal Government to rebuild TasTAFE after Labor's disastrous Tasmania Tomorrow reforms. Instead of looking to Labor states such as Victoria and inspiration elsewhere - in fact Victoria has the lowest completion rates in the nation - Labor should be reflecting on what the Liberal Government is doing here in Tasmania when it comes to building a good training system. Labor's track record speaks for itself. Four thousand traineeships and apprenticeships disappeared on their watch over 18 months. In stark contrast, the Hodgman Liberal Government is supporting apprentices and trainees and we are seeing positive signs on the back of a very strong economy.

Frontline Services - Budget Cuts

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.28 a.m.]

While a member of your Government argues for a pay rise for herself, last week Ambulance Tasmania staff were told to brace for a \$5.7 million cut to their budget. That cut is the equivalent to sacking 37 full-time paramedics. Ambulance stations around the state are already closing regularly. The Tasmania Fire Service has been put on standby because there are not enough paramedics to fill rosters. Why have you broken your promise not to cut frontline services and how many lives will be put at risk if you proceed with these cuts?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question. We have not done and will not do as she suggests. In fact we have a very strong track record on delivering more resources into our health system and that includes improving access to care through our ambulance services. Over the last five and a half years we have employed new ambulance crews around the state and have seen response times improve as well as we have invested. I want to thank our hardworking paramedics for the exceptional work they do. Our highly skilled paramedics and Ambulance Tasmania provide first-class medical response services across the state.

Our resources have increased by \$200 million more than in the 2013-14 budget. That is an 87 per cent increase in just five years on funding into our ambulance services. As we know, as of March this year 92 more full-time paramedics and dispatch officers were employed at Ambulance

Tasmania than five years ago. That is an increase of 30 per cent or thereabouts. We have also acknowledged that demand is increasing. There are increased pressures on our health system across all sectors but we have responded by not only managing our finances responsibly but committing \$125 million to plan that includes the 42 rural and regional paramedics which the Opposition opposed, putting more services into regional Tasmania -

Ms Houston - Stations are closed because there are no paramedics.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Houston, warning one.

Mr HODGMAN - which is an unusual position, particularly for a member who represents such a community. We have the new dedicated aeromedical helicopter service up and running. We were told it would save lives. We expect it will.

Ms Houston - How many paramedics are off on compo?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Houston. Warning number two.

Mr HODGMAN - There are new ambulance stations at Glenorchy and Burnie as well as regional and rural station upgrades. There are more staff in the state operations centre, a boost on top of additional positions we announced last year, secondary triage, new training equipment and more support for volunteers. This demonstrates our support for our ambulance services and the workforce.

It is hard to forget Labor blocking our attempts to bring in mandatory minimum sentences for people who assault these frontline public servants. They were quite happy that day not to stand up and support workers. They spent \$1 million on fighting the paramedics' wage increase claim in their last years of government.

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Madam Speaker, Standing Order 45. Can the Premier confirm there was a \$5.7 million cut to Ambulance Tasmania? Stations are shut.

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order. Please resume, Premier.

Mr HODGMAN - Actions speak louder than words and so does our track record. Ours is one of investing more into ambulance services.

In my last answer I said it must be a foreign concept to the Labor Party that they would understand that a government has to be efficient and needs to continually make sure it is. That improves services for the state and improves the ability of our ambulance services to function well. Perhaps it is not such a surprise. In 2011 there were secret discussions going on with the budget subcommittee that included the premier, Lara Giddings, economic development minister, David O'Byrne and parliamentary secretary for small business, Rebecca White.

Ms Haddad interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Haddad.

Mr HODGMAN - A meeting was held with them and one meeting also included the health minister, Michelle O'Byrne. The issue was that the northern area health service CEO was not able

to obtain information on what the government was proposing to do. The then health minister, Michelle O'Byrne, told this meeting that a further \$28 million of savings this year, equating to the amount of closing 64 beds and two operating theatres, was necessary. It was defended on the basis that these are difficult decisions that need to be made by government.

The Health and Community Services Union said discussions with the northern service had been open, but there were concerns about the transparency of the \$100 million state-wide cuts.

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. The Premier seems to know more about Labor's budget than his own. Is he cutting \$5.7 million from his Health budget and Ambulance Tasmania?

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order.

Ms Haddad - That is \$5.7 million this year.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Haddad, warning number two.

Mr HODGMAN - I will conclude with my quote from the report at the time, the quote being from the then health minister, Michelle O'Byrne, who said -

Our health chief executive will continue consulting with their staff about possible savings strategies, remembering that this may include making difficult choices.

This is again, gross hypocrisy from the Labor Party. Its track record is one of cutting those services. We will not do that. We will be open and transparent with all our agencies and what they are doing, with our hard-working public servants and what we are doing to impact positively on our health system and ambulance services.

Wildlife Protection - Government Funding

Dr WOODRUFF question to MINISTER for the ENVIRONMENT, PARKS and HERITAGE, Mr GUTWEIN redirected to MINISTER for PRIMARY INDUSTRIES and WATER, Mr BARNETT

[10.34 a.m.]

Last week Tasmanians learned DPIPW has authorised the killing of tens of thousands of protected native animals, including black swans, Forester kangaroos, wombats and even platypuses to protect crops over the past five-and-a-half years. Yesterday, an RTI revealed permits authorised the killing 1 857 000 protected wallabies and possums during the same period. Today there is distressing news that more than 170 little penguins in various colonies have been killed in separate dog attacks in the north and north-west this past year. Experts from BirdLife say the existence of penguins in Tasmania is now tenuous.

Your Government has a contemptuous attitude to wildlife protection, which includes gutting the Threatened Species Unit. Despite the handwringing, there is no effective inroads into stopping the slaughter of penguins by dogs. The penguin taskforce clearly does not have the money or power for mapping rookeries or DNA forensic testing.

Will you increase the taskforce's money and immediately consider far tougher approaches to stop dog attacks before we lose these beautiful penguins forever?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, once again the question has been asked of the wrong minister. The appropriate minister is the Minister for Primary Industries and Water. He has responsibility under the -

Ms O'Connor - Why doesn't the minister for the Environment have responsibility for threatened species?

Madam SPEAKER - The minister for Primary Industries will answer the question.

Dr Woodruff - This is the problem. The problem is we have no environment minister who is paying any attention to what is happening to native animals in Tasmania. It is scandalous.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Dr Woodruff, can you raise that in another forum.

Dr Woodruff - It is shameful.

Madam SPEAKER - You have made your opinion known.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, please, we have the Minister for Primary Industries and Water.

Mr BARNETT - Madam Speaker, as the Minister for Primary Industries and Water responsible for wildlife and for little penguin management, I am delighted to respond to that question. The question is in two parts: first, wildlife permits and crop protection permits, then the question on little penguins.

The Government tries to get the balance right, on the one hand ensuring that Tasmania's wildlife is appropriately protected, and second, appropriately and sustainably managing the impact of browsing animals on the agricultural sector.

Dr WOODRUFF - Point of order, Madam Speaker, Standing Order 45. This is not about browsing animal management. It is about our penguin colonies and the penguin taskforce having no money and no power to do anything effective.

Madam SPEAKER - I am reliably informed by the Government that the minister for Primary Industries is the appropriate minister and he is attempting to address your question. I have to rule it out of order.

Mr BARNETT - The answer is in two parts. You had two parts to the question. The first part related to wildlife protection and the permits that you referred to in your question, and then I will address the penguin question.

Dr Woodruff - That was not the question.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, please.

Mr BARNETT - Madam Speaker, I am attempting to answer this despite incessant interjections from the Greens. We will always support farmers, foresters and land managers when it comes to sustainable management of browsing animals and their causing of excessive damage to crops, pastures and natural resources. Long-term wildlife population monitoring indicates the abundance of species subject to special permits remains stable or is increasing.

Dr Woodruff - Rubbish.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, this is most unparliamentary.

Dr WOODRUFF - Point of order, Madam Speaker. Could the minister please take that comment back because it is misleading parliament. It is misleading parliament to say there is any sustainable management of the penguin colonies in Tasmania.

Madam SPEAKER - It is not a point of order.

Mr BARNETT - I am responding to the question. Evidence indicates that quotas for crop protection permits are not being abused. I want to make it very clear for the benefit of those opposite with short memories, the issuing of crop protection permits has been a longstanding practice under governments of all sides, including the previous Labor-Greens government. In the last full year of the Labor-Greens government, 2013, 2783 permits to take native wildlife were issued. In 2018, 1081 permits were issued. For example, in the first year of the Labor-Greens government in 2010 an annual take of more than 1 million wallabies was reported on the front page of the *Mercury*. There is the Greens hypocrisy when it comes to native wildlife. Their allegations are unfounded.

Dr Woodruff - You think these things go on forever. You think you can just take, take, take, shoot, shoot, shoot.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Dr Woodruff. Warning one.

Mr BARNETT - Regarding little penguins, there were deaths at Doctors Rocks near Wynyard. That is very concerning. The Hodgman Liberal Government takes the protection of little penguins in Tasmania very seriously. They face a range of threats, both in the marine and terrestrial environment. Effective protection requires a cooperative approach and action from all levels of government, the private sector and individuals.

Dr Woodruff - No, it requires money and power.

Madam SPEAKER - Warning number two, Dr Woodruff.

Mr BARNETT - To help protect this iconic species I was pleased to announce on 6 June that the Government would be reviewing the Dog Control Act 2000 with amendments with a view to strengthening the law and increasing the penalties regarding those who own those dogs that are attacking wildlife such as little penguins. That work is underway and will be progressed as a priority, noting that the peak breeding season for little penguins occurs over the summer months.

We have also formed with the Government the Tasmanian Penguin Advisory Group to provide expert advice to the department to enhance the understanding of little penguins and improve their

protection across the state. I met with the Penguin Advisory Group just a month or so ago and I was very pleased to be well informed by their proactivity and their cooperation and collaboration with each other and the various groups around the state, working with local government, the private sector and those community groups. They are doing a terrific job. We are working together side by side to achieve appropriate outcomes to protect little penguins as appropriate. We are taking a measured approach that stands in stark contrast to that of the Greens with their frankly lunatic push for deployment of snipers at the relevant penguin rookeries around Tasmania.

Member Suspended
Member for Franklin - Dr Woodruff

Dr Woodruff - Shameful. You are killing our native animals. They will be extinct.

Madam SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff, I will have to ask you to leave because you have just hit a record three warnings. You can come back after question time.

Dr Woodruff withdrew.

Health - Budget Cuts

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.42 a.m.]

While a member of your Government argues for a pay rise for herself, the Hodgman Health razor gang has started to swing its axe. The Tasmanian Health Service has reportedly told doctors at the state's hospitals to slash elective surgery procedures by 15 per cent. At the LGH an operating theatre used for trauma patients has already been closed to save on staffing costs. With elective surgery waiting lists blowing out, will you take personal responsibility for the inevitable impact your cuts will have on the quality of life of sick Tasmanians, and what do you say to the 9426 people who are currently on the waiting list who will have to wait longer in pain before they get surgery?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question. I say to people on waiting lists that we accept as a government that more needs to be done and is being done to improve health outcomes for Tasmanians. Things have certainly come some way in the time we have been in government. In our first term we reduced elective surgery waiting lists to the lowest ever on record in this state. That demonstrates what can be done under a majority Liberal government. I also point to the fact that under Labor there were people languishing on elective surgery waiting lists for a decade. That is what the alternative is and shows how far we have come.

Through making Health a top priority for this Government we have also seen more than 1000 staff and 130 additional beds opened in our health system. As I said in my last answer, around 32 per cent of our budget is now dedicated to Health, the second highest in the nation. That is up from 25 per cent a decade ago. Our health system is busier now, no doubt. We have seen more than 28 000 emergency and elective surgeries performed. In fact, more than 89 000 Tasmanians have received their elective surgery under the Liberal Government over the past five years. That

includes not only record funding by this Government but also by the Commonwealth Government. We acknowledge the Commonwealth's contribution for that. We are working collaboratively with the Morrison Coalition Government to deliver good outcomes for Tasmanians.

The Department of Health continues to work with the Tasmanian health system to maximise timely access to elective surgery and all health care, including the continued rollout of the women's health package and the recent federal election commitments and, of course, the Government's \$757 million six-year health plan.

It is clear we are investing more and doing a lot more to meet with that increased demand. We will have greater capacity at the Royal Hobart Hospital to address access block, and as the minister said the other day at our media event, this will also reduce pressures in our emergency departments. It is a far cry from what people were suffering under Labor when some were on the waiting list for a decade.

I acknowledge the work done by our hardworking staff in our hospital systems and acknowledge the efforts that are going in to ensure that our economy remains strong. I genuinely believe it should be celebrated. We should all be celebrating the fact that Tassie is number one again in terms of economic performance and our budget is strong, which means that we are able to invest more. I will have to repeat -

Ms DOW - Point of order, Madam Speaker, under standing order 45, relevance. The question to the Premier was: is there intended to be 15 per cent cuts to elective surgery?

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order, Ms Dow.

Mr HODGMAN - I am not sure if that was meant to help the Leader. I have made very clear what our commitment to improving health outcomes is. When it comes to the Labor Party, it really is something that people should understand and we will continue to point to the fact that you cannot trust Labor with the economy -

Ms Standen - So you're not slashing elective surgery?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Standen - another warning.

Mr HODGMAN - Last weekend they promised to their party faithful, no less, that they would do no deals with the Greens and would not stand beside them. The Greens were the cause of all their economic woes. Then in the first debate, the first vote in this House, after that promise to Labor voters, they stood alongside the Greens and voted with them, so you cannot trust them. Nor can you trust them on matters of substance. The Leader of the Opposition changes important policy positions for her own political advantage, which is why many Tasmanians are asking what she stands for and whether you can trust her. I point to her comments of 2011 when there was a lot of complaint about cuts Labor was making to the health system and health professionals told us it would take nearly a decade to get out of it, and they were right.

Back then this is what the Leader of the Opposition said about Labor cuts to Health:

The Government has made the tough decisions to reduce spending in order to balance the budget and to take responsible approaches to the administration of state finances.

Then in 2012 in similar circumstances when Labor when making cuts to the health system, the Leader of the Opposition said this:

We are slowing the growth in the costs for Health and this will result in a slowdown of some of the services and the loss of some positions in the department.

We must make savings across government and the largest department, the DHHS with some 40 per cent of the state Budget, must play its part.

This demonstrates again the hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition, who says one thing but does another. Back then she was saying what she thought was necessary for government to do, and that was for Labor to make cuts to slow down spending for Health. We will not do what Labor did to compromise our health system; we have invested more.

Member Suspended
Member for Lyons - Ms White

Ms White - You're cutting 15 per cent of elective surgery; you haven't denied it.

Madam SPEAKER - Leader of the Opposition, warning number three, so you will have to leave and come back at the end of question time.

Ms White withdrew.

Building and Construction Sector Growth

Mrs PETRUSMA question to MINISTER for BUILDING and CONSTRUCTION, Ms ARCHER

[10.49 a.m.]

Can you please advise how the Hodgman majority Liberal Government is working with industry to deliver strong growth in the building and construction sector and how successfully this is going?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Franklin, Mrs Petrusma, for her interest in this area and all Government members' interest in what is quite a staggering increase that we have seen in the building and construction sector. It is a great pleasure to get such a positive question on this important industry and area for Tasmanians. The Hodgman majority Liberal Government is delivering on our plan to build a stronger economy and create jobs. Further evidence recently released shows that our plan is working.

We know that the building and construction sector is a key indicator of the economy's health, which is building greater confidence throughout the state. Our Government has been working hard

to ensure we have the right conditions in place to stimulate more construction, create jobs, and, of course, boost the economy even further.

It is encouraging to see that our continued investment in growth is leading the nation in growth in the levels of construction activity. ABS data released on 30 August confirmed that Tasmania is the strongest state in the nation for the annual growth of dwelling approvals. The 2018-19 financial year saw 3137 dwellings approved, representing 5.8 per cent annual growth. Tasmania was the only jurisdiction in Australia to see approvals growth over this period, demonstrating the strength and confidence in our building and construction sector. With a current average of 261 dwellings approved per month, this is in stark contrast to the health of the industry in the last year of the Labor-Greens government.

Tasmania also continues to experience the highest activity growth in Australia. It is reported that almost \$1.7 billion in total building work was done in the year to June 2019, which was led by the residential sector with an increase of 18.3 per cent to a total of \$970 million. These strong results are backed up by the independent forecasts recently released by the major industry bodies, the Housing Industry Association and the Master Builders Association. HIA's latest housing scorecard showed that there were 701 detached house commencements in the March quarter of 2019, with the HIA saying this was, and I quote, 'the state's strongest performance in 25 years'. The Master Builders scorecard released last month also showed that Tasmania has seen the biggest improvement in the nation in terms of building conditions, stating that the state's sector, 'is the hottest construction market in the country and has been for some time'.

These forecasts confirm the positive outlook is set to continue, and further demonstrate that the Government's policies aimed at supporting the continued growth of the sector are working. We will continue to put in place the right conditions to support this growth and ensure these great outcomes continue well into the future.

As the Treasurer has already outlined today, Tasmania now has the strongest economic figures in Australia. Even former Labor premier, Paul Lennon, said last week, 'The best way to help working people is to have a very strong economy'. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who unfortunately is not in the Chamber at the moment, having been thrown out for the second or third time this week, we do not see support for the building and construction sector and a strong economy as a Sunday morning thought bubble.

As further demonstrated in parliament this week, Labor has no long-term plan. The best they can manage is scaremongering on issues like building cladding, undermining consumer and business confidence, and embarrassing and failed media political stunts. Who can forget the 10 000 jobs that they trashed when in government? This is in stark contrast to the 13 000 new jobs created under the Hodgman Liberal Government. Our disciplined economic management has delivered the strongest building sector and best business conditions in the country, which drives economic growth and helps to create new jobs.

Deloraine Ambulance Station - Staffing Issues

Ms O'BYRNE question to the PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.54]

While a member of your Government argues for a pay rise for herself, volunteers at the Deloraine ambulance station feel they have been ignored by your Government. They are worried

about the amount of time they are already spending out of the community, either ramped at the LGH, or responding to other calls outside their region. They think that will worsen and leave the community of Deloraine vulnerable with no local ambulance response due to your Government's policy.

The community is outraged, with more than 1000 locals already signing a petition calling on your Government to halt your plan to change how the Deloraine ambulance stations operates, and immediately and properly consult with the community and volunteers. Hardworking volunteers, many of whom have dedicated more than a decade each to helping their local community are threatening to quit unless you listen.

Will you please agree to halt your plans and make sure the knowledge of the Deloraine Ambulance volunteers is respected before making any changes to services for the Deloraine community?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question, and take the opportunity to acknowledge and thank our hardworking volunteers for the extraordinary support they give to the service right across the state, especially in our regional areas.

We are well aware of concerns about our plans to increase and boost investment into regional services. We understand there are some issues and we are engaging with those who may have those concerns. I have met with the local mayor. The ministers for Health and for Local Government have recently spoken directly with the paramedics and volunteers at Deloraine. The Chief Executive of Ambulance Tasmania is also engaging with the community. We will work very closely with them and local paramedics on the rollout of what are additional commitments by Government.

I refer the House to what happened when the member who asked the question had our health system and its budget and services. This is about delivering a commitment to boost services in regional communities. We have a strong track record for doing so, including in ambulance services.

We acknowledge that there is very real demand for the service and we are hitting it head on. This year's Budget delivers \$438 million over the next four years for ambulance services and that is over \$200 million more than in the 2013-14 budget that the former government delivered. That is an 87 per cent increase in only five years.

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I draw your attention to standing order 45. We have volunteers who are threatening to quit. They are asking if the Premier will halt the process so that does not happen.

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order, please resume your seat.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, we understand the concerns in the community. We have no doubt whatsoever that Labor members will be doing their best to whip up concerns and fears and to stoke anxieties within the community because that is what they do. They do not celebrate success stories. They criticise us for acknowledging when Tasmanians are doing well.

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I take offence at the Premier's comment that we are whipping up concerns. We have volunteers who are terribly upset. They want their issue

resolved and they want to know if the Premier will halt this. It is not appropriate to say that we are doing this.

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order.

Mr HODGMAN - It is happening right across the state in communities that we also represent. We see and hear what Labor do to stir up anxieties rather than assist communities, particularly those where we are endeavouring to increase our investments and our supports with more paramedics and despatch officers and an increase of over 30 per cent in that regard.

Member Suspended
Member for Bass - Ms O'Byrne

Ms O'Byrne - How very disrespectful of their concerns.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Byrne. That makes three. I would like you to go out for an hour, thank you.

Ms O'Byrne withdrew.

Mr HODGMAN - We are responding by increasing our services. Again Labor's hypocrisy is demonstrated by what they say. What they say to journalists often differs from what they say in communities. I note that the member from the Legislative Council, Sarah Lovell, said, 'The reality is that the demand we are seeing is in our urban areas'. For Labor to say or think that there is no demand for paramedics or emergency services in regional Tasmania is extraordinary. It goes to the point that grassroots Labor people, former Labor leaders, are out of touch with communities outside of Hobart. This is a classic example of it. You are seen to be Hobart-centric.

Ms Standen - The ambulance service would run to a halt without volunteers.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Standen, warning two.

Mr HODGMAN - This is about additional resources for our regional communities, whether it be in Deloraine, the east coast or the north-west coast. We are all about not only supporting members of our ambulance and paramedic services who are paid, but also our volunteers who do a very important role. We want to relieve pressures on those who work within the service by putting more resources into those communities. We understand that if there are impacts as a result of so doing that may be of concern, then we will address those.

I confirm that we will continue to engage and consult very closely with this community.

Forestry Industries - Strategic Growth Plan

Mrs RYLAH question to MINISTER for RESOURCES, Mr BARNETT

[11.00 a.m.]

Can you update the House on how the Hodgman majority Liberal Government is delivering on its strategic growth plan for the Tasmanian forests, fine timber and wood fibre industry? Are you aware of any alternatives?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question and her strong support for timber communities right across Tasmania, particularly in Braddon. I can provide a response with an update. That is because our majority Hodgman Liberal Government was elected with a mandate to create jobs, grow the economy and to rebuild our forest industry. That is why the first action we took was to rip up the Tasmanian Forest Agreement. That was a Labor and Greens-backed deal that turned workers into endangered species.

The industry has responded to our policies and our plans. There has been a 70 per cent increase in the volume of wood fibre produced from Tasmania's sustainable production forests. That means jobs, jobs, jobs. Five thousand seven hundred Tasmanians rely on the forest industry for a job, particularly in those rural and regional areas that we are very proud of and will continue to support.

The industry has rebounded. It has not happened by accident. We have signed up to a 20-year Regional Forest Agreement. We have had Australia's first Wood Encouragement Policy. It is Australia-leading. We are proud of it. We have our strategic growth plan for Tasmania's forests, fine timber and the wood fibre industry. It is built on four pillars: resource security, financial sustainability, job security and a stronger role for the private sector. We have also jointly invested with industry in research and innovation to create more forestry jobs in the future. As we focus on working with the industry to grab future value-adding opportunities we are also working with them to meet the immediate challenges.

There have been challenges with last summer's devastating bushfires. There have been headwinds with the recent tightening of the export pulp markets. These headwinds are placing short-term pressures on native forest operations and contractors. Forest contractors are the small business owners and employers at the heart of the industry. We are working to help them build resilience and to be the best placed to capitalise on future growth opportunities.

Today, I am pleased to announce that the Hodgman Liberal Government will deliver a \$500 000 Contractor Resilience program where participants will be able to work with the specialists at Rural Business Tasmania to consider their business plans, receive coaching and identify future opportunities to ensure their businesses are resilient and continue to be profitable into the future.

Grants of up to \$15 000 will then be made available to eligible businesses to implement identified business improvements. Rural Business Tasmania successfully runs similar programs for farmers, such as the Cultivating Rural Excellence program. It makes sense that the same proactive approach is extended to our forest sector.

The Contractor Resilience program is just one way we are assisting industry to grow, supporting forestry jobs. That is because wood is good. It is because it is recyclable. It is because it is sustainable. It is because it is renewable. It is the ultimate renewable. Forestry is growing in Tasmania. We are backing the forest industry, rebuilding that industry. It is being achieved, notwithstanding the threat of the Labor-Greens opposition.

Labor had their divorce on the weekend, but yesterday, on the forestry motion to support the industry, to rebuild the industry, what did they do? They joined forces to bring back the job-destroying TFA, Tasmanian Forest Agreement, that anti-forestry deal where we saw two out of three forestry jobs cut. They fled the state under the Labor-Greens government. It was devastating.

It was commitment to locking up another nearly 400 000 hectares of Tasmania unfairly. That area is a wood bank for resource security. It will undermine jobs, particularly in regional Tasmania.

That is what Labor is all about. You cannot believe Labor when it says it wants that divorce. They are a bunch of policies for city slickers. That is what they are focused on. That is what Paul Lennon said. They are focused on policies for the city slickers. They are a bunch of city slickers. That is the worry. You have the Labor Party running around -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker, Standing Order 48. The minister has been on his feet for nearly five-and-a-half minutes, ranting, not adding anything to the debate. I ask you to wind him up.

Mr FERGUSON - Madam Speaker, on the point of order, the minister is entirely in order. As was pointed out yesterday there is no specific time limit but there is a minimum guaranteed allocation of questions. The Greens get 100 per cent on that. One question per member, which is not provided to any other party. I ask that the minister be allowed to conclude his answer.

Madam SPEAKER - Honourable members, I am going to read this out.

It is a longstanding practice of Speakers to allow a high degree of latitude in the application of Standing Order 44 which prescribes questions containing argument, opinion, inferences, preambles, et cetera. The quid pro quo is that the application of Standing Order 45 answers must be relevant is also not strictly applied and ministers are permitted to answer as they feel free.

But it is also here saying that,

Traditionally it was one minute limit for a question and around three minutes for an answer.

Given that we give a lot of latitude to the questions, the quid pro quo for that is that the minister has extended time as well. Five minutes is not prescribed in the Standing Order.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you Madam Speaker. On the point of order, I simply make these points on behalf of the people of Tasmania who want value for money out of their parliament.

Madam SPEAKER - Perhaps you could raise it at a Standing Orders Committee meeting. The minister has another 30 seconds.

Mr BARNETT - Thank you, Madam Speaker. Our Government is about rebuilding the forest industry. You cannot believe Labor. It is all make believe. It is a charade. These are members of the Labor Party who are wearing their crispy clean Salamanca moleskins. They are driving around Tasmania in their Labor Party four-wheel-drives with spray-on dust. They are make believe. You cannot believe anything Labor says.

TEMCO - Energy Usage

Mr O'BYRNE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[11.07 a.m.]

Yesterday you failed to answer a simple question about the impact of the possible closure or care and maintenance decision of TEMCO on household power bills. You either do not know

because you are a hands-off Premier who never gets into the detail, or you are keeping this information secret from Tasmanian families. Have you received any modelling about the full costs to Tasmania if TEMCO closes its gate or moves into care and maintenance, including cost to businesses and the Budget bottom line? What are you going to do to prepare for the potential closure of TEMCO and its impact on energy businesses, the state Budget and the energy market?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the acting, acting leader of the Labor Party for the same question I got yesterday.

I am happy to confirm the Government's strong commitment to keeping power prices down for Tasmanians. We are working very closely, as we do with businesses large and small including major industrials, with TEMCO and their owners, South32 on their review process which is underway. As I said yesterday the acting, acting leader of the opposition, David O'Byrne, would just delight in some bad news,

Mr O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I take offence to that. That is outrageous. We do not expect and hope that TEMCO will close. That is a disgraceful slur. All of us in this House care about the people in those jobs. For you to make a cheap political point is out of order.

Madam SPEAKER - It is not a point of order, but if you have been slurred, the Premier might re-word it.

Mr HODGMAN - From one who delivers little political backhanders at every opportunity it shows how sensitive he is. He is the first to complain whenever there is some good news to be celebrated. We only do it because it is good for Tasmanians, for Tasmanian business.

Madam SPEAKER - Are you withdrawing it, Premier?

Mr HODGMAN - I am happy to withdraw if he is so offended but I am offended too by the fact that whenever the Government supports, encourages and celebrates some positivity in our state, the first person to complain about it is David O'Byrne. He only does it because one, he feels bad about it and two, because it suits his political interest to talk down the state in the hope, in my view, for negative outcomes such as this. It is another example of wanting to scare a community that his sister purportedly represents. It is another example of wishing for the worst and another example of being so able to imagine worst-case scenarios and that is the disturbing thing about it.

Member Suspended Member for Bass - Ms Houston

Ms Houston - That's rubbish. Don't you care about the people in George Town and those who work at TEMCO?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Houston, you are out for an hour.

Ms Houston withdrew.

Mr HODGMAN - We will continue to work closely with all government agencies, including our energy businesses. We will continue to work closely with TEMCO, with South 32. They have committed to a process which is underway. It is not appropriate or helpful to pre-empt or speculate as to what might occur, but we are not going to speculate as the acting, acting Leader of the Opposition does for the worst possible outcomes.

MOTION

Seek Leave - Suspension of Standing Orders - Leave Denied

[11.12 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens - motion) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent debate on the following motion: that the House condemns the Hodgman Liberal Government for its reckless mismanagement of wildlife in Tasmania that is driving species towards extinction.

Let the *Hansard* show that as I read out that motion there were groans from both sides of the House.

The reason we bring this on today is because there is a wholesale slaughter of wildlife and native animals in Tasmania. The latest details of that have been released in a right to information request that was obtained by the Greens and was splashed across the *Mercury* newspaper on Tuesday. This is an issue that is of deep concern to the vast majority of Tasmanians. It does not matter how they vote. People care about the welfare of animals and the level of community shock about the numbers is worth noting.

The number of permits that are issued to farmers to kill animals is staggering. In total 12 005 permits were granted, including 21 for galahs, 22 for green rosellas, 151 for wombats and six for platypus. The quota or maximum number of the species able to be taken using the permit shows as many as 21 726 beautiful black swans have been killed, 675 galahs, 681 rosellas and 5087 wombats. The wombat is more vulnerable because of the fact that it is suffering from sarcoptic mange.

Members interjecting.

Ms O'CONNOR - We hear the heckling from the Liberals, but right now we are in an extinction crisis, confirmed by scientists the world over. We are driving species towards extinction.

Dr WOODRUFF - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I cannot hear Ms O'Connor speaking. There is so much noise in the Chamber. It is disrespectful.

Madam SPEAKER - No, neither can I, so that is a very good point of order, I agree.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank Dr Woodruff also for her passionate advocacy for native animals in Tasmania. It tells us everything we need to know about the contempt with which the major parties hold wildlife protection in Tasmania.

Let us just go through some of these numbers and look at the maximum number of animals that could have been culled since 2014. In the five years the Liberals have been in government there

have been millions of animals killed. The problem the Government has here is that it has starved the Nature Conservation Branch and there is no effective monitoring or assessment of populations of these animals in Tasmania. If there is, as the minister for threatening species stated this morning, he should table the data about the monitoring.

There have been 21 726 beautiful black swans killed - and by the way, it is worth pointing out to the House that black swans mate for life, so every time we kill a black swan we are breaking the heart of another black swan. Cape Barren geese, 5486; 24 000 ducks in a time of extinction crisis; and the Forester kangaroo, 51 000 since 2014. The latest data that we could find was a 2001 report on the management of Forester kangaroos in Tasmania, which estimated the population to be 26 000. That was the estimated population of Forester kangaroos 18 years ago and in the past five years permits to kill double that number have been issued by this Government. The Forester kangaroo is a species which was once widespread across this island and was a staple food source for Aboriginal people and, in fact, for the first settlers when they came. Their population has largely been driven into the north-east corner. We do not know exactly what the population of Forester kangaroos is. This is an urgent matter.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, could the member please address the question as to why this is an urgent motion?

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, and I believe I have done that, Madam Deputy Speaker. This is an urgent motion because, as we speak, there are crop protection permits being issued for species which are being driven towards extinction. There are whole colonies of little penguins being wiped by dogs because of the carelessness of government in penguin management. Only last week an entire colony at Doctors Rocks was slaughtered by dogs. This is urgent because our wildlife is being killed at a rate which I believe is unprecedented at a time of extinction crisis. If we do not bring this on as an urgency motion this matter will not be dealt with by the parliament. Both major parties in here are complicit in this wholesale slaughter.

This is an urgent matter and the majority of Tasmanians, we argue, believe it is an urgent matter too. The level of community revulsion about the numbers that were exposed in the RTI request is extremely high. We have a responsibility to protect our wildlife, our iconic species, many of which are not found anywhere else in the world. These numbers are disgusting and they should be a challenge to this Government.

It is ironic that the minister for the Environment has no responsibility for the protection of wildlife in Tasmania. Under section 4 of the Nature Conservation Act that falls to the new minister for threatening species, Mr Barnett. Mr Barnett also has responsibility for logging, mining, primary industries and rampant fish farm expansion. He is utterly conflicted and this Government is driving our wildlife to extinction.

Time expired.

[11.19 a.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Deputy Speaker, there is no question in Tasmanians' minds that this Government is on a mission to wipe out native animals in Tasmania. Everything they have done since they have been in office for five and a half years is to gut the Threatened Species Unit. There are effectively no staff there anymore. It was an amazing place, a source of great expertise and advice for Tasmanians and indeed for Australians. Our Threatened Species Unit

staff were valued at the ANU and other parts of Australia because of their expertise in native animals. It no longer exists.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, I remind the member that she needs to talk about the urgency of this motion, not the substantive debate. We need to know why this is so urgent today this very minute.

Dr WOODRUFF - The reason that Ms. O'Connor and I are standing here today, bringing urgency, is because I asked the Environment minister yesterday where was the base line information that justifies the hundreds and thousands of native animals that have been killed by the 'minister for threatening species' over the last five and a half years?

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, this is entirely unacceptable. First of all, I ask that the member withdrew the false and insulting title she uttered. And I ask you to remind her to refer to ministers and any other members of the House by their appropriate titles. He is the Minister for Primary Industries and Water, and Environment. However, in this case he is the minister responsible for administering the act that is to do with threatened species. To say otherwise is insulting and it is unparliamentary.

Ms O'CONNOR - On the point of order, there is precedence in this House for the use of the term 'minister for threatening species'. The former 'minister for threatening species' Mr Llewelyn accepted that title any number of times that we used it. We regard Mr Barnett as the minister for threatening species.

Mr Ferguson - It is still not appropriate.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - All ministers are to be addressed by their proper titles. In this case, I uphold the point of order.

Mr BARNETT - I want to make it clear that I find it offensive. I would like the words that were used by both Dr Woodruff and Ms O'Connor to be withdrawn. I find them offensive. My title is minister for Primary Industries. I am responsible for wildlife regulations. They know that and I would like be referred to in the appropriate way. I would like the words withdrawn.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - I ask the member to withdraw the comment.

Dr WOODRUFF - Madam Deputy Speaker, I have heard the comments that have been made and the minister obviously has a glass jaw on this matter. I will withdraw those words.

The minister who is threatening all the species of native wildlife in Tasmania, that same minister and the minister for the Environment should have responded to the question about the Forester kangaroos. We are standing here today because no response has come back from the minister for the Environment. There is no information.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - I draw the member's attention to the urgency of this debate today.

Dr WOODRUFF - I am trying to answer that question, Madam Deputy Speaker. That is exactly what I am saying.

I stood here yesterday and asked a question of the minister for the Environment about where is the baseline information for Forester kangaroos. He promised to come back and provide it. He is not here; he has not done it today. The reason he has not is that it shows there is nothing that has been updated since 2000 when the last and only research that has been done showed there was a population of 26 000. Yet, under this Government, we know that the slaughter of more than 50 000 Forester kangaroos has been authorised in Tasmania over the last five and a half years. Where do we have any information that we do not have a population on the verge of extinction?

Mrs Rylah - Look outside your backdoor.

Dr WOODRUFF - The member who made that comment has just revealed her absolute ignorance. If she had any intelligence or interest she would read the report. It makes it very clear that what you see in front of your face is not evidence. It is evidence of animals that are being driven into spaces because of deforestation in this state.

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I ask that you draw the leader of the Greens to order and ask her to stop making insulting comments across the Chamber.

Dr WOODRUFF - Madam Deputy Speaker, that is a frivolous point of order based on no standing order. He is just trying to interrupt my time about the urgency of the situation. We have the news that 170 little penguins were lost in the last year. *Birdlife Tasmania* makes it very clear they are on the verge of extinction. They are tenuous. Every Tasmanian, with the possible exception of the member sitting over here, would be devastated to hear this situation. What we know is that a faux penguin task force has been established that has essentially no money and no authority.

Mr BARNETT - Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The reference to the Tasmanian Penguin Advisory Group as a 'faux' group is entirely false and misleading. It should be withdrawn. It is a very important group and the Government takes it very seriously.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - The member is asked to withdraw the comment.

Dr WOODRUFF - Madam Deputy Speaker, if the minister wants to make a contribution, he can. I will not withdraw the fact that it is a 'faux' task force.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Are you going to withdraw the comment?

Dr WOODRUFF - On what basis is that an offensive comment? It is not acting as a task force that is functioning to do something. I cannot withdraw something which is patently obvious. That task force has met once, I understand.

Mr BARNETT - Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. Dr Woodruff has made a misleading statement saying that the advisory group has met once. That is entirely incorrect.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - That is not a point of order. The minister will have time to make his comments later.

Dr WOODRUFF - I draw your attention to the frivolous points of order that are wasting time. It is a disgrace.

Time expired.

[11.26 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON - (Bass - Leader of Government Business) - Madam Deputy Speaker, everyone could take a deep breath for a moment to allow the parliament to consider the motion before it which is to upend the business of the day as published on the blue.

The question before the House right now, is not about whether or not any of the claims uttered by either of the two speakers are correct or incorrect. It is Thursday and it is the one-in-three opportunity for Liberal members of the House to raise a matter of public importance. The Greens have gone back -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Standing Order 144. That is absolutely untrue. We had no intention of running an urgency debate today until your ministers failed to answer the questions. No intention at all, hand on heart, I say that to you.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - That is not a point of order. The minister is entitled to give his views.

Mr FERGUSON - The question before the House is a procedural one and that is 'should we chuck out the blue and instead spend the day debating the subject that you want us to debate'. I have had a look at it. I accept your comment, Ms O'Connor, that it is a handwritten motion. I would not judge you on coming in on a predetermined plan because I am sure you would have typed it out if it had been a predetermined plan.

The simple fact is that it is Liberal members' MPI opportunity. It is their turn and it is fair that they have turn.

Dr Woodruff - Do you have any idea of what is happening in Tasmania?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Dr Woodruff. You have made your contribution.

Mr FERGUSON - Additionally, I draw the House's attention to the fact that the Greens have a 100 per cent strike rate today. Two questions for two members.

Members interjecting.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor and Dr Woodruff.

Mr FERGUSON - That is not a luxury afforded to any of the Liberal backbenchers, nor to the Liberal Party nor the Labor Opposition, which has currently nine members and gets seven questions. The Greens do very well out of this arrangement, which assures a minimum number of questions to provide for maximum scrutiny, given that question time in the Standing Orders is constrained to one hour. It often goes past the hour because of the guaranteed minimum. That is why it is there. You may well wish that you have more opportunities to ask questions -

Dr Woodruff - No, we wish we got some answers.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Dr Woodruff. I am sure you do not want to leave the House during your own motion seeking leave.

Mr FERGUSON - You may well disagree with the content of the answer. I listened to Mr Barnett and Mr Gutwein speak to the two questions you addressed to them and they were comprehensive answers.

I also draw the attention of the House to the fact that Ms O'Connor said the minister for Primary Industries is administering the Threatened Species Protection Act. That is incorrect. It is administered by the Minister for Environment, Parks and Heritage. In relation to wildlife permits, I do not want to rehash all the responses again. They have been placed on the record already this morning.

Ms O'Connor - How do you think this goes down with the doctors' wives?

Mr FERGUSON - You bring the doctors' wives into the debate. That is a bit unfortunate. I draw the attention to the fact that on the substance of the issue that you are seeking to draw out, there is nothing new about wildlife permitting reductions.

Dr Woodruff - What is new is that there is no research about the impacts.

Mr FERGUSON - This is in your time. This is the *Mercury* in August 2010 when you were a minister of the Labor-Greens government. I say to you, Ms O'Connor, there is nothing new about permits for wildlife management. The Government takes wildlife management seriously and appropriately -

Dr Woodruff - I know, you do everything you can to make sure that they get shot.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Dr Woodruff.

Dr Woodruff - That's what you do. You hand out a crop protection permit to anyone who wants it.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff, this is your first warning.

Mr FERGUSON - including the quite proper responsibility of a government to ensure that everything that ought to prudently be done to protect threatened species is being done.

I listened carefully to what Ms O'Connor had to say about the monitoring. I invite you, Ms O'Connor, to ask the minister a question at the next opportunity or write him a letter, rather than trying to upend the business of the day. We have important business, one being the affirmation of the housing order for Huntingfield; and second, the Disposal of Uncollected Goods Bill.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. You are misleading the House. It is not the affirmation of the housing supply order. It is a self-congratulatory motion that has no substance to it.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - That is not a point of order.

Mr FERGUSON - For the reasons I have outlined we are not supporting the motion seeking leave to upend the business of the day.

[11.31 a.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Madam Deputy Speaker, as a matter of formal process in this House we will always agree to the seeking of leave for a suspension of standing orders for a matter

of urgency, although it is pretty clear that the Government, with their numbers, will not allow that debate to occur. That is extraordinary and disappointing. It would have been appropriate to allow the seeking of leave before dealing with the substantive motion. The Government has made that decision and the numbers are pretty clear.

The problem with this debate is that the Government is hopeless in its support of government agencies dealing with issues regarding threatened species, in dealing with the management of wildlife across our state. The Government does not value that work. If it did value it it would resource it. In Government you have cut significant resources out of the area of government that would appropriately manage and support landowners and land users. People who have strong interest in animal welfare and species protection need confidence that the Government would take the necessary steps to balance the needs of species, species management and have the realisation that rural communities need to live and operate in their -

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Mr O'Byrne, please address why this is an urgent motion.

Mr O'BYRNE - The problem is there is a real issue. The Government is asleep at the wheel and is not providing the resources appropriate to deal with this matter, hence it has become urgent in the eyes of the Greens.

The other perspective is that the Greens paint themselves as the only ones who care and are the home of the only heart in this place. Many people in the community feel strongly about this issue and know that there is a balance between ensuring the Government has the resources to work with threatened species and work with wildlife management across our state. We also know that the Greens isolate themselves. By their use of language, strategies and tactics in parliament they do not allow people to come together and have a proper conversation about how best to respond to the challenges.

It is urgent in the eyes of the Greens. It is important in the eyes of the Labor Party that these matters are dealt with. We have raised concerns about cutting resources. I understand the motivations -

Dr Woodruff - It is not just a couple of people; 28 000 people have clicked on this issue since yesterday.

Mr O'BYRNE - Do you want to just rabbit on? Do you have any respect? We were quiet listening to you. Listen to you. We were quiet while you were there.

Dr Woodruff - People care. Can you talk about animals?

Mr O'BYRNE - This is your problem. I have the call. This is your problem. You alienate -

Dr Woodruff - Can you actually talk about the issue at hand? Species extinction.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff, you are being disorderly again. That is your second warning.

Mr O'BYRNE - That is why they alienate any potential ally in the community because they paint themselves as the only ones who care. They take the moral high ground that they are the only ones who have a view or have a heart in these matters. It is not true. The Labor Party cares about

these matters, but also knows that you need to balance these issues with the needs of rural communities. It is about getting the balance right.

Dr Woodruff - Doing well with coal.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Dr Woodruff.

Mr O'BYRNE - As a matter of course we would support the seeking of leave, but it is very clear that, unusually, the Government has made the decision it will not do that. We will not be supporting the seeking of leave.

[11.35 a.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Minister for Primary Industries and Water) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I will try to be brief because the Leader of Government Business has made it clear we have a very strong agenda. We have a blue and we want to follow that.

Ms O'Connor - That is not a strong agenda. You have a bulldust motion on it.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr BARNETT - I answered quite comprehensively during question time the two-part question asked by Dr Woodruff. The first part related to wildlife permits and the second related to penguins, an iconic species. The Government takes these matters very seriously. We try to get the balance right ensuring that Tasmania's wildlife is appropriately protected and the impact of browsing animals on the agricultural sector is appropriately managed. We will always support the farmers, foresters and land managers to sustainably manage browsing animal populations that are causing excessive damage to their crops, pastures and natural resources.

The process of assessment by the department in issuing -

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - I ask the minister to address why this is not an urgent motion, please.

Mr BARNETT - I was responding to some of the comments by saying that it is not an urgent motion because I have answered the question in three parts. It is a balanced approach by the Government. Long-term wildlife population monitoring indicates the abundance of species subject to such permits remains stable -

Ms O'Connor - Table the monitoring then.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor. This is warning number one.

Mr BARNETT - or are increasing. Finally, what I made very clear for the benefit of those opposite with short memories is the issuing of crop protection permits is a long-standing practice under governments of all sides, including the Labor-Greens government. In the last full year of the Labor-Greens government, 2013, 2783 permits to take native wildlife were issued. In 2018, 1081 permits were issued. In 2010 during the Labor-Greens government, an annual take of more than 1 million wallabies was recorded on the front page of the *Mercury*. The hypocrisy of the Greens knows no bounds.

With respect to the Tasmanian Penguin Advisory Group it is not urgent because I answered that question. We treat this matter very seriously. The little penguins require protection across the state. That group is made up of UTAS, CSIRO, BirdLife Tasmania, the Derwent Estuary program, community penguin experts, local councils, community-based action groups and other stakeholders. They have met four times. The member for Franklin said they have met only one. What rubbish. She is talking out of her hat. I met with them just last month. I was very impressed. I gave them an update on the work we are doing in reviewing the Dog Control Act to strengthen the law and increase the penalties.

We have made a very comprehensive response to the questions put by the Greens. I am happy to take further questions in due course. Regarding the agenda of the Government, the Leader of the Government has made it clear we have a job to do and we are getting on with the job.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - I call the member for Braddon, Dr Broad.

Ms O'Connor - The so-called scientist.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor. This is warning number two.

[11.39 a.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Where are we heading to in this place? I have not even opened my mouth and the Greens have jumped straight on the attack.

Mr Tucker - You did say you wanted to divorce them.

Dr BROAD - We have not heard, from the members who interject, a case for the urgency of this motion. We do care about our native Tasmanian species. In this place there is all the appearance that the only people in the world who care about animals are the Greens. This is typical of the Greens' behaviour. The urgency motion is based around the whole idea that only the Greens care.

Member Suspended
Member for Franklin - Dr Woodruff

Dr Woodruff - Do you care about spotlighting them?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff this is your third warning. I ask you to leave, please, for an hour.

Dr Woodruff withdrew.

Dr BROAD - We have to have some nuance in a debate like this. Instead of using the typical language of the Greens, such as 'the slaughter', we hear details of the breaking hearts of swans and so on. This very emotive language, such as we are on the way to wipe out all the animals of Tasmania. This sort of extremist language is simply not helpful. We have to have some balance.

Crop protection permits are in place for a reason. I challenge the Greens to go to a farm and see the damage that browsing wildlife has on their production. We see a good 100 metres of grass

eaten to the ground 100 metres from the fence and expect that these farmers should just accept that loss of production without any compensation or any ability to control those animals.

We have heard the Greens talk about the number of Forester kangaroos 'slaughtered' as being in excess of the entire population. You do not have to be a genius, or indeed a scientist, to figure out that if the allegation is that more kangaroos are being shot than actually exist, they would be extinct. The logic does not follow. The extremist language simply highlights the point that only the Greens care. The population of the Forester kangaroo must be increased, there is no doubt about it, otherwise there would not be the animals that need control.

Ms O'Connor - What do you know about the population of Forester kangaroos, Dr Broad?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor, you are on your last warning.

Dr BROAD - You are not actually interested in what I have to say, otherwise you would listen. I am about to give you an example. Due to the highway works delaying the trip home to four or four and a half hours, for quite a while I took a shortcut through Ashby Road between Ross and Cressy. There is a section of Ashby Road which is gravel. I did a count the first time I went through of the number of Forester kangaroos that had been killed by vehicles. There must have been 15 killed on that two-kilometre stretch of road, and it really came home to me that there must be a massive increase in the number of Forester kangaroos in the state. It is true to say that they were once confined to just the north-east, especially around the Mt King William national park. That was the last bastion of the Forester kangaroo, but things have changed since then and there are kangaroos that are creating problems.

Part of this whole premise is that we are driving these animals to extinction. I do not think that is true and all we have to do is look at the roadkill numbers. We know that the roadkill numbers are massively increasing. Once upon a time if you wanted to shoot a wallaby you had to go up into the Great Lakes - this was some 50 years ago - and they were not about. Now we are seeing roadkill in the middle of our cities. I was driving in Horrocks Road in Launceston, just down from the Launceston General, and there was a dead wallaby, in the middle of Launceston. I have seen wallabies run over in the middle of Ulverstone. I have seen wallabies run over just outside the traffic lights at the West Park Oval. The numbers of these animals are in plague proportions. There has to be a balance.

Far from the rationale of the Greens, that because there are crop protection permits all of those animals mentioned in the permit are obviously slaughtered, with all their blood running and the poor little babies are without mums. That is the language they use.

We care about these animals but we have to have a balance. That is why there was a permit issued for platypus in Lake Crescent. What would have happened if that netting was halted because it was illegal for any possible chance that a platypus would die in a net? Then we would have carp all up and down that river system and that would have a far greater impact on platypus than the sacrifice. It is a sacrifice that those six platypuses were drowned as part of that netting process. This is what the grownups in the room have to do. The grownups have to consider the nuance. There are consequences.

What is the greater good? We do not have to run these things up the flagpole to say that only the Greens care about these issues, because the grownups in the room have to deal with the real-life consequences. There has to be a balance.

I have not heard the case for urgency in this motion. All I have heard is once again this virtue signalling, this moralising and taking the high ground. The Greens have their press release all ready and they are the only ones who care. There should be no animals killed in the state and there should be no crop protection permits. The language they use is extreme. If we are going to debate these things we need to do it in a sensible way and not simply do it as a stunt so they can stick out a press release and go to their 10 per cent of supporters and say only the Greens care about the animals of Tasmania because Labor and the Liberals just want to drive them into extinction. That is very unfair.

The House divided -

AYES 2

Ms O'Connor
Dr Woodruff (Teller)

NOES 21

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Dr Broad
Ms Butler
Ms Courtney
Ms Dow
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gutwein
Ms Haddad
Ms Hickey
Mr Hodgman
Ms Houston (Teller)
Mr Jaensch
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Mr Rockliff
Mrs Rylah
Mr Shelton
Ms Standen
Mr Tucker
Ms White

Motion negatived.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Strong Economic Management

[11.51 a.m.]

Mr TUCKER (Lyons - Motion) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the House take note of the following matter: strong economic management.

It is confirmed, Tasmania once again has the strongest growing economy in the nation. In five-and-a-half years we have come from an economy in recession. Two years ago, our economy grew

the fastest in the nation on a per capita basis. Last financial year, we grew the fastest overall. The Australian Bureau of Statistics state final demand data released yesterday, a primary measure of our domestic economy, shows that last year Tasmania out-performed the nation and all other states.

State final demand grew 3.4 per cent in 2018-19, the highest growth rate in Australia in real terms and significantly higher than the national growth rate. At the same time, Tasmania also grew the fastest in the country on a quarterly basis, growing 0.6 per cent in the June 2019 quarter. These are outstanding results. State final demand in the June 2019 quarter is now 16.5 per cent higher than when we first came to government. These nation-leading results have not been achieved by accident. They are a direct result of the Government's work, delivering our long-term plan for Tasmania, which is taking our state from strength to strength.

In many ways it should not come as a surprise. Our businesses are the most confident. They enjoy the best conditions. Our policies are the most popular in the nation for the eighth year in a row. When businesses are confident, they invest and create jobs. Yesterday's results mark the first time in 15 years that Tasmania's economic growth rate has outstripped that of all other states and territories on a financial year basis. As the Treasurer said this morning, this result is also the first time in more than a quarter of a century that Tasmanian growth has more than tripled that of the nation's powerhouse, the New South Wales economy, on a financial year basis. Labor has no credibility on the economy or on jobs.

Quorum formed.

Mr TUCKER - Under those opposite, Tasmania's economy went into recession in 2011-12, with years of low growth. State final demand contracted in 2011-12 and in 2012-13. For half of their last term in government, the state went backwards. In 2010-11 and 2011-12, the Tasmanian state final demand was the lowest in the nation. Quarterly growth in state final demand was even worse. For seven quarters in a row, state final demand contracted. For eighth, it was zero. The only time it had a number one in front of it, it was negative. Contrast this with our record: nation-leading growth. Hundreds of Tasmanians, especially our youth, left the state in droves. Business conditions collapsed and business confidence fell to the lowest in the country. Two-thirds of businesses thought the Government was working against them, and not with them.

Ms O'Connor - There are still people sleeping on the Domain. There are 3300 people on the public housing waiting list.

Mr TUCKER - Yes, we know the Greens were with Labor when this was going on.

Contracting retail spend each and every month between November 2009 and March 2011 - 17 months. October 2011 to October 2012 - 13 months. We know the results of the Labor-Greens government on jobs and the economy: 10 000 Tasmanians lost their jobs, including 6000 women between May 2010 and December 2013, 5500 young people in October 2011 and February 2014. There were 10 600 full-time jobs lost between February 2011 and July 2013. The unemployment rate hit 8.6 per cent. For over 80 per cent of the time in their last four years in government, Tasmania had the highest unemployment rate in the country. It was the highest for 13 months in a row. A budget in deficit and on track for \$1.1 million in debt.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Dr Woodruff, you are still on your suspension.

Dr Woodruff - Sorry.

Mr TUCKER - The Hodgman majority Liberal Government's record on the economy and jobs is clear.

Nation-leading growth - 13 000 jobs. But we know there is more to do. It is why the 2019-20 Budget supports 10 000 new jobs.

Time expired.

[11.58 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Deputy Speaker, apart from being completely boring, that contribution from Mr Tucker failed to mention human beings, failed to acknowledge that there are people right now sleeping on the Domain, sleeping in the rivulet, who are living in insecure housing, who cannot afford to pay their rent.

Under this Liberal Government and, apparently, we have entered the Golden Age, there are 3300 people on the public housing waiting list. They are just the people who have put their name on the list. As was reported in today's media, the hidden homelessness, or the hidden housing stress, applies to nearly 20 000 Tasmanians. The Greens are not going to cop having this sort of debate, where all you talk about is the money, which has only affected a small part of Tasmania, and not talk about human beings. We need to talk about people.

When you talk about the Golden Age in the northern suburbs of Hobart, or in Brighton or regional Tasmania, they just shake their heads in disbelief. It is completely unacceptable for the Government to come in here and crow about the economy without acknowledging the fact that there are people in acute economic distress in this state right now as we speak and as Liberal members play silly political games and run self-congratulatory matter of public importance debates there are people out there suffering. We are not going to cop it.

Let us be really clear about some of the jobs claims that have been made. The Liberals have said they have created 13 000 jobs. The data is very clear; about half of those jobs were imported. The Treasurer said when the last state Budget was handed down that in this term of the parliament the Government would create 10 000 new jobs, but when you go into the State Growth section of the budget papers it is very clear that 6000 of those 10 000 new jobs will be imported workers. That is the truth and the foundation of the economic circumstances we are in and the Government should be honest about those jobs figures. When they talk about creating 10 000 new jobs for Tasmanians they are lying, because in the budget papers themselves it is clear that two-thirds of those jobs will come from overseas, which denies our young people an opportunity to skill up and go into the jobs of the future where there is increasing employment and security and increasing automation.

Let us be really honest also about what has happened to the state's economy. All of the economic indicators started turning around not long after Chinese Chairman, Xi Jinping, visited Tasmania in November 2014. That is a fact, and what we saw then was vast sums of investment coming in from mainland China into Tasmania. That is the truth of it. When you sit on the housing inquiry and listen to the testimony of people who understand what has happened to housing, it is very clear that the acute distress in the housing market came about after November 2014. They are the facts. I am laying it on the table because what the Greens do in this place is tell the truth.

You cannot have a debate about the state of the economy without talking about the circumstances of people's lives who are suffering. You cannot cop claims that we are in a golden age when you know there are people who cannot find a house, a home, or who cannot afford to pay

their rent. We have a Residential Tenancy Act in Tasmania that enables landlords to increase the rent every 12 months, and that is exactly what has happened.

My brother is on a disability support payment. His rent until a month ago was \$220 a week - a significant proportion of his income. Then a couple of weeks ago his landlord said, 'We're hiking your rent up another \$20 a week'. There you have a person on a disability support payment paying \$240 a week out of their income for their rent and, as we know, Commonwealth Rent Assistance is capped. This is happening all over Tasmania. Rents are soaring. We have had testimony to the parliamentary inquiry of families being given a rent increase in one fell swoop of \$70 a week. What does that do? It drives them into homelessness.

This Government is under the illusion that you can keep blowing up a balloon. You cannot. You cannot have a continual growth model. It does not work. It is a finite planet. With 7 billion people on a finite planet you cannot have a continued growth model. We are going to have to adjust the way we think about money and opportunities because we are in the middle of a climate crisis. Everything is changing and changing fast, and yet we have these kind of debates in this place which are so deeply frustrating and insulting to the intelligence of everyday people. None of the substantive issues that are facing Tasmania have been dealt with in this parliament this week other than when the Greens bring it on. We have had politicking from Labor, we have had back-slapping, self-congratulatory debate contributions from the Liberals, while out there in the real world, people are suffering.

I am really disappointed that we have to spend 35 minutes debating the Government talking about how terrific it is, but as ever, the Greens in this place will tell the truth. The truth is that the social fabric of our society is being undermined as a result of Liberal Government policy, there has been a grotesque under-investment in social and affordable housing and no new money into the portfolio until 2017. A pox on both your houses.

Time expired.

[12.05 p.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this, but I cannot believe what kind of 'come in spinner' strategy it was to get in here and talk about the economy. What kind of trap for the new player did they set? You have to be kidding. You come into this House and talk about the fabulous economic times and compare it to the worst times of a global financial crisis and do not actually get any kind of self-recognition in that. Think about it for a moment. We steered our state through a global financial crisis. What have you had? You have had the best of national and international times. You have had the best conditions in which to have a stable economy and a growing job market, and what have you done? You have completely stuffed it.

In the past 12 months, 5100 full-time jobs have been lost; 3200 Tasmanian men and 1900 Tasmanian women have lost their jobs. There are 2200 more people unemployed. Do not come into this House and start crowing about your success when you have been given every opportunity from a national and international market to do the right thing. You are failing Tasmanian workers.

In the 2018-19 Budget, your Treasurer said, 'Our budget is under control and we are able to invest more into essential services'. What rot. Despite the fact that you have increased GST receipts, despite the fact that revenues from state taxes as well were increasing, as well as really favourable international economic conditions, you are taking us into \$1.1 billion net debt. If this is

what you do in the best of economic times, dear God, what would you do if you had a real challenge? If you actually had a significant economic challenge, what would you do to the state coffers, because in the best of circumstances we have \$1.1 billion in net debt?

Do you know the last time we were in net debt? It was in 2003-04 when Jim Bacon and Paul Lennon, former premier and deputy premier at the time, were paying off the last time you got us into net debt. It took years to fix it and these things do not happen because of international or national forces. They happen because you are very bad at your job. You are not very good at the economy. You can run the line as much as you want but the reality is that given the best economic circumstances, you have squandered them, and the thing is you knew you had squandered them. You knew it because the Preliminary Outcomes Report 2018-19 exposed your financial recklessness and what Premier Will Hodgman and Treasurer Peter Gutwein were doing to our economy, and you did nothing. Those of you who sat in Cabinet are ultimately culpable of that.

There is a massive underspend on infrastructure and you are still taking us into \$1.1 billion in debt. You banked savings from the most vulnerable - \$65 million from disability payments, \$10 million from Health and a \$15 million raid on GBEs - so do not come in here and pretend that you are good economic managers. It is a farcical position for you to host. Your reputation for economic management is in absolute tatters.

Let us talk about the other things you are not doing. You were very excited about the figures yesterday. What is happening in retail trade? It is stagnating, that is what has happened. The signs are not good and you have no capacity to trade out of it because you have no capacity to manage the economic good times.

Let us talk about the many opportunities and threats you are also ignoring. There is an opportunity for 500 jobs in the hydrogen sector, and where are you? We do not have a hydrogen strategy. Look at what Western Australia, South Australia and Queensland are doing. Do you think that an investor reading the Finkel report at the end of this year is going to look at the fact that you had a couple of meetings, compared to the well-researched work that other jurisdictions have done, and give us a good score card? Of course they are not. It was an opportunity for jobs and you have simply walked away. You have done absolutely nothing. This line that you are running of 'please do not mention TEMCO because that would be bad to mention it': the company has said that there three options before them. The three options are divestment, care and maintenance, and closure. We have been in circumstances where we are in government with major industrials when they face challenges. We stayed in the room for the conversation so that if they needed something we were there and there was no lag time. The other thing we did is that we planned for each eventuality.

Nobody wants those jobs to go and we should be doing everything we can to make sure that we are as attractive as possible for another investor if their decision is divestment. If their decision is care and maintenance, that is a significant hit to our state and we need to have a plan for it. If their plan is closure, it is a terrible outcome for that community and you, as a government, have no plan. You wonder why you get us into an economic mess of \$1.1 billion in debt coming down the line. It is because you do not know how to manage a budget.

Through the hardest of economic times we require our governments, our treasurers and our premiers to step up. This clearly has not been the hardest of economic times. This has been an opportunity, when the economic times are good, to build, to grow, to invest in the future, to identify new opportunities and to future-proof our jobs and our economy against shock, and you have not done it.

At the same time, you are failing people in Health. You are failing people who are looking for housing. You are failing people with disabilities. You are not getting anything right. You are good at the one-liners. You are good at the media statements. Well done, you. You know what? When your term in government is looked back on, it will not be with respect nor with any kind of glowing praise. It will be looked back on as a government that squandered every single opportunity they had to do the right thing.

If you look at every term of government across all political colours for years and years, you will see that within every term of government there is an economic driver that is set up for the future. Tell me what yours was last term? Nothing, because you sat back and thought the economy is going well, we will be okay. You are not setting one up for the future either. You talk about your infrastructure pipeline. For heaven's sake, how much of that is real? Half of it is not there. A lot of it was already funded. There is nothing that you have identified that will proof us against the shocks.

There are very real concerns in the national economy that we are facing significant challenges. You are not well placed to deal with it. When you stand in here and you crow about the economic times, you need to think very carefully about what you have done to our state.

Time expired.

[12.13 p.m.]

Mrs RYLAH (Braddon) - Madam Deputy Speaker, Tasmanian investment is the strongest in the nation and we should be celebrating that because that means jobs, opportunities and strengths in our communities. On this side of the House we know how important it is for the Government to live within our means. This is important for the delivery of services and for the ongoing growth in the economy. It has been an outstanding result in the five and a half years since we took management and control of the Tasmanian Government.

We have built confidence, built investment, jobs and communities. There has been a dramatic turnaround. We are rebuilding. We are upskilling. We are working diligently through economic management to ensure that people are working, that we have the infrastructure that we need for the future, and the service delivery that is demanded by our population. We are balancing getting confidence, investment, spending and improving conditions. We are about job creation, and we are about job sustainability.

Labor has no credibility on the economy or jobs. You took the hay out of the barn. It was public sector superannuation money that you took.

Members interjecting.

Mrs RYLAH - The Tasmanian economy went into recession despite what you did to the public sector in 2011 and 2012 and in 2012-13, and for half of your last term in government. In 2010-11 and 2011-12 the state demand was the lowest in this nation. We were the last state and territory in this nation. It was a disgrace. Quarterly growth in state final demand was even worse.

Members interjecting.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. I cannot hear Mrs Rylah, not that I particularly want to. There is a lot of heckling happening and I ask if you could bring the

temperature of the House down a bit. Maybe Mrs Rylah could talk about human beings in her contribution, just in passing.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. The Opposition will have another opportunity to make a contribution. I ask that you do show Mrs Rylah respect, please.

Mrs RYLAH - For seven quarters in a row state final demand contracted. For the eighth it was zero. In fact, the only time it had a 1 in front of it, it was a negative 1. Contrast this to our record nation-leading growth and that means jobs, opportunity and confidence for people and families in this state.

Business conditions collapsed and business confidence fell to the lowest in the country. Two-thirds of the businesses thought that the government was working against them not with them. There was contracting retail spend each and every month. Under those opposite, private investment contracted from the December 2011 quarter to the June 2013 quarter, an incredibly important measure of the strength of the economy and what opportunity there is for the people in that economy.

We know the results of the Labor government on jobs and the economy. We know 10 000 Tasmanians lost their jobs. The unemployment rate hit 8.6 per cent and for over 80 per cent of their time in their last four years of government Tasmania had the highest unemployment rate in the country.

Dr Broad - What is the rate now?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - The Opposition will have their time soon.

Mrs RYLAH - In fact, it was the highest for 30 months in a row. Hundreds of Tasmanians, especially our youth left the state.

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I am a little concerned Mrs Rylah might be misleading the House inadvertently. The unemployment rate is the highest now in the country.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - That is not a point of order.

Mrs RYLAH - Tasmania's investment is the strongest growing in the nation. Tasmania once again has the strongest growing economy. Two years ago our economy grew the fastest in the nation on a per capita basis. Now, last financial year we grew the fastest overall. These are outstanding results. Yesterday's in ABS's state final demand data, our primary measure of our domestic economy shows that last year Tasmania outperformed the nation and all other states and territories. These nation-leading results have not been achieved by accident. They are a direct result of the Government's work, delivering on their long-term plan for the Tasmanian people, which is taking our state from strength to strength.

Our businesses are the most confident; they enjoy the best conditions. Our policies are the most popular in the nation for the eighth time in a row. When businesses are confident they invest and they create jobs. Today car sales were reported. Tasmania's new vehicle sales sector is performing the strongest. In fact, car sales - as you would know Dr Broad - are a leading indicator of the economy. This is very positive for our future.

The extraordinary state final demand growth was underpinned by the highest growth in private investment in the nation on both an annual and a quarterly basis. In 2018-19 private investment grew by a nation-leading 7 per cent in real trend terms. Private investment in Tasmania increased by 2 per cent in the June quarter to \$1.25 billion and 7 per cent above the level recorded one year earlier. In the year to 30 June 2019 private investment increased by 6 per cent compared to the previous years in original year average terms.

Business investment in Tasmania increased by 1.7 per cent. The June quarter of 2019 increased to \$799 million, 9.3 per cent above the level recorded one year earlier. Dwelling investment in Tasmania increased by 3.1 per cent in the June quarter 2019 to \$365 million and was 6.7 per cent above the level recorded one year earlier in real trend terms. Private investment is now 26.5 per cent higher than when the Hodgman Liberal Government was first elected in March 2014.

Time expired.

[12.20 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Madam Deputy Speaker, we have had two Government speakers talking about the economy, but we did not hear a single Government member say what they had actually done. The Government is quick to take credit for everyone else's work. We heard all about private investment and people buying cars. We did not hear a single economic reform discussed.

Mrs Rylah - Let us hear yours. Is this your audition? Come on.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Dr BROAD - This is their problem. They have nothing to show. They have spent all the debate saying it is Labor, Labor, Labor. They have absolutely nothing to show. Every speaker spends well over half their time saying Labor, Labor, Labor. They are running the Barnaby Joyce defence of Labor, Labor, Labor, Labor. It is because they have nothing to point to.

There has been zero economic reform. The only thing they have done is take advantage of the GST that has been flooding into the state that they did not budget for. Now we have seen a turnaround in GST receipts. We are seeing \$1.1 billion of debt building up on the horizon. No doubt there will be more. It has got to a situation now where even their comrades -

Members interjecting.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. There is too much noise in here right now.

Dr BROAD - They do not want to hear. Even their Liberal comrades at Font PR describe the Government's agenda as housekeeping. The former chief of staff of the Premier is currently describing the Liberal's agenda as housekeeping. All they can talk about is us. They have been in government nearly six years. You are the Government. We are holding you to account.

They talk about the highest unemployment rate. We have the highest unemployment rate in the country right now and it is getting worse. The trends are clear - 5100 full-time jobs are gone. We did not hear the member for Lyons talking about that. We have \$1.1 billion in debt building up. In the next budget it will be even more. We see storm clouds on the economic horizon federally. We hear discussions about low retail trade and yet the Government has no plan, apart from blaming

Labor, which was in government six or more years ago by the time they come around to the next budget. These guys have got nothing going for them.

A debt of \$1.1 billion sounds like a big number. Let us put it into context. What will \$1.1 billion buy? We could redevelop the Royal Hobart Hospital twice for that sort of money. You could probably have close to four *Spirits* on the run to Victoria with that money. We are talking about a significant amount of money. The Government knows it is digging a big hole. It has a big spade and is digging a big hole into debt. Someone is going to have to dig the state out of it and fill it up later on.

What do the geniuses on that side come up with to fill that black hole? They come up with the tremendous idea of taxing investment. That was their strategy. The member for Lyons did not say boo when the Government planned to put in a job-destroying investment tax. International investment has been a cornerstone of the Tasmanian economy since settlement. Continuing overseas investment plays a significant role in job creation and innovation. The farm tax that they were going to put in, this tax on investment and jobs, was the silliest idea.

The Government slipped this little line into the Budget hoping that nobody would notice. People did. We thought maybe the Government was going to back flip on it. Then in parliament the Premier doubled down on it and said good government will always look to increase revenues. He said it is not a tax on investment because the Government was focusing on ensuring foreign investors pay their fair share, as if foreign investors are not paying their fair share.

We can see how well that went down, especially in communities like Circular Head. Local share farmer Matthew Gunningham told the *Circular Head Chronicle* last Wednesday he was concerned about the prospect of a further tax increase on foreign investors, 'I think foreign investment in general has been a very good thing for Circular Head'. I did not hear a peep from any of the members for Braddon raising the concerns of Mr Gunningham. Mr Gunningham is a busy dairy farmer currently sharing four properties with foreign investors, one of which is a small European family that this Government wanted to smack with a big job-destroying tax. What better way to put them off than by slugging them even more tax. It creates an enormous amount of uncertainty for further expenditure.

Their only economic reform was to slug foreign investors. They do not want to hear about this. They must have been so embarrassed to see the *Circular Head Chronicle*. John McNabb from the Tarkine progress association, the business group from Circular Head, said, 'As an investor why would you choose Tasmania if you are going to be so heavily taxed'. This was your Government's brilliant way to dig itself out of \$1.1 billion in debt and that an annual land tax would discourage foreign investment. What have these geniuses got on their mind?

I think it was this story by Isaac in the *Circular Head Chronicle* that finally tipped the Government over the edge and got them to backflip. It was a very meek little back flip in a media release from 28 August, the same day they read the *Circular Head Chronicle*. Maybe Mrs Rylah got a bit concerned about what was going on in the *Circular Head Chronicle* and the smackdown from investors and business groups in Circular Head begging, pleading for the Government to backflip on this. The media release said -

... following feedback received through the consultation process from the TFGA and industry representatives, the Government has decided not to proceed with the introduction of the foreign investor land tax surcharge, as was proposed.

This was done in a rush. From memory there was a grammatical error in that particular bit. They smashed it out. They thought, 'the *Circular Head Chronicle* has turned on us, the investors of Circular Head have turned on us. We heard Laguna Bay on ABC radio'.

Time expired

Matter noted.

MOTION

Huntingfield Housing Land Supply Order

[12.27 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Housing) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the House -

- (1) Supports the Huntingfield Housing Land Supply Order made under section 4 of the Housing Land Supply Act 2018.
- (2) Acknowledges that Tasmania's Affordable Housing Strategy, which includes the critical release of more land, is responding to the current challenges in the housing market by boosting supply across the housing spectrum.
- (3) Acknowledges that the Affordable Housing Action Plan 2 and the additional investment in funding is another positive step towards continuing this momentum.
- (4) Supports the Tasmanian Government's \$1.6 billion investment in infrastructure of roads and bridges, including \$30.8 million over four years for congestion-busting projects in Greater Hobart.

My contribution today on this motion will focus on the first part, the Huntingfield Housing Land Supply Order made under section 4 of the Housing Land Supply Act 2018. Other colleagues who are listed to speak will address other aspects of the motion.

I bring this motion today in recognition of the high importance and public interest in the proposed Huntingfield development and the broader issue and challenge for Tasmania of housing supply that it is intended to address.

As a key action arising from the Premier's March 2018 housing summit, the Government undertook to fast track zoning changes for government land to accelerate the delivery of affordable housing for the supply of more houses for Tasmanians. The Housing Land Supply Act 2018 was passed unamended by both Houses of this parliament. The act provides for the making of housing land supply orders to fast track rezoning of government land for housing.

To date the Government has made four housing land supply orders for the rezoning of land in West Moonah, Rokeby, Devonport and Newnham, with a total area of 6.7 hectares rezoned so far for housing across the state. This proposed order includes a further 34 hectares of land for housing

at Huntingfield. This will be a significant boost at a time when there is high demand for housing in the greater Hobart area, with pressures on housing affordability and availability.

Before presenting the detail of the proposed order it is important that I outline some history and the strategic background to the Huntingfield land. This land was once part of a larger parcel acquired by the government and then transferred to the Director of Housing in 1974 for the purposes of developing it for housing. The area has been progressively developed over the years, with land also sold to the St Aloysius Catholic College and the Tarremah Steiner School for their Huntingfield campuses. The remaining land at Huntingfield is now subject to the proposed order.

This land has been consistently identified for future urban development for a number of years. It is located within the Greater Hobart urban growth boundary and specifically within the Huntingfield South greenfield development precinct under the Southern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy. It is identified for future housing under the Kingborough Land Use Strategy endorsed by the Kingborough Council in May of this year and in the previous strategy endorsed in 2014. It is currently zoned particular purpose zone 1 urban growth zone under the Kingborough Interim Planning Scheme 2015, which is a holding zone for future urban land not set aside for future agriculture, and is identified as suitable for the delivery of affordable housing in Tasmania's Affordable Housing Strategy 2015-25 through Tasmania's Affordable Housing Action Plan 2015-19.

Everything points to this land being strategically set aside for residential development and determined to be appropriate for that development by the Kingborough Council, the Tasmanian Planning Commission and the Government. The issue is the timing of releasing this land from future urban status. I consider the current demand for housing in Greater Hobart is such that the land is ready and needed now for rezoning for residential development.

The proposed order seeks to rezone the site to allow for future residential development. It is important to acknowledge that the order only relates to the rezoning of the land and while it is informed by a master plan that is being refined now, it does not provide for the subdivision of the land or the development of any buildings. The future subdivision of the land and development of houses will be subject to the normal development assessment processes administered by Kingborough Council under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993.

The proposed order includes a large area of land and for this reason it has been informed by initial master planning for the whole site which identified the opportunities and constraints for development, including the location of the open space zone to provide open space connections through the site and to protect important Aboriginal heritage values; the potential connections to existing roads; the preferred internal road and lot layout; and provision of public transport routes through the site to a first approximation.

In accordance with the requirements of the act, the proposed order was released for consultation with interested persons for a period of 14 days. This occurred during June 2019. Additional time was granted to those who sought it and the interested persons were identified as property owners and occupiers directly adjoining the site, the Kingborough Council, the Aboriginal Heritage Council, the Tasmanian Heritage Council, Tasmania Fire Service and relevant state service agencies and authorities including the Friends of the Peter Murrell Reserve. This direct notification process is very similar to that which a normal planning scheme amendment would require.

The consultation version of the order proposed to rezone the land to the inner residential zone, open space zone and local business zone and to also apply a modified form of the state planning provisions for the inner residential zone to provide flexibility for delivering a variety of lot sizes and dwelling types, including smaller lots that could be delivered to the market as affordable housing. A total of 37 hectares was proposed with the inner residential zone, including 12 hectares for higher-density housing within precinct A.

A total of 52 submissions were received from the consultation period, of which 11 were from interested persons consulted under the act and a further 41 submissions from the broader community. I acknowledge the significant number of people from the broader community who have shown an interest by making a submission on the proposed order and also to those who organised and attended a public forum I held on 25 July this year. The feedback we received from those people through those mechanisms has been invaluable in helping us to refine the proposed order currently before the House.

Key things that were identified in the submissions included the following; the scope of the initial consultation and the use of the fast-track process in place of traditional planning scheme amendment processes; the density of development that would be possible under the inner residential zone; concerns with the location of the local business zone in proximity to existing residences and schools; traffic impacts, both within the site and beyond and the need for infrastructure upgrades to keep pace with future developments at the site; the need for open space buffers from the Peter Murrell Reserve, an existing development; and guarantees on the delivery of affordable housing from the site was also mentioned. I note that many of the concerns raised relate to the detail of the future development of the site rather than the proposed rezoning.

The proposed order that is now before the House has been altered to address the key concerns raised by the community, particularly through providing a formal link to the future master plan for the area that will be built and finalised through the normal process with the Kingborough Council and with consultation with its community. This is evidence that the Government has listened and will ensure that the site is appropriately developed with further input from the community surrounding it and key stakeholders.

We make no apologies for using the fast-track process for rezoning the land for housing. Demand for housing in Greater Hobart remains strong and there have been calls for more affordable housing to be delivered to the market. This is the purpose of the act that we here built and agreed to so that it could be used to deliver more land to market in suitable locations through borders like the one that is currently before the House.

Following the making of the order, to set the zoning for the site, I propose that there will be further consultation with the community, Kingborough Council and infrastructure providers to develop this detailed master plan for the site. Importantly, this has to occur before any future subdivision application is lodged with the council. The final subdivision design will be assessed by the council with input from the community through the normal discretionary development application process under LUPAA.

The key alterations we have made to the order from the draft that was first exposed to the community include the following -

- the inclusion of a general residential zone for the majority of the land identified for residential development, with the exception of the two areas previously identified as precinct A, which remains within the inner-residential zone proposed.
- requiring the new lots to achieve an average density of 450 square metres in the general residential zone and 200 square metres in the inner-residential zone while maintaining the previously proposed minimum lot sizes of 275 square metres and 130 square metres to allow for a diversity of lot sizes to be achieved for these respective areas.
- relocation of the local business zone to a single and more central location within the new residential area to avoid potential conflicts with existing residences and schools.
- expansion of the open space zone to provide a wider buffer between the new residential area and the Peter Murrell Reserve and the two schools and to better reflect the intended public open space corridors within the site.
- linking the future subdivision design to a master plan prepared for the entire site, ensuring it is developed with a diversity of lot sizes with appropriate road, pedestrian, cycle and open space connections, a clear internal road hierarchy that directs the main traffic route through Huntingfield Avenue and the new Channel Highway connection, and delivers appropriate stormwater management measures for the site.

I consider the zoning and the proposed order to be consistent with the adjoining land and recent developments approved by Kingborough Council in the nearby Spring Farm development. The flexibility provided by the varied minimum lot sizes gives the opportunity for the site to be developed as a model housing estate encompassing a modern sub-division design philosophy, making efficient use of the land that is available, and providing more useable public open space to suit the needs of the community. Approximately 50 per cent of the site is proposed to be open-space zoned.

By administering future development under the Homes Act 1935, the Director of Housing can ensure that an appropriate proportion of dwellings are set aside for social housing. At present, the intention for this site is to deliver around 15 per cent of the total number of homes as social and affordable housing.

I note the Department of State Growth has expressed support for the re-zoning of the land and their in-principle support for the intended new access and roundabout onto the Channel Highway, subject to detailed modelling and design. The new access is expected to considerably improve travel times and safety for road users during the school peak times at Huntingfield.

I acknowledge the concerns raised from the community and Kingborough Council to ensure the capacity of existing infrastructure is fully considered, and that upgrades keep pace with the future development of the site. The Government is in the box seat to ensure this is achieved as manager for developing the site and provider of the infrastructure. A number of projects have commenced, or will shortly commence to investigate and improve transport conditions in the Kingborough area.

In its submission on a proposed order, State Growth has outlined some of those projects which include a corridor planning study for the Channel Highway between Margate and Kingston, the Greater Hobart traffic solution to address traffic impacts from population growth from the suburbs

south of Hobart with funding for end-to-end passenger transport solutions for the Kingborough area. Measures being proposed under the Hobart City Deal to improve southern access via the Southern Outlet, include a detailed investigation of the Southern Outlet to manage peak demands, including an addition inbound priority lane, new park-and ride-facilities and priority lanes for Macquarie and Davey streets.

I am satisfied that further detailed master planning, in consultation with State Growth, Kingborough Council and the community, will inform the further detailed design for the future sub-division, ensuring it aligns with the existing road network and future upgrades.

In summary, last year, we here, agreed that we needed to rezone more government land for housing and we agreed on a specific set of legislation to achieve that. We have applied that legislation to a parcel of land owned by government for the purpose of future housing and recognised as such in regional and local land use plans. The purpose of the order is to activate this site so it can be used for housing. That is all.

With regard to the major issues raised in the consultation process and related public discussion, in terms of concern about scale and density, and claims that the whole site will be dedicated to high density housing, as I have explained, half the site will be open space. Of the remaining half, in residential use, two-thirds will be zoned general residential and one-third only inner residential. To achieve diversity of lot sizes and housing types, including around 15 per cent social and affordable housing, including innovative housing options, we are taking a cue from best practice in Australia, and overseas, in developments like Lightsview in South Australia.

The second major issue of concern has been roads and traffic congestion. Again, while not part directly of this rezoning order, I believe we can provide evidence that we have heard and understood the needs and interests of current and future residents of Huntingfield, and areas to its south. Plans for this site will be factored into strategic planning and design processes that are currently underway to cater for increased use and traffic and to decrease congestion are going forward.

I acknowledge and I respect the rights and interests of the existing residents of Huntingfield to have a say on changes that affect them. We have listened to and responded to their concerns. I also acknowledge and respect the will of the participants from the Housing Summit in March last year in this place where we developed legislation to respond to the need to rapidly rezone land to make it available for more housing for Tasmanians. I acknowledge and respect also the future residents of Huntingfield, some of whom are currently on the housing register; some of them are in housing stress who expect us to deliver for them.

The proposed order delivers on the Hodgman Liberal Government's commitment to deliver more residential land to the market, particularly affordable housing options in a strategically appropriate location and in a manner that will provide for a model for sustainable housing developments. I commend the proposed order to the House.

[12.46 p.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise today to speak on this item of government business, which is related to a notice of motion. I must admit when the notice of motion was tabled as Government business for today I was confused about why one would be brought on when an order had been tabled in the parliament and there is a legislative instrument to allow this

order. Then it dawned on me that this Government has no business. You have run out of business and no new business has been introduced for the last two days.

Tasmanians should be concerned about this, as are we. This characterises the form of this do-nothing Liberal Government. In the words of Benjamin Franklin, 'If you fail to plan you are planning to fail'. I believe this is a further characterisation of this Government. Planning is an incredibly important instrument and not just from a regulatory point of view. To date, this Government has been obsessed with the regulatory aspect of planning in Tasmania with the redevelopment of the Planning Scheme and the move to a statewide planning scheme.

They may have failed to deliver a faster, simpler, cheaper and fairer planning system in Tasmania. I note, too, that they have actually dropped this slogan. They have gone about setting ambitious population and tourism targets, with no regard to the planning for the required infrastructure and essential services for everyday Tasmanians.

They have no population settlement strategy and no strategic direction for the state and no state planning policies. I note they have no ability to work with communities, business and industry to plan for effective change and for the future growth of Tasmanian communities.

They have under invested in the TPC and the PPU at a critical time of need. They undertake poor communication with community groups on planning reform in general. I can think of a number of occasions that this has occurred. Recently, with the introduction of the LPSs across local communities, I attended a meeting at Riana where only one representative from the Government was there. That was the honourable Leonie Hiscutt MLC. It was not clear if she was there representing the Government or representing herself as a landowner in the district. There was no formal overview or welcome to people from the Government or introduction about the changes being implemented in the scheme.

Mrs Rylah - It's a council thing, the Central Coast Council.

Ms DOW - That epitomises it, Mrs Rylah, that you just deflect it back on the councils.

They did that in response to significant community concerns to changes across rural zoning across the Central Coast municipality, which I might add has come from a statewide direction and the changes to the statewide planning scheme. One would think that there is an opportunity for the Government to work with communities and enable them to understand better the changes that will be impacting on their properties and what they can and cannot do with their properties in the future. I believe that was a missed opportunity for the Government.

This example is another poignant example of a process that could have been so much better. Huntingfield is a unique parcel of land that has been earmarked for development for a significant amount of time. I understand that it was even being looked at when we were in government as an area that could cater for residential growth across the Kingborough municipality. I believe that there have been previous master plans that have been developed for that site. It is not a new parcel of land. It certainly was a parcel of land that was spoken about, Madam Deputy Speaker, when you were the former minister in 2015 in a media release that talked about the development of 230 lots on that site for residential occupation.

There has been a lot of discussion about the development of the master plan, but the best place to start the master planning process should be with the local community, local businesses and the

local council about what indeed was the future vision for that site and what that might look like. From my experience people always understand change better when they understand what it might mean for them and where they can see a concrete example of what that community will look like into the future.

This is about the development of a new community within the Kingborough community. It is a whole new village. It is a place where people are going to be living. It is not just an announcement about meeting targets around social and affordable housing. It is a place where people need to have a sense of belonging, have access to essential services, have the public transport they require to get to where they need to be each day, have access to see a GP and that their child will have a school they can access when they are living on that site. They are all really important considerations that should be done collaboratively across that community.

I cannot understand why that would not have been the starting point for this process rather than the tabling and distribution of a housing supply order. With people given only 14 days to respond, unless you had access to planning expertise or a thorough understanding of how the planning system works - which the vast majority of people, let us be honest, do not have in Tasmania until it comes to them looking at when they might want to put a deck on their house or make an extension to their home - it is technical in its nature and it is difficult for people to really understand what that might mean for them. There has been a perfect opportunity in this to consult more broadly with that community and to work together - council, community, business, industry, service providers - around what the future of that community site will look like.

The consultation has not been good; we have established that in this debate today. I want to reflect on a meeting that was held on 27 July that over 300 people attended. It was organised and coordinated by Planning Matters Alliance Tasmania and at that meeting a number of motions were passed so I thought it might be good for the debate to table those today and read out what those motions were. They were:

1. The meeting shares numerous concerns about the proposed housing supply order at 1287 Channel Highway, Huntingfield, including inadequate community consultation, the impact of such high density of new houses on existing residences, visitors, schools and roads, the Peter Murrell Reserve, loss of agricultural land and the bypassing of the Kingborough Council and independent Tasmanian Planning Commission.
2. The meeting calls on the Tasmanian Parliament to reject the proposed housing supply order for Huntingfield and for the Government to proceed with any future rezoning proposals through the standard planning scheme amendment process.
3. The meeting calls for development of a strategic plan in conjunction with the community, including considering agricultural values and impacts on Peter Murrell Reserve for the Huntingfield land, which would inform any rezone proposal.
4. The meeting recognised the need for more social and affordable housing provided it is supported by the required infrastructure.

Neither the minister or the local members attended that meeting. I think that was also a missed opportunity.

Mr Jaensch - Were you there?

Ms DOW - No, I was not there but I am not the minister. I have had a good look on the site and met with stakeholders and got a good understanding of the layout of that parcel of land.

Mr Jaensch - Do you support it?

Ms DOW - I will continue with my contribution. A major concern raised with me through the many people who have contacted me in my shadow role and as a member of parliament - as I am sure many people here have been contacted as well - was around the changes to density and particularly the inner-residential density, which was quite new for a site of this nature and raised alarm bells for local community members. They had every right to express their concerns about changes to density, and what that might mean for their quality of life and their way of everyday life in Kingborough.

There were also issues raised about traffic management and planning for essential services, which I certainly think has not been demonstrated well. There is also the role of local government and I know that the question has been asked as to why, this being such a unique parcel of land with such a large amount of community interest and having been around for a very long time and considered for further residential growth, was that not able to go through the ordinary process of planning approval with the local council in line with their planning scheme and to enable that process to take place with a rigorous assessment of the TPC, as would have been the case ordinarily. Others have certainly commented on this as well. There are implications as well with the local provisions schedules being developed at the moment and how that might impact on this proposed change.

Recognition of Visitor

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER - Honourable members, I acknowledge the presence in the Speaker's Reserve of the Honourable Terry Aulich, a former member of this House.

Members - Hear, hear.

Ms DOW - Madam Deputy Speaker, there was a real opportunity here to work with local government within their current constraints as a planning authority to really showcase a jewel in Tasmania's crown when it comes to social and affordable, albeit mixed development, housing development for Tasmania. I hope that opportunity has not been missed.

I refer to the comments of Dr Katrena Stephenson who presented to the Select Committee on Housing Affordability. When asked about the site at Huntingfield, Dr Stephenson said:

We raised some concerns with the bill initially, most of which were addressed, but one of them was around ghetto-isation or large-scale developments. There does have to be an appropriate consideration of the scale and community. Fast-track does not mean you abrogate the responsibility around community engagement and it might not have to be the same full council process but there has to be an engagement process and that is just common sense.

She went on further to say:

The other thing about that particular development, as I understand it, is that commentary was made that the development applications still go through normal processes.

and this is really important -

With the more recent changes to the way our planning system works, there are permitted pathways and so, in reality, because it is a residential development, if they are compliant with the permitted pathways, it does not go through council. There is no opportunity for the community to engage in that regard. When you think about that and the scale collectively, you can understand the concerns that have been raised by both council and community.

The Government needs to ensure that that is not the case and that the master planning process is indeed undertaken with the council and the community. I will ask the minister to guarantee that today.

I also want to talk about the submission that was made and presented when the supply order was tabled. That was from the Australian Institute of Architects and it talks about creating places for people. It was a great submission that highlighted a good model process for well-designed urban places that they say can only be achieved by adopting an integrated design approach where multidisciplinary teams work collaboratively at all stages of the project. The things they highlight as being an important part of that process are strategic planning, engagement, excellence through leadership, collaboration and teamwork, integrated process and design culture and custodianship which ensures that all systems are in place and to ensure that it is well maintained and sustainable over a long term.

I say to the Government that I hope you read that submission and take on board some of those things when we are looking at the master plan, because it is absolutely essential that this undertaken. It provides a really good model for this process to be undertaken and a way for the community to work with the council and the Government around the development of that master plan.

I move on now to talk about the ability of the Government to be able to deliver these homes in the long term. We know that there are significant pressures on the building and construction industry, and underinvestment in the TAFE system and the pressures on the building and construction industry will be -

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

MOTION

Huntingfield Housing Land Supply Order

Resumed from above.

Ms DOW (Braddon) - Madam Speaker, Labor supports making surplus government land available for social and affordable housing. We supported the Housing Land Supply Act because we recognised the acute demand for social and affordable housing in this state.

Housing market growth may be one of our strongest economic indicators, but unemployment and our key socio-economic indicators continue to be our key weaknesses in Tasmania. Both are contributing to Tasmanians being more vulnerable and at risk of homelessness. The other factor to consider is short-stay accommodation and the impact this has had on the rental market in metropolitan and regional areas. There has been significant change in the housing market over a short period in Tasmania.

There are estimates regarding project requirements for social and economic affordable housing across Tasmania. The current demand is for 11 000 social and affordable housing dwellings. The total required for the next 20 years is estimated at 14 200. Right now, there are 3300 Tasmanians on the waiting list for a home. I note that the Hodgman Liberal Government's record on delivering social and affordable housing is abysmal. The Government must once and for all commit to a minimum of 15 per cent of the dwellings being dedicated to social housing in the Huntingfield development and explain what proportion will be affordable housing.

We talk about homelessness and housing stress. Maslow's hierarchy of needs and the social determinants of health are closely related and important with shelter being identified as a basic human need. Whilst we need an immediate response to homelessness in Tasmania, we also need greater investment in early intervention and mental health support services.

We are concerned about the \$450 million in cuts in the Budget and what that will mean for every day Tasmanians, the services they have access to and their ability to get treatment and support when they need it. These cuts come at a time when Tasmania has the highest unemployment rate in the country. This may very well lead to more Tasmanians being vulnerable and at risk of homelessness.

The process surrounding the future use of the Huntingfield site, a site which holds so much potential and means a great deal to local people, could have been handled so much better by this Government. I am disappointed in the level of community consultation which has taken place and the order of events thus far. Why would the Government choose to go down this path? Why wasn't consideration given to working through a master plan for this site in the first instance?

I extend my thanks to all those people who have contacted me to express their concerns for this process. I conclude my contribution by moving an amendment to this motion, which my colleagues Alison Standen and David O'Byrne will also speak on.

I move that -

All the words are removed after 'that the House' and replace with the following -

- (1) Supports further investment in increased supply of Affordable and Social Housing in Tasmania.
- (2) Notes that the Government failed to consult with the community on the Huntingfield Land Supply order made under section 4 of the Housing Land Supply Act 2018.
- (3) Notes the attendance of over 300 people at a community meeting in July who voiced their concerns regarding this development and the Government's mishandling of the consultation and planning process.

- (4) Acknowledges the notable absence of the minister and Premier, despite this being the Premier's electorate, at the meeting held in July.
- (5) Notes the significant missed opportunity to work with the local community, business community and local council to plan and develop a state-of-the-art housing development.
- (6) Notes the Liberal Government's failure to achieve a faster, cheaper, simpler, fairer planning scheme in Tasmania.
- (7) Acknowledges that Tasmania's Affordable Housing Strategy, which includes the release of government-owned land, is making a contribution to increasing housing supply, but much more is needed to meet current and projected demand.
- (8) Acknowledges that the Government's *Affordable Housing Strategy 2015-2025* and *Affordable Housing Action Plan 2019-2023* (AHAP2) were developed on the basis of market conditions at the time that have since deteriorated significantly and based on resources available at the time rather than a real assessment of market demand.
- (9) Recognises that under investment of the Hodgman Liberal Government in affordable housing supply over five years has contributed to the widening gap between social housing demand and supply in Tasmania.
- (10) Recognises that while the AHAP2 and associated funding is welcome, much more is required and urges the Government to undertake a comprehensive review of the Affordable Housing Strategy 2015-2025 and funding through the 2020-21 Budget processes to prioritise social housing as essential public infrastructure.
- (11) Notes the Government's failure to invest in infrastructure and have an effective transport strategy to deal with the issue of traffic congestion south of Hobart.

I will now speak on the amendment and provide some commentary alongside each of the points.

It is important to acknowledge that we support further investment in an increased supply of affordable and social housing in Tasmania. Given the high level of community concern around this development it is indeed important that points 2, 3 and 4 be also acknowledged around the level of consultation that was undertaken or lack thereof.

Madam SPEAKER - Ms Dow, can I ask in future - I have asked before - that when there are amendments that I be given a copy.

Ms DOW - I thought the Clerk had given you one. My apologies.

I believe point 5 is particularly important. It is about the development of the master plan and the order of things and how that could have been done a lot better in the first instance in setting it out for the community to have a greater understanding of what things would look like; the layout,

the considerations for where the levels of density would be, to encourage greater community understanding and appreciation of what was trying to be achieved by the Government.

Point 6 is pretty straightforward in that the Government has pretty much given away its mantra of 'a safer, cheaper, simpler, fairer planning scheme'. It has not been able to achieve that to date.

Affordable Housing Strategy: my colleague, Alison Standen, will speak on the amendment to each of these points as per her shadow responsibilities. It is important to acknowledge those points in this motion today.

The Government has talked a lot about investment in infrastructure, traffic management, busting congestion and a lot of throwaway lines about the importance of that. In fact, not a lot has changed for people travelling each day on the Southern Outlet and other roads in and around this area. There is a need to work more strategically to address some of these issues. We feel that this will only be compromised further through this development. It is important for that to be noted as part of this motion today.

[2.39 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Housing) - Madam Speaker, I rise briefly to speak to the amendment that has just been moved. The Government will not be supporting the amendment for a range of reasons. There are a number of points there. The substantive motion and my opening contribution focused very much on the main issue of the Huntingfield housing land supply order and support for it and its significance. I note that the amendment comprehensively and studiously avoids any reference to the order itself and support or otherwise for it. I believe this amendment indicates Labor's non-support for the order.

There is a range of items listed here. I would be very happy to address each one of them in turn but they are fairly cynical political statements. I think they would find them hard to substantiate. The main point is that I have moved a motion that headlines with support for the Huntingfield Housing Land Supply Order, which has been conducted to the letter of the legislation that was agreed and passed unanimously with no amendment through both Houses of this parliament. We have applied it to this site with a view to being able to fast track the release of much-needed land for development of housing for Tasmanians in housing stress and homelessness. The amendment avoids any reference to support for the Huntingfield land supply order so we will not be supporting the amendment.

[2.41 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I will speak to the amendment. Labor has captured the situation fairly accurately. I have a whole range of other things to add to it, but we do not see anything that we disagree with in this amendment. No doubt it has come from conversations Labor has had, as have the Greens, with the Planning Matters Alliance of Tasmania and with many other people in the local Kingborough community who have been contacting me for weeks now. People at the public meeting and people from the Kingborough Council have also been consistently concerned at the process that was used by the Government to bring on the community discussion about the Huntingfield development.

Before I talk about the amendment, it is worth looking at the reasons why the community responded the way they did. In my mind, there were two reasons. One was the substance of the Huntingfield development being specifically on that space and how people felt about what was being proposed. The second is the history of this Government's dealings with the community over

planning. The Liberals came to government following a long opposition campaign where they aggressively promoted the idea of a single statewide planning scheme.

They were substantially and openly backed by the Property Council of Tasmania. The Property Council of Australia (Tasmania Division) has written a number of things which are interesting to revisit in light of where we are today with Huntingfield. They made a submission to the Tasmanian Planning Commission on the draft state planning provisions back in 2016. A number of comments were telling. First of all, they boasted how they had advocated aggressively in the lead up to the 2014 state election for a modernised planning regime and that their views were regularly accepted and promoted by the Liberals. They welcomed and strongly supported the appointment of Mary Massina in April 2014 as the Executive Chair of the Planning Reform Taskforce that the Liberals established to create a statewide planning scheme, now known as the Tasmanian Planning Scheme. Mary Massina was previously the director of the Property Council of Tasmania and strongly advocated for, amongst other things, forcibly amalgamating local councils in Tasmania, reducing taxes and council rates, reducing regulation generally for property developers, reforming building regulations, et cetera.

The Liberals thus put into the head job of writing, developing and consulting on the Tasmanian Planning Scheme the previous president of the Property Council. What a surprise that the community was treated with utter disdain in that process; were locked out of having serious and meaningful input into the development of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.

Where we are today follows the course of the last five and a half years. As a result of the train wreck of damage the Liberals have done to the planning scheme, we have a bolstered community concern and opposition to the sorts of planning reforms that have been completely disregarded. The value of the natural landscape has been completely dismissed and there has been no meaningful engagement with communities about developments that are happening in their local council area. Both of those things have happened under the Liberal Government.

One of the benefits that has come out of that is a strong community has established itself. The Planning Matters Alliance Tasmania (PMAT) has been functioning for a bit over two years. It grew out of the Tasmanian Planning Information Networks (TasPIN). Last time I looked some time ago, PMAT represented at least 60 or 70 community groups - and I am probably underestimating - around the state. They have come together as a body to protect their local areas and natural landscapes, to stop the rampant development and privatisation of reserves, our parks and our conservation areas, which is exactly what is happening. These privatisation attempts are happening all around the state. Let us not forget that Rosny Hill in Hobart is a live discussion at the moment. We also have Lake Malbena. We have so many other examples where the community is totally disregarded and effectively written out of any opportunity to engage because it gets in the way of developers' interests. Developers would like to take the beauty of the Tasmanian landscape and have it for their own to do with what they want for free.

That is the backdrop to anything that this Government does in the planning space. What a surprise that the community did not trust the motivations of the department in how they undertook their activities. What a surprise that people have great concerns. Because of the history of how they have been mistreated in the past, they will look askance at anything that comes from this Government. So they should. They understand that unless they look out for the community's interests, unless they look out for holding onto our public open space, for holding onto spaces for plants and animals that are threatened, to be able to survive and thrive, unless they do that work, this Government will not do it for them.

The other part of this is that the Government has created the space where councils and even the Planning Commission has such a reduced ability to intervene or to make final decisions that are not fiddled with by the minister of the day for planning. In March 2017 the then Planning minister, Mr Gutwein, refused to take a number of recommendations from the Tasmanian Planning Commission about the statewide planning provisions they recommended in their report to him.

As well as having steamrolled through the complex reforms that had gone to the Planning Commission and showing utter contempt for the community through that process of consultation, the Planning Commission delivered its final report of 429 pages, despite having only been given seven weeks to make their consideration on the massive complexity of material they had before them. How contemptuous that the minister contracted the timeframe for the work that the Planning Commission delegates had to do such a serious body of work on our planning scheme. Even though they had done this awesome job and made some very important recommendations, the minister chose to disregard some very important ones, including rejecting the commission's recommendation to throughout the natural assets code and to start the process from scratch because the Tasmanian Planning Scheme's natural asset code is built on a woefully inadequate map of information. The Planning Commission stated in their report their absolute lack of confidence in the vegetation mapping that will guide the council decisions about land clearing.

I am not surprised that this Liberal Government would have that view and not want to improve the mapping of threatened species across Tasmania. However, I was shocked yesterday to hear Dr Broad from Labor espousing exactly the same view and complete lack of concern at the impact on newly listed threatened black gums, eucalypts, because it might get in the way of what some farmers want to do on their properties because we might have to look after those remnant critically endangered plants.

Opposition members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, please.

Dr WOODRUFF - No, this is what Labor did. This is an absolute disgrace. Labor has got to this point where they do not regard our threatened species at all, as well as going ahead with the Adani mine in Queensland, championing the mine and the loss of species that that mine will bring on, not just in the local area of the Carmichael mine itself but for the whole planet.

Ms STANDEN - Point of order, Madam Speaker, under standing order 201, relevancy of the debate, that the debate shall be confined to the clause or amendment before the committee. I fail to understand why the member's contribution on Adani, trees and all manner of interesting things relating to her arguments against Labor has anything to do with the amendments on social and affordable housing in her own electorate.

Madam SPEAKER - That is a big one and I am not certain how to rule on that. We are on the amendment and the member should be addressing that.

Dr WOODRUFF - Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is very interesting that Labor is happy for me to go into a history lesson about what the Liberals have done in planning over the last five and a half years when it suits them but, when the spotlight shines on them, all of a sudden they are jumping up and dusting off ancient standing orders which have never been used in my time in this place to try to shut me down and derail me from the conversation.

Let us go back to the topic at hand. We were talking about threatened species and the importance of planning and protection -

Opposition members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, let us have some composure.

Dr WOODRUFF - The example of Labor and the Adani mine means that we have to have laws that are strong enough to do something about what is obviously such a planet-damaging development as the Labor-supported Adani coalmine. In Tasmania -

Ms Standen - Oh, we're back on Adani?

Dr WOODRUFF - It is not a laughing matter, Ms Standen. There are plenty of children who are crying themselves to sleep at night at the thought of that mine going ahead.

Ms Standen - Affordable housing in your electorate and Adani is the best you could bring up?

Madam SPEAKER - Order. I ask Ms Standen to obey the rules.

Dr WOODRUFF - Madam Speaker, there are many things that this planning scheme has done badly and the community is enlivened to the problems within it. They understand all too fully that they have now limited opportunities for meaningful engagement about many things that may concern them about local developments.

Within that context, it is not surprising that 300 people turned up to a community meeting in July to talk about the concerns they had over a proposed subdivision at Huntingfield and the planning process in particular. It was the planning process and the consultation that really concerned people.

In addition to that, there was a whole raft of issues people raised as concerns about that subdivision, as they would about any subdivision that was being proposed, and they were very relevant questions to ask - about stormwater flow and the impact on local nature reserves, in this instance the Peter Murrell Reserve which is much loved by people because it protects remnant vegetation and animals and is a beautiful recreation area for all the people who live in this now increasingly intensely developed part of southern Tasmania.

People also talked - particularly from Tarremah and St Aloysius - about their real concerns about the placement of the business district and its very close location to their schools. There were many concerns about road and traffic flow and the extremely high density of dwellings that was proposed in the initial consultation, which was to be far higher than anywhere else in Tasmania. There were so many issues that people wanted more information about. They were very concerned that the Premier and member for Franklin, Will Hodgman, was not at the meeting, and although the premise for this housing land supply order was to provide affordable housing to people in the Kingston region, they were also very concerned that the order did not specify an amount and did not define 'affordable'.

The Greens remain concerned with those issues as well. I made this point a number of times to the minister's staff in the briefing the other day, and I thank the minister's staff for the comprehensive briefing we had on this Huntingfield land supply order. It was very much

appreciated, so thank you for the time and detail that was provided. We are concerned, however, that a land supply order which is created under an act specifically to increase the amount of affordable and social housing does not specify the proportion that will be used towards that.

I want to see more detail because I do not understand how that would play out in real terms in terms of houses on the ground. But the case has been made and it is understandable that the purpose of intensity is to enable smaller and cheaper houses to be built, because by definition by being smaller and on a smaller land base they will be more affordable.

There are many questions about what affordable means, and affordable to whom. We will continue to push the minister to make sure that the work that is being done in this area is supported by TasCOSS, by Shelter Tasmania, and by the other groups that are working hard every day trying to find solutions for what is a housing crisis in Tasmania.

Ms O'Connor will also be speaking this afternoon on this. We have much more to say about the motion that the Labor amendment is an amendment to. It is an outrageous piece of rubbish to put on the Notice Paper. It is disgraceful that this Government is showing contempt for parliamentary process. There was much more important legislation that could have been brought on today. This is a PR exercise. It is using parliament's time for propaganda releases from the Government about the Budget and on which they have wasted parliamentary time already. This has nothing to do with the supply of affordable housing. This is talking about investment in infrastructure.

This is a joke and a very poor joke. We do not need to have this debate today. We could be debating important legislation. This is totally unnecessary - it is a PR exercise for the department. You had your Government time this morning. Bring on legislation that is going to change people's lives.

This has given me a chance on behalf of the Greens, people in Tasmania and community groups, to put on the record, this Government's appalling performance in housing planning policy mismanagement, their disregard for the community. The only the way you treat the community is with fear and loathing. The voices of the community are something to run away from as fast as possible unless it is from the Property Council and a few other pet bodies that get listened to whenever the door is knocked on.

Mr Jaensch - Do you support the amendment?

Dr WOODRUFF - I have already said we support the amendment. It is the amendment I am speaking to.

Ms O'Connor - How could you not support that amendment?

Dr WOODRUFF - That is what I said.

[3.03 p.m.]

Ms STANDEN (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I support the amendment put by my colleague, Ms Dow, in relation to this unnecessary Notice of Motion on the Huntingfield Land Supply Order. This is a waste of the House's time. The Housing minister knows that having tabled the Housing Land Supply Order earlier this week, he could have picked up the phone and talked to me, to the Mayor of the Kingborough Council, or turned up to the community meeting held some weeks ago.

There have been many opportunities for the Housing minister to have a chat about the Housing Land Supply Order for Huntingfield. This is not one of the effective mechanisms.

He knows that having put the land supply order on the table in this place, and that he intends for it to be tabled, therefore, in the other place, the clock is ticking on a possible disallowance motion. The only conclusion I can draw is that he wants to play politics rather than responding to the community sector's demands for a bipartisan approach to social and affordable housing in this state, which has suffered from under-investment. Rather than responding in a bipartisan or tripartisan way, rather than sitting down around the table to talk about solutions to social and affordable housing, he wants an indication of whether or not opposition parties will move to disallow his motion.

The Government's record on social housing is one of failure. When debating the Land Supply Order legislation at the end of 2018 Labor put on record its support for that bill. I did not contemplate at the time that developments of the size and scale of Huntingfield would be fast-tracked and rezoned through that mechanism. The Planning minister knows there are standard planning mechanisms that would allow for a standard approach, with community consultation.

He knows he is only a couple of months away from completing a draft master plan. If he had taken time to complete the master plan first and front-ended this process, he could have avoided all this pain. The minister, the Premier, whose local electorate this is, and the failed former Housing minister, Mrs Petrusma, know this is a mistake, because they have been down this path before. They ought to know that by front-ending processes, like Mrs Petrusma did in the case of the Wirksworth development in my own electorate just a couple of short blocks away from my home, the pain that is caused in the community. In the case of the Wintringham development for housing aged people, homeless and people at risk of homelessness, if they had managed the community consultation process better they could have avoided the pain and backlash from the local community.

The Government is determined to blunder on and repeat the mistakes of the past rather than sitting down with the parties, the council, the local community, bodies like Planning Matters Alliance and with opposition parties. All this hoo-ha could be avoided.

During a debate a short time ago, the Housing minister called on us to be above politicking. It is galling that here we are, a few weeks later, with a motion before the House that is designed exactly for that purpose. It is a waste of the House's time; pure politicking when a land supply order has already been tabled.

Nonetheless, let me take this opportunity to speak on the amendment to the motion. It gives me an opportunity to outline the Government's woeful record on social and affordable housing, and to place on the record some of the comments that I and community sector organisations have made in relation to the pathway to improved social and affordable housing. Not just in Huntingfield, where it has been well known for some time that the area has been earmarked for development, but right across the state where the level of social and affordable housing sits at just 5.5 per cent or perhaps 6 per cent of the total supply of residential dwellings. There have been calls for that to be lifted to as high as 10 per cent.

We know that from 2013 to 2017 something like \$45.6 million less funding was invested and 506 fewer houses were available in that period. The wait lists since 2014 have tripled from 2400 in 2014 to just over 3300 today. The wait list for priority applicants has nearly tripled from

20.6 weeks to be housed in 2013-14 to now on average 50 weeks. I know of plenty of applicants who have been waiting for years and years and have simply given up.

The period 2009 to 2015 saw the completion of 2217 new affordable and social homes in Tasmania, achieved through a combination of Commonwealth and state funding. However, it was a period of accelerated development in social and affordable housing and it was sorely needed. Although some were completed in 2014 under the Hodgman Liberal Government, this was a completion of Labor initiatives. Of these homes, 1116 were affordable in the private market and the remaining were social and community housing stock.

Moving forward to the current Liberal Government's Affordable Housing Strategy which promised 900 new homes in the period 2015 to 2019, we know now that just 453 were completed in the five years to the end of June, so just 50 per cent of target. The Government further announced in their Affordable Housing Action Plan 2 that the second action plan would provide an additional 1500 new affordable homes, increasing the number of new affordable homes to 2400 over eight years, but when you peel that back it is not 2400 new homes at all, it is lots and homes. In fact in AHAP 2, as it is called, only 607 new social dwellings are promised.

If that is not bad enough, the backdrop to this, I am disgusted to note, is that over the five-year period of the Hodgman Liberal Government there has been a net decline in the housing stock of some 600 houses, so while we have more than 1600 homeless Tasmanians and 3300 on the public housing waiting list, there has been a net reduction in homes available to house some of the most vulnerable in this state.

How does the Government's plan fit with the estimate of demand? The Government's own Affordable Housing Strategy, which was based on old settings, stated that we require a minimum of 656 affordable homes every year to 2031 to meet what was then current demand. We know that this figure has been climbing every day since 2015 when that figure was set. Estimates vary now as to what the current demand is, but the most recent data I have is from Dr Kathleen Flanagan of the University of Tasmania, an eminent expert in the area of housing supply, who estimates that in the next 20 years the current need is just over 11 000 but the overall need will be 14 200 new social and affordable homes in the 20-year period at a massive cost of \$3.15 billion.

Madam Speaker, those are very big numbers and she said so at the time, but let us not shy away from them. The demand in Tasmania for social affordable housing is significant and it has been climbing. The AHURI report on social housing as infrastructure estimated that in the period to 2036 there would be an estimated 14 900 additional social housing dwellings required to meet projected needs. Who knows what the actual figure is? We know that TasCOSS, Shelter Tasmania and others have been calling for an accurate assessment of demand. The Government might have indicated that they will fund research through AHURI and UTAS and if that is so that is a very good thing because clearly that is a very big gap in terms of the estimate of demand. That should strengthen the call for tripartisan approaches across all levels of government to work together on this very significant area of need in this state.

I note that just yesterday there was a new report produced by -

Ms O'Connor - Compass - they made a submission and presented to the inquiry.

Ms STANDEN - Yes, showing that the true demand in social housing is about 600 per cent above the official figures which is a stunning figure and an absolute indictment on this Government's track record on social and affordable housing. Mr Kennedy, the report's author, said:

Income and assets data from the last Census suggest there are an additional 19 000 households eligible for social housing who have as yet chosen not to apply. If every household in Tasmania who met the eligibility criteria for social housing decided to apply, waiting lists would increase by 598 per cent, the highest increase of any Australian state.

Ms Kym Goodes of TasCOSS said that a large number of Tasmanians had given up putting up their hand for social housing and other basic support in the face of such high demand.

As chair of the affordable housing select committee I wish to reflect on a couple of public submissions made to that process from the University of Tasmania, Shelter Tasmania, TasCOSS, Anglicare and the Local Government Association of Tasmania.

Mr JAENSCH - Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker I believe Ms Standen is about to discuss submissions made to an inquiry that is still underway.

Ms STANDEN - They are public submissions that are up on the website.

Mr Jaensch - I am just checking.

Ms STANDEN - A little sensitive, but thank you for trying to protect me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - If they are public submissions they are appropriate to be discussed but if they are private from the committee that is different.

Ms STANDEN - The transcripts are available on the public record. You do not need to be quite so sensitive, Mr Jaensch. What I am about to say ought to be seen as strengthening your arm in terms of the need for social and affordable housing and increased investment in this state. Sure, you can see it as a direct criticism of your Government's poor track record, but I want to provide context for the House in relation to the Huntingfield development.

Professor Eccleston of the University of Tasmania said:

Our broad assessment is that the housing market remains incredibly tight. In the availability of suitable and affordable and stable housing, the conditions have not improved over the last two to three years, notwithstanding various initiatives and investment. The key criteria are that there are levels of housing stress in the community and particularly the private rental market. The latest data in our work is consistent with this; private rents as a function of income are only marginally behind Sydney and greater Hobart is one of the tightest rental markets in the country.

Any working household on average earnings in the private rental market in Greater Hobart is experiencing rental stress that is fairly significant. A cause of that, and further evidence to explain why that is the case, is that the private rental

vacancy rate, as we measure it, remains at unprecedented lows in terms of consistent methods ...

And so it goes on. He very validly points out that the overarching objective ought to be about liveability. He says:

Not only are we increasing the supply of housing, but how can we be sure if that is suitable, affordable, fit for purpose and well-located in terms of access to social services, employment, infrastructure and to ensure we have strong and interconnected communities? That is the medium- to long-term challenge for our state.

I mentioned before that Dr Flanagan estimated a need for 14 200 dwellings, with 11 100 required to meet current need and she goes on to define that and outline the total funding required of \$3.5 billion over 20 years. She says:

I acknowledge that these numbers are so large that they are virtually unthinkable but we cannot pretend they do not exist.

Members interjecting.

Ms STANDEN - I think you would do well, Mrs Rylah, since you were a member of this committee, to be quiet and listen to some of the very valid submissions. I note that you were absent for most of the committee hearings, so this will be news to you, I am sure.

I am trying to strengthen the Government's bow in relation to accelerating the level of investment in social and affordable housing. It is very clear that the level of investment at the moment is very much too low.

I asked Dr Flanagan whether the current level of investment through the Affordable Housing Action Plan and the Affordable Housing Strategy was sufficient to meet the target of 14 200 homes within the existing policy framework. Dr Flanagan's simple answer to that was no.

Shelter Tasmania went on to talk about the impact of short-stay accommodation. Although they were very polite about it, it was clear that the Government's hands-off approach in relation to short-stay is a contributor here, in particular with the private rental market and rental affordability index escalating significantly in the last few years with one in five in the private rental market being squeezed slowly but surely, putting downward pressure on the social and affordable housing market.

Ms Chugg says she thinks to get to 10 per cent to address the imbalance and current shortfall, we are calling 10 per cent of properties to be social affordable housing rather than the current 6 per cent of properties that shifts as our population grows rather than just being numbers when you are pawing for a percentage. She says, 'I think to get to 10 per cent is a huge change in the paradigm of thinking about how we balance the housing system'. Not to underestimate the very significant challenge in that area.

Ms Goodes from TasCOSS said, 'In our view, Tasmania is facing an unprecedented housing affordability crisis'. In her submission she talked about how the environment changed significantly about three years ago. The consensus from the community sector, insomuch as the housing debt is

a big drag on the expenditure in affordable housing, is that AHAP 1 and 2 were probably reasonable. They were set within the parameters of resourcing available at the time rather than the demand that was projected. Since 2015, demand has significantly grown. Therefore, and these are my words, not directly from the community sector, my conclusion from that is the current level of investment is manifestly inadequate.

Mr Mundy from Anglicare, a long-standing and well-respected person within the community sector in Tasmania says -

We believe that the housing system is full and blocked at the moment for most people who want to enter it. There is nowhere for exiting crisis to go. Nowhere for people exiting supported accommodation to go. These are very key issues for us.

Many submissions were heartbreaking. They focused not on housing supply, but on homelessness and supported accommodation, those who are falling out of our affordable housing system.

Mrs Rylah interjecting.

Ms STANDEN - Mrs Rylah, talk about things that you know something about. I presume from your interjections that you know very little about social affordable housing.

In summary, the contributions of this very valuable exercise of the Select Committee on Affordable Housing looks at the need to boost the level of investment in social affordable housing from some 6 per cent to 10 per cent and the need for population and settlement planning and policy. It observes that the private market has not responded, and in particular, in the last three to five years the market conditions have deteriorated significantly.

We know Huntingfield is a significant opportunity - 34 hectares and an estimate of some 450 dwellings. I am keen to hear from the Minister for Housing whether the 15 per cent is social housing or whether that is social and affordable housing, as he said in his contribution on this debate on this motion.

I thank the minister and the eminent experts within the planning and housing areas of the departments for a comprehensive briefing on this substantial housing land supply order. I have every faith in the professionalism and the commitment of those officers. I thank them very much for their commitment to this process. I noticed their eyes showed they had some doubts over the corners that they were being asked to cut. In particular, when I asked the officers whether the 15 per cent was social or social and affordable, was it an absolute commitment, was it a maximum or what, a bit of dodging and weaving went on. Since the minister has brought on this motion I take the opportunity to once and for all clarify: is it a maximum? Is it a target? Is it something that is mandated under the Homes Act? I understand that the delivery mechanism is yet to be resolved and that there will be a joint-partnership/private-developer relationship with the community housing sector and so on. I am not so focused on that. The fundamentals in a land supply order on proportions of social affordable housing ought to be very clear and they are not.

I understand the history of this large allotment of land. The 34 hectares is significantly larger than the other four parcels of lands that have been released by the Government under this fast-track mechanism.

I acknowledge the people from the Kingsborough Council, local residents, Planning Matters Association and the countless constituents who have contracted my office with their concerns about this. As I said at the beginning, if there is one thing that comes from this minimum-possible consultation process, I hope the Housing minister learns that if he front-ends the process with better consultation then he would save himself some pain.

I had asked in the instances where the Government is looking at using fast-track rezoning, where does the onus lie in filling that gap in community engagement? Does that need to be front ended or is it adequately captured in the normal process? Dr Stevenson said in her submission to the Select Committee on Housing Affordability -

When there is a significant piece of land, it needs to be front-ended. In the way that a council might undertake master planning before they did a major rezoning exercise because there will be no other opportunity.

My colleague, Ms Dow, has already outlined the local government associations' concerns in relation to this. Dr Stevenson said -

Fast-track doesn't mean you abrogate the responsibility around community engagement and it might not have to be the same full council process but there has to be an engagement process and that is just common sense.

Clearly, this minister, this Government and the Premier, whose local electorate this is, lacks that common sense because if they had taken account of advice like that, they would have been in the community, speaking with the council, speaking with local residents and getting it right. They could have spent a couple more months on the master planning process and they could have saved themselves this pain.

As others have said, there have been concerns about density and scale. I have talked about guarantees for social and affordable housing. I want to pick up on the minister's comment that this is an opportunity for a model housing estate. Well, hear, hear, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I visited Lightsview in South Australia and I have seen firsthand what is possible with clever, innovative urban design. I understand, though, that it is a stretch for Tasmania and it is an opportunity to show leadership for the council, community and the private sector, the building and construction industry in particular. It would be a challenge to take on new approaches to building, and even different materials. There needs to be significant investment in the building and construction industry. As we have heard through the submission process to the select committee, it is one of the barriers to social and affordable housing development in this state.

In relation to the master plan, the Kingborough Council mayor has put it very succinctly to me and has said what is happening here is that the community and the council are being asked to take the Government on trust. This is quite a substantial land supply order with substantial detail in it, but in the end, as the minister has said, it is just a mechanism for fast-track rezoning. It does not have the detail of what this development application will be.

The process has been dreadful from beginning to end. As to the level of consultation, the minimum possible route was taken on the draft order. He put it out to a handful - 10, 11 or 12, I don't know - let him explain how few people he wrote to because that was the minimum required under the legislation. There may have been a day or two around that 12-day period minimum

consultation period but no longer, so particularly for under-resourced community organisations, schools and the like with whom I have met, that is an impossible ask.

He stands in this place and has the gall to say, 'We have listened. Look, we've come up with this fat document and we've listened to all these comments and tick, tick, tick', but has he shown the community the respect of going back to front those schools and the council and front a community meeting that he failed to attend in the first instance and say, 'Here we go, I've listened to your concerns and this is what I propose as an approach'? Has he taken that opportunity? Wouldn't you think you would?

Clearly, he has been positioning and timing the tabling of this order very carefully to ensure he maximises his opportunity for getting his land supply order by using the numbers of the parliament to get it through.

Mrs Rylah - How could he have done that? We didn't know that Bacon was going to resign. That's pathetic. Talk about the bottom of the barrel. Almost an own goal.

Ms STANDEN - He has taken the low road.

Mr Jaensch - I have taken the fast track because we had an emergency, remember?

Ms STANDEN - How do you describe an emergency or crisis? The Housing minister has the gall in this place to proclaim that he is fast-tracking social and affordable housing when I have just outlined to this House that he has a target of some 607 new social housing dwellings in his Affordable Housing Action Plan 2 to take us through to 2023, which will be woefully short of demand.

Time expired.

[3.34 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I will not be speaking for long on this rubbish motion. It is Thursday, it is not private members' time, it is not Government private members' time, and we have a motion on the books which has no action attached to it and no tangibles for people who need housing. It is simply an exercise in self-congratulation. It is regrettable and cynical to use the parliament's time in this way and it points to a really weak legislative agenda and a desire for the Government to try to look good in the social and affordable housing space. It does not look good and it has not looked good since it came to government.

I hope this does not upset you, Ms Standen, but I agreed with pretty much everything you said. It was very hard to argue with the facts you laid out.

Ms Standen, Ms Butler, myself, Mr Tucker, the member for Lyons, and Mrs Rylah are all on the housing inquiry which this parliament established in order to address what is clearly a housing crisis. Ever since we established the inquiry and started listening to evidence, the truth of the housing situation in Tasmania, not just in the city, is coming to light. The depth of the housing need in this state is something that requires urgent attention and it is not going to be dealt with by the housing land supply order for Huntingfield.

Mr Jaensch - Every bit counts.

Ms O'CONNOR - That is true, Mr Jaensch, every bit does count, but it is disappointing that we still have not had a clear statement from you, as minister, about what quantum of the proposed 450 houses will be social and affordable housing.

Mr Jaensch - It's in the report.

Mr O'Byrne - 'Up to'.

Ms O'CONNOR - Up to - that is right. All of that said, it is very clear that although this was a consultation process that slipped out of the Government's control because, as Ms Standen said, there was no commitment to meaningful consultation on the Huntingfield land supply order, what has happened is that people in that community have rightly expressed their concern. I imagine many members of this House have received many dozens of emails from concerned residents who did not feel heard, but it is clear that they have been heard and there has been a level of sensitivity to the community angst about the original draft housing supply order.

When you have a look at the contrast between what was originally put before the community in the draft and what we have now, it is a substantially improved housing supply order. That is a win for the community, because the community made its voice clear that it wanted to be heard and to a very significant extent, process issues aside, this reflects that the community's concerns were taken into account.

It is pretty clear that there are a number of quite -

Ms Standen - The Government's two local members aren't here to listen to this debate which shows the level of respect and concern that they have.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, it is very odd that on a motion which the Government proudly brought forward for there to be only the minister and Mrs Rylah in the Chamber representing the Government. However I recall yesterday during Labor's private members' time that it was just the Leader of the Opposition and for a period of time the member for Braddon, Ms Dow. I do not know what that says, but it says something.

There have been a number of significant changes made to the draft housing supply order.

Mr O'Byrne - I wasn't allowed in. It's not fair, I was chucked out.

Ms O'CONNOR - Waah, call a wambulance, Mr O'Byrne.

Mr O'Byrne - I haven't heard that for quite some time, since the school ground.

Ms O'CONNOR - We want to thank people who came from the department to brief Dr Woodruff on the Tasmanian Greens' behalf on the changes and the final supply order that was tabled in the parliament. It is pretty clear that the area zoned for higher density has been significantly reduced. That is a direct response to the concerns that were raised by residents. The area zoned for open space has increased and open space breaks have been included between the residential zoned areas. The two local business zones have been reduced to one and that zone no longer borders on existing housing or schools. There has been an extra five-metre setback from the Peter Murrell Reserve, which is a very significant natural area that demands protection and

sensitivity in relation to development around it. It is also a habitat for pardalotes. It is very important that we protect the Peter Murrell Reserve.

I feel quite strongly about the Huntingfield development because the master planning for the development began when I was the minister for housing. I believed then and I still believe that with Huntingfield the intent of Housing Tasmania and the housing innovations unit is to deliver a quality housing development. That and protecting the Peter Murrell Reserve was the driving objective when I was minister. There is a band of significant Aboriginal cultural heritage that runs just along the northern boundary of the Peter Murrell Reserve. Protecting those attributes is really important. I believe to a significant extent that the supply order does that.

We have also received detailed responses to some of the issues raised by the community in our briefing. I do not want to do the minister's job for him but I do want to talk about the process after rezoning.

A master plan will be developed containing the specifics of the proposal. This will likely go out for public and council comment in October or November this year. A final document will be prepared in early 2020. Minister, when you make your reply on this notice of motion you might restate that commitment to listening very carefully to the community and the council through the finalisation of the master plan that goes to council. The master plan, if it is endorsed by the council, will have to conform with a future subdivision application to council. If the master plan is not endorsed by council criteria outlined in the housing supply order it will have to be met in the subdivision application.

The subdivision application and any future development application will go through the normal planning process allowing for public comment. I believe, minister, when I checked with you earlier today, that the process from here provides three opportunities for public comment and input into Huntingfield?

Mr Jaensch - Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - At least three opportunities. Thank you, minister.

Mr Jaensch - As well as the three that have already been, through the regional land use strategy, the council's land use strategy and the draft order.

Ms O'CONNOR - It is only truly accurate and fair to count one consultation over the specifics of the Huntingfield housing land supply order. That is the one opportunity to date that people directly affected by what happens on the Huntingfield site have been given an opportunity to feed into the land supply order.

If the master plan is not endorsed then criteria outlined in the housing supply order will have to be met in the subdivision application. The subdivision application and any future development application will go through the normal planning process, through the Kingborough Council, which has rightly been aggrieved at the way this has been handled to date, for public comment.

The master plan is intended to address the number of the issues raised and be binding on future applications to council. The master plan, on our information provided through that briefing, will address commitments to social and affordable housing, infrastructure requirements for the

development and the number of lots that are finally decided upon through the housing land supply order. Is that correct, minister?

Mr Jaensch - Yes.

Mr O'Byrne - Is this question time?

Ms O'CONNOR - You have to take every opportunity in here, Mr O'Byrne. I am restating why we believe that the final housing supply order for Huntingfield that has been laid on the table in here is a significant improvement on the draft that went out six to eight weeks ago. I am laying out our reasoning for being more comfortable with this.

I will add that the community is not yet reassured. This is a challenge for the minister and the people he works with in Housing Tasmania and the housing innovations unit, as Ms Standen said, to engage in a meaningful way with the people who still feel aggrieved. The reason they feel aggrieved, as Dr Woodruff said, is because of this Government's history of being secretive and undermining the planning system in Tasmania and the public's right to have a say.

We are speaking on Labor's amendment but I want to foreshadow that we have a further amendment, which has been distributed. I have given a copy to Labor and to the Speaker. I am looking for my copy for the minister. Dr Woodruff and I have spent a good five minutes looking for it and I cannot find a spare, so let me read it to you, minister.

Mr Jaensch - An amendment to the amendment?

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes.

Madam Speaker, I move -

That the motion be amended by omitting all words after 'That the House' and inserting instead -

- (1) Acknowledges that Tasmania's housing crisis has occurred due to the Liberal Government:
 - (a) under-investing in social and affordable housing;
 - (b) doing too little, too late to regulate short-stay accommodation; and
 - (c) pursuing aggressive population and tourism growth targets without any forward thinking or planning.
- (2) Calls on the Liberal Government to:
 - (a) significantly increase their investment in social and affordable housing;
 - (b) introduce regulations to prevent growth in short stay properties and tight rental markets;
 - (c) undertake comprehensive settlement and population planning.

- (3) Agrees that instead of patting himself on the back, the minister should spend his time in the House bringing forward meaningful legislation to improve housing outcomes for Tasmanians.

One of the most significant pieces of legislation that applies to people who are in both the public and private rental market is the Residential Tenancy Act. The Residential Tenancy Act, as it currently stands, is insufficient to protect the rights of renters from landlords who are gouging, from substandard rental accommodation, from rental accommodation that has inadequate heating or insulation. There need to be amendments made to the Residential Tenancy Act lifting those minimum standards to make sure that everyone who is in a rental house, whether it is in the private or the public rental market, has their rights to safe, secure and liveable housing upheld by the law in Tasmania. We will be watching this Government on the Residential Tenancy Act. We have flagged bringing some amendments forward.

We want to see this minister and this Government take seriously the soaring rents in Tasmania. We have had people come to us who have been sluggish with, in one fell swoop, rent increases of \$50, \$70 or \$100 per week. A single parent family with children who are dependent on some way or another on Commonwealth income support cannot cope with rent increases on that scale.

Mr Jaensch - That is why we have a commissioner and that is why they issue orders, as you know, because you have the answers to your questions. Do not misrepresent that. There is control.

Ms O'CONNOR - Which answers to the questions? That we put on notice?

Mr Jaensch - Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, you may have signed them but I have not seen them. Were they tabled today?

Mr Jaensch - No, have they been tabled? I have seen the answers to your questions.

Ms O'CONNOR - They are lost in the bureaucracy somewhere, Mr Jaensch. I do not have the answers to the questions we put on notice three weeks ago, and now that you, by interjection -

Ms STANDEN - Point of order, Madam Speaker, as we are at a bit of a juncture here. For clarification I request some information from the member. We are on an amendment to the amendment, but the amendment from the Greens is worded as an amendment to the original motion rather than amendment to the amendment.

Ms O'Connor - That is why I read it into *Hansard* and said that the motion be amended by deleting all clauses.

Madam SPEAKER - Someone wiser than me will work this out.

Ms Standen - Could we get some advice? Just so we understand procedurally, that's all.

Ms O'CONNOR - I am happy to wait for some advice.

Madam SPEAKER - You can keep talking.

Ms O'CONNOR - As I was saying, if the current arrangements for tenants in public and private rentals were adequate, we would not still be hearing from constituents who are getting slugged with rents that are unaffordable and, we would argue, unjustifiable. The current framework with the Residential Tenancy Commission in Tasmania is clearly inadequate, Mr Jaensch, because it is not protecting tenants from landlords gouging.

Mr Jaensch -Any mechanism requires referral.

Madam SPEAKER - The member's amendment is in order.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to put onto the *Hansard* some of the evidence that has been presented to the inquiry about particularly at-risk cohorts in an incredibly tight housing market. The testimony we heard, for example, from the Youth Network of Tasmania, which represents the interests of 85 000 young people aged 12 to 25, makes it clear that this is a particularly vulnerable cohort of Tasmanians who require social and affordable housing. In the private rental market, the evidence we heard is that young people are being squeezed out of a rental market where a property is advertised and 40 to 50 people turn up to inspect and may apply and it is invariably not the young people who get that rental.

The testimony of YNOT is that young people are being turned away from homelessness services, that they are experiencing the dark side of the two-speed economy, and it is the side of the two-speed economy that the Government never talks about. I have not heard any minister in this Government talk, for example, in any meaningful way about the soaring level and the tragedy of youth unemployment in Tasmania, and when young people cannot find a secure home it is that much harder for them to access education, skills training and employment.

I encourage all members of this House to have a look at some of the submissions that have come into the housing inquiry. There is a number of excellent submissions. The one YNOT has put forward contains four key recommendations, which are:

1. Engage with young Tasmanians experiencing housing stress and homelessness to identify solutions and inform future policy.
2. Regulate the short-stay tourism accommodation industry to encourage investment in the private rental market.
3. Greater investment in social housing and prioritisation for young people in areas with reliable public transport and access to services, including education, employment and health care.
4. Explore and invest in alternative long-term supported accommodation models for young people experiencing homelessness with complex needs.

We also had testimony from Laurel House, an excellent service in the north and north-west of Tasmania to provide supports to victims of sexual assault. The testimony that came before the inquiry from Laurel House was very firm that there are people now on the waiting list who are highly traumatised and have experienced shocking sexual assault violence. That means they are being turned away at a time when they need support the most. Laurel House has called for much more responsive Housing Tasmania policies for the victims of sexual assault and domestic and

family violence. They make the point that there is a direct link between sexual domestic violence and homelessness and that in fact it is the leading cause of homelessness.

The testimony to the committee was that the shelters are bursting to overflowing. In these situations, it is often children who are hurt the most and are pushed into homelessness. In broad terms, Laurel House makes it clear that the fastest growing at-risk group for homelessness are single women over 50. This is potentially a hidden cohort of homelessness because these women are often quiet about their circumstances and will rely on the kindness of friends and family for a roof over their heads.

Laurel House recommends increasing the affordable medium-term and long-term housing options for people escaping domestic violence, increasing the supply of one-bedroom units or supported housing models and providing financial assistance for housing costs for a temporary period for people escaping domestic and family violence to access or to remain in private rental housing as a long-term option. They recommend that social and affordable housing providers should relax their eligibility criteria for people escaping domestic violence, especially those with children, and this would allow, particularly women, who are predominately affected, who may technically have a home or a name on a title but no financial means or income to access affordable housing programs.

We also had a very interesting presentation to the inquiry from Hobart City Mission about the causes of the current housing crisis. As we know, the reckless and negligent under-investment in increasing the supply of social and affordable housing for the first three budgets of the Hodgman Liberal Government has most certainly contributed towards this crisis, as has the explosion of Airbnb, unchecked and unregulated.

The Hobart City Mission submission talks about some of those demand side factors that have increased the demand for social and affordable housing in southern Tasmania in particular, which include: one, a natural increase in housing demand from young Tasmanians entering the home ownership market; two, increased migration to Tasmania from mainland states; and three, an increased number of international students enrolling to study at the University of Tasmania. In the evidence that we heard the population of international students is about 5500 and every one of those kids needs a roof over their head too. There are also significantly increased tourism numbers coming to Tasmania.

Mr Jaensch - And people are not having to go away to get a job anymore as much.

Ms O'CONNOR - Actually, there are a lot of young people leaving the state, Mr Jaensch, and there is a whole range of reasons for that. In fact I encouraged my children to leave the state and to go and learn some more about the world and then come back, settle down, invest their skills in this place and have a family, hopefully, although in a time of climate emergency I am no longer telling my children that they should have children. You cannot tell your kids to do or not to do anything when they are adults but I am not particularly optimistic about the world that my grandchildren will be in.

Mr Jaensch - You as a grandmother?

Ms O'CONNOR - I would be all right.

Hobart City Mission also points to net migration to Tasmania. This goes back to the point you were trying to make, Mr Jaensch, that net migration to Tasmania in the last year totalled 6500 people. The Government has committed to a population of 650 000 people by the year 2050. If the climate keeps going the way that it is, we will have more people than that here in the year 2050. It is highly problematic when you set a target for population but you do not have a plan for dealing with population and settlement. We were the only party that went to the March state election with a comprehensive plan dealing with population growth in Tasmania. Apparently now it sits at about 520 000 people. This is leading to increased congestion, a tight rental market, the lack of efficient, cost-affordable, cost-effective, public and active transport. We are experiencing ad hoc development. We are at risk of cultivating urban sprawl, which impacts on natural values, bushland and water supplies.

There is regional inequity. That was another interesting part of our inquiry - learnings. We heard, for example, from St Helens Neighbourhood House about the pressures even in a regional town like St Helens.

Mrs Rylah - Especially in regional towns.

Ms O'CONNOR - It is hard to say especially because this is happening all over Tasmania. A lot of the focus has been on the pressures in the south but it was illuminating to listen to the manager of the St Helens Neighbourhood House talk about the pressures within that small community to find affordable housing. One of the issues was the increase in short-stay accommodation.

Then there are sea changers who are coming to Tasmania because it is the best place in the world to live. We are seeing the impacts of unmanaged population growth happening right across Tasmania. It is our responsibility to work together on population settlement planning, so we have good urban boundaries, so we are protecting our natural values and we are protecting amenity, we are making sure that there is a sustainable use of resources as is required under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act. We need to develop a population and settlement plan that is aligned with state policies on climate change and settlement, transport and infrastructure.

There needs to be a stand-alone department of planning established, planning for Tasmania's future. We also strongly feel that you need to have the expertise providing advice to government as our population grows.

In this state we should have a state engineer. I often say to my nephew in Queensland, who is studying civil engineering and finding it a bit boring in the third year because they have to dig a lot of holes, that engineers will save the world. They will be a critical part of coping with some of the future shocks that come with a climate emergency.

We also need to reinstate the office of the state architect. When I was the housing minister, I asked Peter Poulet, who was the then state architect, in for a chat. We worked together - my office, Housing Tasmania, the state architect - to develop a set of liveability principles for new housing development in Tasmania that recognised that you need to have spaces for people and you need to create communities. In the fabric of that design you need to make sure that you have green spaces, that you have safety so the people who live in these communities feel safe walking their streets at night and that you are building houses which are thermally efficient, have universal design principles and in an ideal world are attractive houses.

I am certain that since the Liberals came to office, the former state architect's outstanding work on a set of liveability principles for Tasmania has been ditched. The minister would do well to dust off that body of work by Peter Poulet and make sure it is applied to the Huntingfield development. We have an opportunity to create something quite remarkable. Minister, I believe that is what you would like to see too. Even though it has been handled in a ham-fisted way by your Government there is an opportunity to turn the Huntingfield Stage 2 into a highly liveable, attractive, climate-resilient, connected to services, beautifully designed, slightly higher density development that is a model for 21st century suburban development.

We also need a state demographer who can provide advice to Government on what is happening in population shifts. I saw some work by outstanding demographer Lisa Denny, who works in the UTAS Institute for the Study of Social Change, that pointed to decline in some municipal areas. In about 26 municipal areas around Tasmania you are likely to see population decline. That throws down a challenge to Government to make sure that we are investing in regions, we are asking regional communities what their infrastructure needs are and what their hopes and dreams for the future are. We do not want to lose the community spirit that is in rural and regional Tasmania.

We cannot support the motion put forward by the Minister for Housing. It is not because we do not support increasing the supply of social and affordable housing. It is far too inane and self-congratulatory for us to support. That is why we have moved the amendment. It is also impossible for the Greens in this place to support the Tasmanian Government's \$1.6 billion investment in infrastructure of roads and bridges, which has nothing to do with increasing the supply of social and affordable housing. It is simply self-congratulatory pap. It is about time the Government started recognising social and affordable housing construction for what it is. It is an investment in social infrastructure. We need to think about housing as social infrastructure and not another part of the infrastructure objective of Government. This is social infrastructure and it should be regarded as such.

The stigma that is attached to social housing must be dealt with. One of the ways to do that is to invest in those communities as we have done through reforms that were brought in by the Labor-Green government - sorry, Standing Order 144 - for working with the community sector to revive communities through better housing futures. When you go out to Clarendon Vale and to Brighton-Gagebrook, where we have seen better housing futures roll out, you are seeing rejuvenation of communities and of the social fabric of those communities. That is very positive.

We will not be supporting the motion that the Government has put forward. It is a waste of the parliament's time, but it is an important opportunity to address some of the housing issues in debate that Tasmania has. I am taking the opportunity anyway, even though it is pretty clear what this is about.

[4.09 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak on the amendment to the amendment to the motion. We will not be supporting the amendment to the amendment to the motion, because we feel that the amendment that has been put forward to the original motion is superior in terms of its content and its ability to articulate the problems with this Government and their lack of vision and their lack of action on issues, not only around housing but around a range of issues. We will flag that at the outset. In doing so, I acknowledge the work of my parliamentary colleagues, the shadows in this area, Ms Anita Dow and Ms Alison Standen, for their work on this amendment.

Bringing this motion in on this day was clearly a political wedge stunt by the Government. Their work on the amendment to the motion gives it some level of substance. It gives the subject matter due respect. I also acknowledge their work in consulting with the local community and with a key range of stakeholders on this appallingly ham-fisted approach to housing development from this Government.

If you ever want an illustration of a government with no vision, no direction, no comprehension of what it is going to take to assist the state traverse some difficult waters particularly in housing, this is it. This is a government that has absolutely no legislative agenda. Here we are, on the Government's day, Thursday afternoon, and we are debating a motion that, as other speakers have acknowledged, means nothing in the scheme of things, except to fill in time. There was no bill introduced in the House today, nor yesterday; there were no bills introduced into the House in the Thursday of the sitting week most recent.

Last year the Government introduced 66 bills. So far, to date you have introduced 35. Most of the bills that you have put on the table are on minor administrative matters. This is a government that clearly has no legislative agenda and no vision and no strategy for the future of the state. It is indicative that you are spending all this time on a motion that you know means nothing. The most amazing and galling thing is that you have led with your chin. You have brought on a motion about a subject which makes you look bad. Your consultation process, not only in terms of the implementation of a strategy for housing, but on this particular matter, has been appalling. You claim that you need to act on the crisis and that is why you need to go through this shortened process. It is a crisis of your own making.

Mr Jaensch - You voted for the process, you fool.

Mr O'BYRNE - Of course we did. We are helping you out, mate. Your Government has driven the state into a housing crisis.

Mr Jaensch - You used to think there was an urgency. You used to think there was an emergency.

Mr O'BYRNE - By interjection, he is a bit sensitive. I can understand that. In the Cabinet room they have said, 'How are we going to fill Thursday afternoon? We have no agenda, no bills. Oh, Minister for Housing, Roger, can we get you to speak on a motion that makes you look bad, completely exposes you for an appalling process with the local community and exposes a government for six years of inaction on housing?'

Not only do they not have a legislative agenda, they cannot get on a motion that remotely makes them look average. Even mediocre would be nice. It is appalling. Speaker after speaker on housing, community group after community group on housing, have been very clear in criticising the Government for a lack of action and a lack of strategy. You have been criticised up hill and down dale. You respond with a panicked, white-knuckled approach at Huntingfield that has divided the community. You should hang your head in shame for the way you have tried to smash it through.

Yes, you have consulted and, yes, you have made some changes recently but the way you have dealt with this is appalling. We know it is a crisis of your own making. The former failed housing minister, Mrs Petrusma, stood in Huntingfield in 2015 and said, 'We want to build a supply of affordable housing in Tasmania. It is a key reform direction of the Hodgman Liberal Government'.

On the same day, the minister said, 'We will progress the second stage of the Huntingfield land release project near Kingston in the state's south to deliver about 230 serviced residential lots'.

Ms Standen - Do you know how many social housing dwellings she delivered in her term? Thirty-seven.

Mr O'BYRNE - What a legacy 37 is. No legislative agenda and you force poor old Roger to soak up enough time in this parliament to get yourself through to adjournment tonight. You have dragged on a motion about a disallowable order to fill in time. We all know it.

He has fled the Chamber because not only is this a waste of the parliament's time; it is a classic own goal. It is an illustration of the incompetence of the Hodgman Government in this policy area, and is indicative of their incompetence in other policy areas. It is indicative of the fact that they are willing to throw the minister who has just resumed his seat onto the table and say, 'Mate, can you soak up a bit of time, cop a bit of flack and lose a couple of coats of paint on this issue?'

In 2015, the bold plan was to build in Kingston and deliver 230 residential lots. Guess what? The community at the time was aware of it and expecting a proper consultation process. The community that I spoke to knew that the Huntingfield development had been identified for a long time and that there was going to be development there. When the Government announced 230 at a press conference in 2015, four years ago, there was no community outcry. They were expecting a proper process and a master plan to work through, as the member for Franklin, Ms Standen, talked about. If you had only spent a few more months doing some hard work, you may not have got into the grief that you are in.

Ms O'Connor - Mr O'Byrne, they make no apologies.

Mr O'BYRNE - No, because they are the only ones that are going to build the housing, and they are the ones that have a strategy. That is why we have more people sleeping rough. That is why we have more people without housing, more people in marginalised circumstances and the experiences of our community. Since my being re-elected in 2018, housing has become a white hot issue. You do not have a strategy, and you have been hopeless for the last five or six years. You make a strategy but you do not implement it; it is all words. You move from 'houses' to 'houses and lots'. Okay, well get your swag out and hope for the best.

In white-knuckle panic you think, hang on, here is a go. We can load up on Huntingfield. We can load up on that community. You go through a consultation process and the consultation letter went to only 15 residents. We took on trust that you would have a genuine consultation with the local community. We took you on trust that you would do the right thing and that you would not dive into this sort of rubbish. The letter went to 15 residents and only three other interested parties. You only had three other interested parties to communicate with.

The initial letter did not go to Tarremah School or the school next door. The other letter went to the local parish priest. They must be confused about who is the responsible person there. The local council did not even formally receive their letter. This is incompetent.

Then you want to rush it through but the community was expecting 230 lots, but now it is 500 plus lots. Really intensive. Then you wonder why there was a public meeting of 300 people that was organised in very quick time. Many people came out. Do not dismiss them as people who do not want anything in their backyard. These are decent community people who wanted to be

consulted and wanted to have a say. They thought, four years previously, they were going to get a 230-housing lot. There was broad community support for that. They were waiting for the master plan. Then, in your white-knuckle panic, you try to bash through over 500 lots into that community with little or no genuine community consultation.

When the balloon went up and people were concerned, you went on radio and assured people that the zoning in the area is consistent with Spring Farm. You said it was inner-residential when it was not; it is general residential. You were misinformed and you misinformed the community and you copped an absolute pizzling.

It is just outrageous that you would try to bash this through in the way you have and upset the community. It is illustrative of your ham-fisted approach to anything important and major in this state. You fumble every time. You wait for something to happen, wait for it to blow up, and then in white-knuckle panic you try to bash something through. In this case, you should hang your head in shame. When you talk to the community members down there, the local members are nowhere to be seen.

Minister, you had the opportunity to go to that community meeting and you chose not to. If you were really open-handed about this and wanted to consult with the committee, that was a great opportunity for you. You did not have to get up and give a speech, just listen. There were motions passed at that meeting. The council has been outraged by your approach in terms of this. They were willing to work with you on this, but no. In an attempt to try to wedge people and play more pathetic politics, you bring this motion in to save a bit of time to get you through to the adjournment tonight.

Ms O'Connor - Or to wedge you guys.

Mr O'BYRNE - Yes, that is what it is. If you actually had some bills to debate, we know this motion would not be on the table. I would go back to your caucus and say, 'I'm not the fall guy here. Pick someone else to suck up some time', and maybe we would pick an issue you can defend.

Mrs Rylah - Look at the blue.

Mr O'BYRNE - Okay, here we go. We have all afternoon. Order of the day number four is the Disposal of Uncollected Goods Bill. I know who is uncollected at the moment over there.

In terms of the motion you put, you talk about infrastructure. There are no infrastructure upgrades for Nautilus Drive, which is a bottleneck for that community. The original proposal was for over 500 houses at Nautilus Drive, which is already facing significant congestion and problems. At the Fork in the Road roundabout there is already significant congestion and at no stage have you consulted. It is known in that community that from Kingston south as you head down to Margate and Snug, there are issues with congestion there.

Then you have the gall in answer to your Dorothy Dixier the other day to say, 'We've got this study', but it is a study you announced in the election campaign that you still have not delivered on. You are still working through a study of the Channel Highway from Margate south and that was launched and announced when the subdivision was going to be 230 lots. At no stage have you consulted with any community prior to your announcement south of Huntingfield. Those commuters and industry people who use that road would be massively impacted by this.

Then you talk about your \$1.3 million congestion buster. What rubbish. There is \$1.6 billion in infrastructure in roads and bridges. I am pretty sure the people of Kingston are happy that the Bridgewater bridge will assist congestion on the Southern Outlet and pretty sure the Margate people are saying, 'Good on you, upgrade Sorell'. A number of big front pages in the election campaign were about the underground bus mall. Public transport was the answer. Now we find out they do not know where it is going to be built or if it is ever going to happen. It is outrageous.

Then the ferries were going to fix congestion. I am sure the people in Kingston are happy with a Bellerive to Hobart ferry; that is going to help them out tremendously. Now we find out that the money was given to Metro. Let me be clear: we are not against public transport and ferries, but what we are against are thought-bubble ideas to give you a veneer of cover about your lack of action in dealing with congestion in southern Tasmania.

In terms of ferries, you have given Metro a couple of hundred grand to get a consultancy from a Queensland company. Effectively, they said that for the money you have allocated in the budget for a ferry - because that is the only thing you can play with as you are heading to over a billion dollars of net debt - you may as well invest in more buses. You have no credibility on congestion-busting. Then you talk about a fifth lane -

Mrs Rylah - You don't want to talk about the fifth lane tender that's been put out this week.

Mr O'BYRNE - I am glad you brought that up. In the election it was a fifth lane and then it morphed into a fifth lane tidal public transport, but again you do not fix the issue of the bottleneck at the top of the Macquarie and Davey streets and the bottom of the Southern Outlet. You do not fix the fact that you will have more buses that will just hit another bottleneck. It is not a fix in and of itself. When you pat yourself on the back for a massive congestion-busting investment -

Mrs Rylah - Are you auditioning - is that what this is about?

Mr O'BYRNE - Seriously? Goodness me. It is almost like exhibit A, the defence rests. This is exasperating. We are exposing your Government for incompetence and you talk about that. This is outrageous. Let us get back to the important stuff, shall we?

To the people of Kingston and Kingborough, the people down there who are saying, 'Fantastic, we've got a government that's investing in congestion-busting measures', they are just consulting on a fifth lane on the Southern Outlet and tow trucks. It was great to see the minister back on the ramp. Congestion in Hobart has been an issue for a long time now and is at crisis point. The then minister, Rene Hidding, said in 2015-16 that this is a crisis point. We are now three or four years down the track and the best they can do is get a couple of tow trucks on the Southern Outlet. This is incompetence writ large.

The community deserves the right to be treated with respect. They were told over many years that this section of land was going to be upgraded, developed and that there would be social and affordable housing. In 2015 your minister said that they would commence that development process with a master plan for 230 lots. In the dead of night you dropped it out and hoped it would be okay. You ignored the community. You did not go and front them.

Ms O'Connor - Are you talking about the sale of the Treasury building?

Mr O'BYRNE - That is a different matter we will no doubt debate, member for Clark. In terms of your approach on this and your lack of respect for that local community, you have put people through an appalling period of time completely unnecessarily, and then you want to parade it in this House as a great outcome for the Tasmanian people.

You have driven the state into a housing crisis and with your white-knuckle panic you have divided the community and have put them through unnecessary angst. You have people wanting to make decisions to sell their house and move to other places. These are life decisions, minister. Yes, after public uproar and many people providing submissions to you, you have backflipped and moved back. Is it enough? We are still working with the community on this. Please show a bit more respect for this House and the community of Tasmania and do not put yourself in this situation again to move these terrible motions which reflect poorly on the Government. I indicate that we are against the amendment to the amendment that is now before the Chair.

Ms O'Connor - If you want to disallow it just move disallowance.

Mr O'BYRNE - We are talking to the community, we have said that, as are you.

[4.29 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Housing) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I note that on the amendment to the amendment in the contributions from Mr O'Byrne and Ms O'Connor they both referred to the response to the first draft that went out through the consultation process. The changes made in response to the issues raised, which I laid out in a detailed contribution earlier when Mr O'Byrne and Ms O'Connor were not in the room, but it will be on *Hansard*; that is why it is there -

Mr O'Byrne - It doesn't mean that we can't make our points and we don't have to agree with you.

Ms Standen - It doesn't mean that they weren't listening if they are not in this place.

Ms O'Connor - That's right. We have to put up with tedious repetition from you people every day. At least ours was not tedious.

Mr JAENSCH - You are welcome to make your points; I am just directing you to a source of information to address things that are of concern to you. On the record there are answers to many of the questions and issues you have raised. The two members who have spoken about the final form of the order being an improvement on the draft are, I believe in doing so, acknowledging that the Government has been sincere and effective in its consultation and its listening and its responsiveness to the concerns of the people in the Huntingfield community.

We have done that by applying the process that they all voted for, that we agreed here when we put together the Housing Land Supply Act when those opposite still thought that there was a housing crisis going on -

Ms STANDEN - Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I take offence. I am being verballed here. The minister is inferring that I am saying that his consultation was effective. It was anything but.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Ms Standen, that is not a point of order. You will get an opportunity to rebut the minister shortly.

Ms O'Connor - The minister was not being honest.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr JAENSCH - I was not addressing those comments to Ms Standen. I prefaced it with a reference to the contributions from Mr O'Byrne and Ms O'Connor on the Greens' amendment to Labor's amendments to the original motion. After saying we had been ham-fisted and clumsy in consultation, we have applied the process that was built into the Housing Land Supply Act that passed through both Houses of the parliament unamended. At the time everybody here accepted the need for us to be able to rapidly move more appropriate land into appropriate zoning for housing across Tasmania to address the housing shortage.

Ms O'Connor - To be fair there is a scale issue here.

Mr JAENSCH - But everyone here, from your own contributions, knew all about Huntingfield and that it had been earmarked for residential development. I will take that as a level of recognition that there has been consultation, that there has been a listening to the concerns raised, that there has been a sensitive response in the recrafting of this order for the zoning only of this land, which was always destined to be residential land.

We have followed the process that Labor and the Greens and the Legislative Council supported off the back of the housing summit at the beginning of last year when people came together to address the urgent need to develop not only more housing but more land for housing. Since then -

Ms Standen - Eighteen months later.

Mr JAENSCH - Since then, and I think, Ms Standen, your interjection was a snide reference to having hardly moved quickly, in that 18 months we have built brand new legislation, brought it through both Houses, applied it already to four parcels of land around the state, and now to a fifth, to provide more land for houses to be built on.

Ms Standen does not recognise that land plays any role in providing more housing. She believes that houses levitate without having to be connected to the ground. The availability of suitable land, suitably zoned land, affordable land in the right places is fundamental for the provision of more housing for Tasmanians.

We make no apologies for using the legislation that we developed off the back of a process that decided that there was an urgent need to release more land to apply to land that we already identified for future housing. We followed the process to the letter and brought forward this order in draft form, consulted with the community, taken their views on board, changed it, improved it and brought it to this place and asked for it to be supported.

Today Labor and the Greens have indicated they will not be supporting that order. They used to believe in a housing emergency. They used to believe there was a crisis and we urgently needed to take special action -

Ms STANDEN - Point of order, Madam Speaker. The minister is clearly misleading the House when he says that the opposition parties would not be supporting the order. We are not supporting the motion. That is what we have clearly indicated.

Madam SPEAKER - I do not think that is a point of order but I think the minister gets the fact.

Mr JAENSCH - The first line in the original substantive motion is that the House supports the Huntingfield Housing Land Supply Order. Both Labor and the Greens have taken it upon themselves to stand up here and indicate, not as an amendment to that, to remove that and replace it with a string of insults or opinions that they have, political statements about the Government's performance in housing -

Ms Standen - Which ones are insulting?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms Standen. I have to ask you to refrain from interjecting.

Ms Standen - Sorry, Madam Speaker.

Mr JAENSCH - It is a terrible shame. Many people were very encouraged when across the political divide early last year, before even the final results of the election were in, the Premier pulled together people to deal with the urgent need to address our housing shortage. One of the priority actions agreed to by all 38 participant organisations, including Labor and the Greens and the Liberal Party, was that we needed to identify surplus government land in suitable locations to be rezoned for housing as a matter of urgency, to address a crisis and provide emergency powers to the Government and the minister of the day to be able to do that. We developed bespoke legislation for a limited period of five years to give that power to the Government because it was so important that we provided more housing for Tasmanians in need. We built that legislation, we have rolled it out on four sites; we have a fifth now - it is a big one. It is one that the other parties and former ministers in this place also identified as future housing land and did not activate at the time. We did. We are trying to do that. We are trying to use the tool that they agreed to, that responded to the crisis that they agreed was a crisis to urgently provide more housing and more land for housing for Tasmanians.

Now they appear to be walking away from it. Ms Standen is also repeatedly in this space -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. I do not want to be throwing people out this afternoon because it is the last day of the week. We are all going to be in a good mood, so please refrain.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Ms Standen has again affirmed today, as she has in the public debate in this place and outside, that she does not consider the provision of land as part of the solution for Tasmania's housing shortage. I am over trying to explain that to her. We are just going to get on and release more land, because that is what you need if you are going to build more houses. You need it to be appropriately zoned. That is why we built this piece of legislation which various speakers have referred as clumsy and hand-fisted and brutal. However, it is the one that they agreed that we should have because we

had an emergency. We still believe that there is an emergency to be dealt with. That is what we make no apology for.

We have responded to the community's concerns. We respect the concerns of the neighbours and the community of Huntingfield and the Kingborough Council area. As Ms O'Connor identified in her contribution, those people have another three opportunities or so still to shape the final look and feel, the numbers and the layout and the aesthetics and the functionality of this new community. They always have had those opportunities built in. This is about the zoning that enables that. The zoning across this entire site, the average lot size across this entire site, is going to be very similar to that of all the adjacent areas.

I note that the enthusiastic contributions of groups and individuals and advocates in the debate about this, but I also note that they have taken a very consistently literal and dramatic view and put out around the community the concern that there is going to be a wall-to-wall, high-density, 100 per cent social housing development here, and it has never been that. I think that Labor and the Greens have known that and never said anything about it but let people get scared. That is what they do. That is what they do about cladding.

Ms O'Connor - No, you are being dishonest, Mr Jaensch. This is beneath you.

Mr JAENSCH - I would be really interested to know if any of the members here who voted for the Housing Land Supply Act have spoken to their constituents about the process, what it involves, how it works and what safeguards are built into it, including the fact that this is Homes Act land under the control of the Housing Director and the requirements that are built into that for how land can be used and what proportions and diversity of housing ownership and tenancy types lot sizes need to be provided. It is all there, because we debated this when we put together the act which Mr O'Byrne now says is ham-fisted. He voted for it.

Mr O'Byrne - No, your ham-fisted approach to it.

Madam SPEAKER - Mr O'Byrne, warning one.

Mr JAENSCH - We have used the process. We have consulted and taken aboard the community's concerns -

Mr O'Byrne - You sent a letter to the priest, not the school.

Madam SPEAKER - Warning two.

Mr JAENSCH - We have improved the order in line with those concerns, and now we have laid it before both Houses of parliament and, in this House, Labor and the Greens have refused to support it.

Mr Gutwein - Don't you want to build more houses?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr Gutwein.

Mr JAENSCH - I think that this is theatrics to a level, at least from Ms O'Connor and I suspect also from Ms Standen, but she is less theatrical, more just nasty when she does it.

They have talked about the type of development like Lightsview, which is ground-breaking. It is new thinking. It is thinking that has changed in its practice and best practice that has changed since 2015. This is the type of thinking we are introducing here and we are including, through the use of our choice of zoning, the ability to use a minimum lot size that allows innovative forms of housing to be built for people who would rather be riding a bike than mowing a lawn. By reducing the land component of the cost of them acquiring, renting or buying a house, it is making it more affordable for them. We are using zoning to give us the flexibility to provide innovative forms of housing to meet the needs of the people who are entering housing stress now, people with incomes in the private market right now who thought that one day they would be able to afford a house and now it is beyond their scope. We are trying to provide new forms of housing.

When the members try to catch us out on the percentage of social and affordable and what we mean by that, on page 8 of the report at the front of the order there is a definitive statement, that says:

At present, the plan for this site is to deliver 15 per cent of the total number of homes as social housing.

You will note, if you know the Homes Act, that there are some limits in there that says you do not ideally have more than 15 per cent. Why did I say 15 per cent social and affordable? Because in this development we want to start to work with some new types of housing which might change that boundary and how we have traditionally understood it. We want to provide housing that is affordable for people who previously would only have been in social housing that belongs to someone else and is subsidised. If we can provide new types of products using innovative, higher-density, smaller lot sizes as part of an integrated development, I think we are making inroads here dealing with a group of people who we are being told are coming into housing stress now for the first time and never thought they would.

This is a very nuanced approach. We are designing a community here which has a mix of lot sizes, housing types and what we are presenting here in the housing land supply order is the zoning which gives us the minimum lot sizes to work with flexibly which, when the master planning exercise is finalised and agreed through its various stages of community consultation and work with the council, it will lock our planning settings for that whole site so that even if we have areas zoned for minimum very small lot sizes under inner-residential, it will not be able to be further subdivided beyond that point in time.

This is the process we have used and it is anything but ham-fisted. It is a very nuanced approach. We have done consultation and taken the community's views on board. We have made substantial changes, and the benefit of all that lies in the housing land supply order that is currently before the House.

In the Greens' amendment to the amendment, the first point is only political. The second point which calls on the Government to (a), (b) and (c) is generally redundant. It says 'significantly increase the investment in social and affordable housing'. At the moment we have \$200 million of state money committed to our plan for affordable and social housing, which is more than any previous government has put on the table.

Paragraph (b) says 'introduce regulations to prevent growth in short-stay properties and tight rental markets'. We have introduced again, and successfully brought through this House, nation-leading brand-new legislation to require compliance and data-sharing from the short-stay

accommodation sector to inform the way short-stay accommodation can be further regulated, managed and understood at a local level right across Tasmania, taking account of the fact that in St Helens, Sandy Bay and Huntingfield it will have a different footprint and a different role in the housing market.

We need to be able to equip our decision-makers and our local regulators, including our councils, with data. We do not have that at the moment. We are going to be the first place in Australia that does. We are going to have that data by the end of the year. We are alive to this, but this demand that we introduce regulations is premature and fails to recognise that we are on track to being the most sophisticated managers of that sector in Australia.

As to the request or demand to undertake comprehensive settlement and population planning, that is what our Tasmanian planning policies process is about. It is also the sort of work that our strategic growth initiative, led by our Premier, is about ensuring that we have right. As members here will also know, as part of AHAP 2, we have listed and invested and now commenced work with the University of Tasmania's Institute for the Study of Social Change. You were addressed by Professor Eccleston yesterday, who is working with Housing Tasmania and our social services sector on forecasting future population demand for housing and social housing. We announced this months ago. It is not forgetfulness; it is a wilful ignorance and wish to paint the Government as asleep at the wheel and it is just not true. We are on the record about that again and again.

As to paragraph (3) of the amendment to the amendment, instead of patting myself on the back, which I am unable to do effectively, I should spend my time bringing forward meaningful legislation - such as the Housing Land Supply Act and the Short Stay Accommodation Act. They are both very innovative pieces of legislation built from scratch by this Government in the last 12 months and brought through this House and supported by everybody. You cannot get away with pretending that we are not making a meaningful dent in our policy response to Tasmania's housing shortage and the challenges that creates for Tasmanians.

I have all sorts of other things I could mention from the contributions but I am reminded that I am speaking on the amendment to the amendment.

The comment Ms O'Connor made about the amended order being a substantial improvement, I will take that. The demand that we engage in a meaningful way with the community, I think she also understands that is what the master plan process is for. She read into *Hansard* the stages of that process as she understood them including the community's opportunity to participate in them. That issue is also recognised as being addressed.

Ms O'Connor went on to make a claim that we need to take soaring rent seriously. At the end of the day, rent and housing prices in Tasmania have been rising swiftly, faster than many other places, because demand is outstripping supply. Apart from stepping into a finite market and telling people what they can charge or artificially subsidising or penalising the purchasing or selling of housing services, the way to address the cause of that and settle prices at a more affordable level is to provide more houses.

To provide more houses, you need more land; the right sort of land, zoned the right way. That is what the Housing Land Supply Order is about. That is what is in front of the parliament right now and Labor and the Greens have failed to support it today. It is the first line in our motion. They took it out and replaced it with a political slap which is a shame -

Ms O'Connor - Minister, it is because the motion was such garbage politicking.

Mr JAENSCH - You did. It says, 'Acknowledges that the Tasmanian housing crisis is caused by the Liberal Government'.

We have some people here who want to respond to a crisis and be seen to be doing something when it suits them, who have passed good legislation through this place that has been designed in response to that. They have now got to a point where it is hitting the ground, where we are testing our resolve to urgently seek, rezone and release land for housing for Tasmanians. In the full knowledge of the intent of the controls, the safeguards and the processes that are prescribed in this legislation, they have been quite happy to encourage people to be panicked and in some cases, misled about the Government's intentions and to fuel the fire of that for their own purposes. They come in here and not take issue with that resolve. They want to have a bob each way and walk both sides of the street. They want to be part of the solution when it is a good one. I hope that they do not disallow the order, but it concerns me that they have taken the opportunity today to not support the Huntingfield Land Supply Order and, in fact, erase it from the motions that have occupied our afternoon here.

That is shame. There are people waiting to see this development come forward, and who would want to see it supported strongly across their parliament. The legislation enabled was supported across the parliament. There was 360-degree support for the action arising out of the housing summit in March last year, before I even became the Housing minister. That spirit of support for this as an emergency and requiring a special and different response for Tasmania is lacking. The Labor and Greens have not got the guts to see it through.

We will. We are the Government. I am the Minister for Housing. Our job is to provide more housing for Tasmanians and we will get on with that job. We ask that regardless of the theatre, that Labor and the Greens see fit to support the Housing Land Supply Order through the next fortnight.

It may be no surprise that we do not intend to support the amendment to the amendment.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Amendment negatived.

[4.56 p.m.]

Mr HODGMAN (Franklin - Premier) - Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to the substantive motion and lend my support to it. I acknowledge and thank the minister for bringing this matter forward. For those who said from the opposition benches that this was not an important matter not worthy of debate not a good use of the Parliaments time, I am interested to note that we have been having this debate of some hours. Rightly so, affordable housing for more Tasmanians, delivering on what we have committed to in the recommendations from that summit, indeed from key stakeholders in this sector, is very important. It is a good use of this parliament's time.

There is a mechanism before the construct of this parliament that will allow us to deliver those objectives. This is important government business. We are alarmed at what we have heard today, which suggests it might be put at risk. To debate this matter and for political parties to firmly

express their views as to what they see as the best way forward to support more Tasmanians into housing is not, as the opposition parties suggested, a waste of our time.

Homelessness and housing stress is a matter that has been variously described by some in the Opposition as a crisis, so for us now to be debating a mechanism to support people into more housing shows.

Ms O'Connor interjecting.

Mr HODGMAN - It is a motion in support of a mechanism, a vehicle, before the parliament in order to deliver on what we have been told and what we have agreed as a government is necessary.

Ms O'Connor - Self-promotion.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr HODGMAN - It is necessary to address what some in our community, including the member who interjected, described as a crisis. Now they complain about us bringing it before the parliament to get some certainty as to how we might proceed. What I fear is happening here is that the opposition parties have been exposed.

Ms Standen - Why didn't you attend the community meetings?

Mr HODGMAN - This is the gross hypocrisy that is so galling from the member who interjects who herself was not at the meeting.

Ms Butler - How do you know, you were not there yourself.

Mr HODGMAN - Are you saying she was.

Ms Butler - How do you know she was not? You were not there.

Mr HODGMAN - Let's have some honesty. Let's just own it.

Ms Butler - I have been there and met with the council.

Mr HODGMAN - You were happy to do a media conference the next day rabble-rousing, stirring up concern in the community.

Ms Standen - Have you met with the community.

Madam SPEAKER - Ms Standen, I have to give you a warning.

Mr HODGMAN - You were suggesting that you have been engaged when you were not. The point I have been making all week in this place is that Labor cannot be trusted. It was demonstrated just now. Similarly, you simply do not know what they stand for. They want to have a bob each way. They want to sniff the political breeze; get down into a community, frighten them, rabble-rouse, stir up trouble, try to throw a spike into what we are trying to do to support more people into housing. You have been demanding that of us for months. Your only contribution is to try and

play politics. That is why we are calling you out today to understand whether or not you have the strength of your convictions. Are you going to support this order or not?

Ms Butler - We are going to support solutions.

Mr HODGMAN - This is a solution. This is going to deliver on housing for more Tasmanians. This will support the building of homes that you are opposed to. I have a statement from the member for Franklin, Ms Standen, saying not only is there a housing crisis but there is also a failure to support economic development and growth in our communities by the building of houses, yet when push comes to shove you do not have the guts, the conviction, to stand up and support what we are endeavouring to do through a vehicle that you now attack which you supported. The process for establishing this order passed through this parliament with unanimous support, but now you pick and scratch and knock, and at every opportunity you will complain about the process. If you were serious about the outcome, you would support what we are doing rather than trying to pick holes in every single thing.

Yes, the community I represent is concerned. I grew up in it so I understand that there are people who are concerned about the proposed development, but similarly we are endeavouring to support people in our community who need a home and affordable housing. One of the equally galling things I heard in Labor's contribution today - and there were a lot of mistruths in it as always - was that this was something the Labor Party considered when it was in government. The shadow minister for Planning said the development we are talking about at Huntingfield, or a version of it, was something Labor had looked at when it was in government, but it did nothing - Labor did nothing about it; Labor members thought about it and looked at it, but did nothing -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. So it is really clear to you, as I made clear in my contribution, we began the master planning. As Greens minister I progressed the master planning so I do not really know what your point is about Labor, but for the four years I was minister we progressed it.

Madam SPEAKER - Could we say that was a point of clarification?

Mr HODGMAN - That may be so, but the Labor shadow minister for planning said in her contribution that it was something Labor had looked at when in government but did nothing about progressing. They claim to be all-seeing, all-knowing now and are saying, 'This is all a mess of your making; this is a crisis that is your fault; there has been no planning'. Well, what did you do when you were in government -

Ms Standen - Why didn't you progress it in your first term?

Madam SPEAKER - Ms Standen, warning number two.

Mr HODGMAN - to progress the building of affordable homes not just in this community but in the other communities where work is now underway as the minister outlined. You did nothing -

Ms O'Connor - In that four years, we built 2200 new homes.

Madam SPEAKER - Ms O'Connor, one.

Mr HODGMAN - That is a galling thing in itself. You did nothing about it when you had the opportunity, but, as I say, the Housing Land Supply Act allows for an efficient, timely rezoning of government-owned land to provide more affordable housing sooner. One of a number of key actions considered, and in fact was the result of last year's Housing Summit, that legislation received unanimous support in this place, passed through both Houses unamended, had the support of the social services and affordable housing sectors, and will provide more dwellings. It proposes a mix of open space and local business zones to serve the needs of this new community and its surrounds. It will speed up the process of rezoning so we can get on with the job sooner, which you have demanded of us and which we will do through this process.

It does not apply to subdivision and development application processes, which will continue to be assessed by the council. The suggestion that it is being rushed without proper process or that it is not affording the council to play its respective role in this process is not true either. Once the process of rezoning has been completed, the master planning exercise debated at some length today - including community engagement on the final plan for the site - work will begin on subdividing the land and any necessary development applications to make the land ready for more homes to be built - processes that again will include community involvement.

As the minister has said repeatedly today, these processes were agreed to by parliament, by this House, by all parties within it, including those who now choose to criticise the process. It will expedite the rezoning well ahead of what it would normally take, over six months. Of course we will take any steps we can to increase the process, improve the process, strengthen and streamline the process without compromising the capacity of the council to do its job, and, indeed, for people to have their say. I well recognise there are many in the community who have views and concerns. Yes, we also need to invest contemporaneously more into infrastructure, into transport networks in the community, which we are doing. This will allow us to also get on with the job of providing housing supply across the full spectrum.

This is a threshold question for Labor Party members. They are still keeping their cards very close to their chests. They cannot say at this point whether they will support the order. The only reason they would not do so is because they will not or because they want to cause some political mayhem while they can, and they want to obstruct, either politically or perhaps potentially, I suggest dangerously, the progress of this order passing.

It is a simple question. You have demanded that we build more homes to support affordable housing in communities, yet when we do, you complain. People will often say, and I do not attribute this to anyone in any community where these developments are proposed, that you are not considering what is in the best interests of the state and those needing a home, but you are prepared to cherry-pick and to knock developments of this sort for your own political advantage. You demand of us that we do things, then when we do, you complain. You will take issue with every single point of detail and complain. If we can better engage with the community, so it understands what is happening rather than the tripe that comes out of the mouths of local Labor members and others trying to stir up trouble, we will also endeavour to do that.

It is so disingenuous for people who complain and who describe this as a housing crisis, that when we want to build the houses, rezone, engage with the community, allow it to participate, take onboard their views and address them in the second iteration of the order, they still complain about it. It makes my point that the Labor Party is only about politics these days. Labor members do not know what they stand for. They do not know what their convictions are. If they were serious about supporting people into affordable housing, they would agree with a process such as this - and they

have: they previously agreed to the legislation that establishes this process, but they are still not able to stand up today and say they will allow this motion and the order itself to pass.

It is staggering and it is pathetic because this Labor Party is without any conviction. Its members claim to be the strongest supporters of those in our community who are doing tough - those who might need a roof over their heads are among them. We have classic opposition politics - they are trying to walk on both sides of the street, stirring up trouble in the community and not being part of the solution, which we have always invited them to be, including at these housing summits, at every step. Yet they do not, when push comes to shove, have the strength of their convictions to stand up. It is a reflection on the Leader of Opposition who sets the tone and presumably calls the shots on a matter such as this that local members and the shadow minister are directed not to express a clear view one way or the other. That is more a reflection on the Labor Party than on anyone else.

Notwithstanding that, we will continue to pass this order for rezoning to occur and for building to start as soon as possible. We will listen to affected communities and work with them to ensure they understand the circumstances and the detail of what is proposed. We have been over that in some length today. I am genuinely disappointed in Labor's approach to this because it is opposing the building of more affordable homes. Labor members are playing politics with a serious issue, which is receiving priority attention from government and which is being demanded of government by key stakeholders, by the broader community and by Labor members themselves. Yet their conduct today on this important motion, and alarmingly, the order that will allow us to get on with the job of doing what we need to do and what is expected of us is being put at risk by this reckless and unprincipled Labor Party.

[5.10 p.m.]

Mrs RYLAH (Braddon) - Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to support the motion. Every Tasmanian needs a roof over their head. Increasing social and affordable housing and reducing homelessness will continue to be the top priority for this Government. Last year the Housing Land Supply Act 2018 was passed unamended by both Houses of the parliament and with the support of the Public Housing Sector. The act provides for the making of housing land supply orders to fast-track rezoning of surplus government land for housing. That is exactly what we are talking about today.

As a result of the strong economic outlook and prospects for families who are looking towards living in Tasmania, Tasmania's population is growing for the first time in many years, bringing many benefits for our community, our economy and the state but also bring challenges. One notable challenge is the capacity of our housing market which the Hodgman Liberal Government is focused on through our Affordable Housing Strategy and our action plans. The Government committed \$125 million into the second stage of the Affordable Housing Action Plan, taking our total commitment into affordable housing to almost \$200 million over eight years. It is the largest ever investment into affordable housing in Tasmania's history by the Tasmanian government.

The Hodgman Liberal Government will continue to boost the supply of affordable homes over the next four years. We need to pull all the levers we can to address the current housing shortage. This process will see surplus government land rezoned faster to meet the increased demand for social and affordable homes across Tasmania. A number of rezoning orders have successfully passed the parliament and the new rezoning legislation allows the delivery of affordable housing faster, to meet higher demand.

To date, the Hodgman majority Liberal Government has made four housing land supply orders for the rezoning of land in West Moonah, Rokeby, Devonport and Newnham, with a total area of 6.7 hectares rezoned for housing across the state. As the member for Braddon, I am particularly pleased that the Devonport order provides for the land situated at 39A North Fenton Street, Devonport, to be rezoned to inner-residential zone under the Devonport Interim Planning Scheme. I was disappointed in Ms Dow's contribution and pure Opposition politics because of the success of this rezoned housing order. As with all the orders already passed with the parliament, this order will enable more social and affordable homes to be built for Tasmanians. Together, these orders could yield up to 250 new dwellings, depending on the type of development proposed and approved. All land rezoned through our new process will be used for a mix of social, affordable and private housing options.

On the north-west coast there is already an appetite for an increase in smaller blocks and medium-size apartments. Several proposed housing projects in Devonport strongly suggest there is an emerging market for apartment-style living. I attribute that to the work we have been doing in Devonport.

The Hodgman Liberal Government is committed to providing a clear pathway for getting permits and approvals for building apartments in order to facilitate an increase in high-density dwellings. Importantly, cleverly designed smaller homes cost less to build or buy and consume less energy and resources in construction. Medium-rise developments can be energy and resource efficient housing solutions and can be planned to avoid shading existing residential areas. For Tasmanians who never thought they would ever own their own home, this will give them the opportunity to realise their dream of a home of their own.

Tasmania's housing sector has gone from strength to strength, with an increase of 5.8 per cent in building approvals over the past 12 months. Tasmania was the only jurisdiction in Australia to see approvals growth over this period. The Hodgman Liberal Government has extended the \$20 000 first home builders boost, provided stamp duty relief for pensioners who are downsizing their property, removed red tape to make it easier and quicker to build homes and rezoned surplus government-owned land to enable more homes to be built. We have been busy and we have delivered.

Land release forms a critical part of the supply of new homes and houses. The second stage of the Tasmanian Affordable Housing Action Plan sets out clear deliverables across the state, particularly for the north west. It includes the new supply of at least 345 affordable lots and homes in the north west.

Stage 2 of the action plan will add the Burnie Youth Foyer, a purpose-built, integrated learning and accommodation facility for young people. This will work with Eveline House in Devonport to provide more coverage and support to young people who are at risk of homelessness and who are exiting out of out-of-home care.

Mr Jaensch - It is a fantastic place.

Mrs RYLAH - It is, I agree, minister. We will also work with the Youth, Family and Community Connections to relocate their youth shelter to Burnie. This will increase the capacity of the shelter and improve the quality of the transition that young people go through when they leave crisis situations and re-engage with education, training and employment.

The second action plan will also deliver a new men's shelter. This will assist single men and dads with kids and is crucial in providing more stable living arrangements. This is a bold vision. I commend the minister for his work in putting it into place and delivering what he has delivered to date.

The Huntingfield site has been earmarked for housing for many years and is clearly identified in Kingborough Council's Land Use Strategy. The Hodgman Liberal Government is now activating this site to deliver houses to address high demand. The new rezoning legislation lets this happen faster so we can deliver more homes sooner. Concerns raised with the consultation have been broadly addressed through the rezoning process order and in the next stages of the development process. Importantly, rezoning the land is just the first step. The subdivision will still need to go through all the normal planning and approval processes with the Kingborough Council, including further consultation.

Housing Tasmania will be engaging with the local community about a detailed master plan for the layout of the site, including cycleways, playgrounds and open spaces. The final makeup of different housing types and lot sizes is yet to be determined. At least 15 per cent will be set aside for social and affordable housing. That means a minimum area, Ms Standen, of 15 per cent. The minister has stated this publicly and again today.

The Government is already acting on some of the other concerns that have been raised such as the potential increase in traffic along the Southern Outlet. We have committed \$35 million for the fifth lane along the outlet that will provide an additional dedicated transit lane to improve traffic flow, with the analysis currently being undertaken to determine the most suitable approaches for implementation.

The proposed rezoning allows us to encourage flexibility and diversity in housing size, ownership and affordability, providing opportunities for conventional houses as well as more innovative smaller houses and lot sizes for households which cannot or do not want to use or maintain a larger block, as the minister mentioned. This level of design and integration is a major departure from the broadacre public housing schemes of the past. We believe it will be one that Kingborough and Tasmania will be proud of. Through good design and planning at this site and across Tasmania, we can deliver a mix of housing types to accommodate our growing population and meet the needs of Tasmanians now and into the future.

I look forward to seeing the master plan and understand the Kingborough Council will be doing things like letterboxing residents, consultations and public information sessions to ensure the community is fully informed on development. The master plan will show the roadways, cycleways, parklands and open space and the amenity to the new community in the Franklin electorate.

I congratulate the minister and his department for their significant efforts in this important issue of rapidly supplying the housing supply needed in southern Tasmania in particular, but more broadly across the state, using every lever, innovative policy and legislation to get as many people into homes with the highest priority we can.

[5.20 p.m.]

Mrs PETRUSMA (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I want to follow on from what Mrs Rylah was saying. I too congratulate the Minister for Housing on his passion, commitment, dedication and hard work because it is not an easy portfolio, as the member for Clark, Ms O'Connor, knows. It is quite easy to sit in opposition and criticise, but they need to show that they actually have a policy

or a plan or anything. At the moment it is very easy to sit there and throw stones and think they can make a difference, but the fact is the \$200 million this Government is investing in housing is the largest state government investment in public housing that has ever been in this state.

Under the previous government there was what we used to call a magic pudding fund of \$60 million in the housing fund. I think it commenced in about 2008 or it might have even been before that. In every single budget that came out year after year, the housing fund would still be there. Each year it was supposed to have allocated \$10 million or \$11 million or something and it was never used up. When this Government came in and put in place Tasmania's first Affordable Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing Action Plan it was the first government to actually take it seriously. I congratulate the minister. I thank him for his work.

Ms O'Connor - No, that's not true. Developing a strategy is not taking action. It's not true to say yours is the only government that's taken it seriously.

Mrs PETRUSMA - Ms O'Connor, I know you were very passionate about this area, but at the time there was federal government money put into it.

It was acknowledged that when Housing Connect started, because there was going to be a one-stop shop for housing in Tasmania, they knew back in 2013 that the housing wait list would increase because people who had never come forward before felt comfortable to come forward and say they had a housing need. We welcomed that. We needed to know who needed housing. We needed them to be able to go somewhere. I congratulate the then minister for that initiative in getting Housing Connect but they knew at the time that this was going to lead to more people coming onto the housing waiting list.

It is only through us knowing what the need is that we can actually tackle it. I went to the Housing Summit in March 2018 and what we are talking about today, the housing land supply orders, was one of the outcomes of that summit. It is important to note that when it was debated in this House it was unanimously supported by all parties because we all recognised that we needed to work together to pull the levers to put more supply into the housing system. This is why this housing land supply order is so important.

We have been asked today why we are even debating it. It is an important debate to be had, because we need to know from both Labor and the Greens if they actually support this housing land supply order for Huntingfield. We do not want to see these much-needed houses for people in southern Tasmania, especially in the greater Kingborough area, not happen. We need to know if they are going to support it. It is vitally important for all concerned that there is reassurance that this housing land supply order is supported.

I thank everyone who has taken the time to contact me and send me emails to let me know their thoughts on this housing land supply order - the good, the bad and the ugly. The Government wanted to hear from people in the area as to what their thoughts were. I congratulate the minister and the department because they have taken on board these concerns that have been expressed. As we have heard today, the order has been revised in response to this feedback by residents and I thank the minister for being willing to do that consultation and to change the order as well.

I remind the House that the site has been earmarked for residential development in the Regional Land Use Strategy since it was developed and it is mentioned comprehensively throughout Kingborough Council's own land use strategy, which was endorsed unanimously by the council

earlier this year. I again put on the record that it is important to acknowledge that the order only relates to the rezoning of the land. While it is informed by a master plan that is being refined, it does not provide for the actual subdivision of the land or the development of any buildings. The future subdivision of the land and the development of the houses will be subject to the normal assessment processes administered by Kingborough Council under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act and, as is required under the Housing Land Supply Act, a draft order was presented for consultation feedback.

As the minister has stated, we received a number of submissions and it has been invaluable in refining the order to be presented to the parliament. As the minister stated today and on Tuesday as well, the order that was tabled responds to the concerns raised by the community, including the density of development possible under the inner-residential zone, the location of the local business zone and its proximity to existing residences and schools, the traffic flows both within the site and beyond it, the need for infrastructure upgrades in order to keep pace with future development, and the need for open space buffers from Peter Murrell Reserve and existing development. It also provides for the delivering of affordable housing on the site.

To address the concerns around density, the minister and the department have adjusted the zoning and, as the minister has stated, we are committed to being innovative and to provide flexibility in delivering a wide mosaic of standard housing as well as smaller housing options and town houses. Those people on the housing waiting list no longer want three, four, five, six, seven, eight or nine-bedroom homes because the profile of the people on that list has dramatically changed. We need to develop housing that suits the demographic of people on our waiting list, the sort of housing that they need. We need to include smaller housing options and townhouses which, by the nature of being small, become more affordable and also tailored to a particular market.

When we talk about affordable housing, we have to remember that for everyone at all levels, if we can fit them into an affordable house that suits their income level, that prevents them from getting into financial stress where they spend more than 30 per cent of their income on housing. We are talking about trying to help everyone to not spend any more than 30 per cent of whatever their income is on affordable housing. That is why this development, through good urban design and planning during the master planning exercise, will be a mix of housing types and tenancies that will be achieved and all the choice of zoning does is provide the flexibility to achieve the desired outcomes. We also have to remember that this act has now been utilised four times around Tasmania, which is great because it is going to see more housing developed at a time when it is desperately needed.

The other thing I appreciate about the land supply order in Rokeby as well as in Huntingfield is that it is going to lead to jobs, whether it is at the takeaway in the area or apprenticeships from the tradies, because we know we are going to need tradesmen of all different descriptions to be building this number of new houses, which is great for the people concerned but also great for the local businesses in the Kingborough area. In Huntingfield, because businesses have left the area - for example, Vodaphone - we need more business in the area to help the local cafes and other businesses. This is a great initiative that will help to do that.

I acknowledge that the minister has been working hard on the Affordable Housing Strategy and action plan. We recognise that we need more supply in our housing market. That is why we look at all the different levers that are available. The Government has established targeted initiatives to boost home ownership. We have seen 1584 first home owners take up the \$20 000 first home

builders grant since 1 July 2016. A further 1522 Tasmanians have accessed the Government's first home owners duty concession of up \$7000 on the purchase of an established home.

These show our plan to increase the supply of affordable housing across the whole spectrum is also increasing. ABS data shows that in the 2018-19 financial year, 3121 dwellings were approved. This was the strongest growth of any state in the country and 9.5 per cent higher than approvals for 2017-18. This Government is maintaining the momentum in the first few months of the second stage of the housing strategy. It is \$200 million over eight years. This is the largest ever investment into affordable housing in Tasmania's history.

I note the motion also talks about the Tasmanian Government's \$1.6 billion investment in infrastructure of roads and bridges. Roads in the area will be an integral part of this development. A document was tabled with the order on Tuesday. It is a letter from the Department of State Growth. It is dated 27 August 2019. It is from Martin Blake, the acting general manager of State Roads. I will not read all the letter but it is important for the record that quite a substantial amount of this letter be read into *Hansard*. Mr Blake says -

The Department of State Growth is supportive of the proposal to rezone the Huntingfield land. Housing Tasmania consultant, GHD, has been actively engaged with State Growth during the concept planning phase of this development to ensure the Huntingfield site benefits from safe and well planned access and maximises access for passenger transport services and active transport modes.

GHD and Housing Tasmania conducted a workshop with relevant State Growth areas in April this year, including Traffic Engineering Branch And Passenger Transport. Issues discussed include access to the Channel Highway, public transport, appropriate design to promote cycling and walking, park and ride, and improving overall access to Kingston.

In regards to the capacity of the road network and the Algonia Road roundabout, the Southern Outlet and Macquarie Street, the department says that -

State Growth recognises that a number of large subdivisions are being developed in the Kingborough area that are likely to result in increased inbound traffic on the Southern Outlet, including White Water Creek, Spring Farm and Coffee Creek Estate. ...

State Growth recognises the proposed Housing Land Supply Order at 1287 Channel Highway, Kingborough, will result in further additional traffic movements on the Southern Outlet.

That is why the Department of State Growth has engaged a consultant to undertake a corridor planning study of the Channel Highway between Kingston and Margate.

This study is undertaking modelling of the Algonia Road roundabout, to quantify the current level of performance, evaluate possible short and long term infrastructure improvements and is also undertaking modelling to understand the impact of a new access into the proposed Huntingfield Estate from the Channel Highway.

The results of this study will not be available for another 6 to 8 weeks. However, the consultant for this work has confirmed that the traffic simulation model prepared for this work takes into account natural traffic growth as well as all the developments under construction and planning in the surrounding area and provides a prediction of future travel demand on the road network around the Huntingfield development. Utilising this future scenario model, the consultant will be able to see what effect the development will have on the road network, and what potential impacts may be seen by the additional traffic generation.

Whilst the proposed Estate is still in a master planning phase, there will be opportunity to test the predicted number of lots and assess how the predicted traffic generated performs within the existing road network. Depending on the outcome, the number of lots or the existing road infrastructure may be reviewed to ensure an acceptable level of performance is achieved for each road user.

It is an important point to remember here.

State Growth has given in-principle support for the development of a new access to the Channel Highway in the form of a roundabout. The roundabout will be required to be designed to State Growth and Austroads standards. The proponent has advised State Growth that an optimal and safe location connecting onto the Channel Highway has been a guiding design factor of the anticipated site layout for 1287 Channel Highway, Huntingfield.

Currently there are significant delays for traffic leaving Huntingfield during school peaks and in the PM peak. A second access point is expected to considerably improve travel times and safety for these road users. ...

In regard to Metro services it says -

In January 2019 the frequency of services from Margate which travel via Huntingfield increased significantly. On average there is a service every 30 minutes during the AM and PM peak periods ... and on average an hourly service during the weekday inter-peak period and in the early evening. ...

In terms of future network changes to better service the new development at Huntingfield, State Growth will work with Communities Tasmania to ensure that their master plan for the area can accommodate future public transport. This would include ensuring that the design of the subdivision, both in terms of road layout and connectivity, can support an efficient public transport route and that the road design can cater for future buses. ...

In regard to the planned road network improvements it states -

The Tasmanian Government has committed to addressing the impact of population growth on suburbs south of Hobart through the Greater Hobart Traffic Solution. A component of this solution is funding an end-to-end passenger transport solution for the Kingborough Area. Additionally, a range of measures are being progressed through the Hobart City Deal to reduce congestion and improve transport across Greater Hobart. These measures include providing

improved southern access via the Southern Outlet, providing a modernised and integrated public transport system and improving the utilisation of transport infrastructure to address congestion affecting the Kingborough municipal area.

The Department of State Growth will shortly release a tender for consultancy for an integrated multi-faceted approach to manage peak demand traffic flow on the Southern Outlet and into the CBD. In particular, the project includes:

- Concept design for an additional inbound lane on the Southern Outlet between Olinda Grove and Macquarie Street catering for T3 traffic (incident response, buses, taxis and cars with three or more occupants);
- Provision of new Park and Ride facilities in Kingborough; and
- Establishment of a bus lane in Macquarie Street and a T3 lane in Davey Street.

In regard to plans for a park and ride facility in Huntingfield -

State Growth recognises that the existing bus stop located at Channel Highway/Algonia Road roundabout is informally used as a Park and Ride facility by members of the local community.

State Growth recently engaged a consultancy to progress feasibility investigations and recommend locations for Park and Ride facilities within Greater Hobart. Whilst this work is not yet finalised, preliminary advice from the consultant has suggested that the Channel Highway/Algonia Road roundabout may provide a suitable site for formalised Park and Ride facilities within Kingborough. It is understood that the local council are supportive of Park and Ride facilities at this location. It is anticipated that these Park and Ride facilities would be serviced by an express bus service to the Hobart CBD.

This work will be furthered by the upcoming tender to provide concept designs for Park and Ride facilities within Kingborough. The concept design will determine not only the final location of Park and Ride facilities, but important design elements including car and bicycle parking capacity and the effectiveness of the site to provide a 'Kiss and Ride' drop-off and pick-up service.

That letter was tabled on Tuesday. In regard to the traffic issues that have been raised, the Department of State Growth is listening to the concerns of constituents in the area. We acknowledge the frustration of communities that have been caught in traffic congestion in the greater Hobart area. That is why the recently promoted Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Michael Ferguson, has outlined the Government's comprehensive vision to bust congestion on these roads. Not only the measures here that I have just outlined, but it is also the tow trucks that are now available in key locations, it is a better bus interchange at Kingston and it is technology to warn motorists in real time about congestion points on their commute.

These are all crucial actions and I am proud to be a member of the Government that wants to see more affordable housing developed for more Tasmanians. I want to congratulate the Minister for Housing on his passion, commitment, hard work and desire to see more housing available in this state.

The core of why we are here as members of parliament is because we care and I encourage all members of this House to support this Housing Supply Land Order. I see that it is very important

not only for the people of Kingborough who might be without a home, but for the people in the Greater Hobart area. I know that on this side we do want to see more houses developed. This is a very crucial part of our housing plan.

[5.41 p.m.]

Mr TUCKER (Lyons) - Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on this important motion, which is a vital part of the response for Tasmanians in need of housing. The Hodgman Liberal Government's Affordable Housing Strategy is helping more people into homes across Tasmania. It is extremely disappointing that Labor are wilfully ignorant of the targets we set at the start of the first action plan and would rather play silly political games.

As a government we take the needs of Tasmanians facing homelessness very seriously, whereas Labor are more interested in politicking. In fact, the first question in Budget estimates regarding emergency support for Tasmanians experiencing homelessness came from me. Labor, on the other hand, failed to ask a single question about homelessness.

I ask Ms Standen where she stands on this Huntingfield estate? These people need a home, a roof over their heads. This is not a time for sitting on the fence and getting splinters in her arse. It is probably why they have a doctor in the Labor Party.

I was pleased to hear from the minister that we are getting on with the job of building more homes, which is why we are investing in an additional \$125 million in stage 2 of our Affordable Housing Strategy, taking our total investment into affordable housing to almost \$200 million over eight years, the largest-ever state investment into affordable housing in Tasmania's history.

Importantly, we have allocated almost \$68 million in 2019-20 financial year to boost the supply of new social and affordable homes. This is in addition to the \$30 million housing investment under the Hobart City Deal. Our Affordable Housing Strategy addresses the full spectrum of need from crisis accommodation to social housing and affordable home ownership.

In recognition of the Government pulling all the levers we can to address the current housing shortage, I am pleased at a rapid rezoning of government land to assist in boosting the supply of affordable housing in Tasmania. The rezoning of surplus government land will play a major role in meeting the increased demand for social and affordable homes across Tasmania. It is pleasing to hear the proposed rezoning of land at Huntingfield, the latest under our rapid rezoning process that may yield over 450 dwellings with a mix of open space and local business zones to serve the needs of this new community and its surrounds.

The Government will continue to identify more land across the state that can be rezoned for housing supply, as well as progressing our major investments in affordable housing.

We all see the housing issues that are occurring. In my local community of Break O'Day, I have seen people in housing stress, and the risk of homelessness impacting people, at different times of their lives. By understanding the housing pathways and the risks that people encounter at different transition points, we can better design outcomes leading to better housing outcomes. There are remote and rural housing variations across the whole of Tasmania. The key housing problems of these areas are a lack of affordable private rentals and the high cost of new builds and upgrades resulting in derelict buildings and financial barriers into home ownership.

Responsive strategies aim to provide rapid assistance to people at immediate risk. Preventative strategies can be at a targeted level to assist vulnerable cohorts at risk of housing stress or homelessness. The Tasmanian Government has a role in prevention by insuring an adequate and

appropriate supply of affordable homes; its primary role is in targeted early intervention and responsive actions.

The Government's Affordable Housing Strategy is the most comprehensive strategy ever developed to improve affordable housing. It helps those most in need into safe and secure accommodation. The first point that underpins this strategy is preventing housing stress for low income earners by increasing the supply of affordable homes. This Government is making sure that we are investing heavily into this strategy, with almost \$200 million over eight years - the largest ever investment into affordable housing in Tasmania's history into the state housing market.

The second phase of this strategy sets out key targets for that strategy to meet: more land release with capacity to supply around 380 new lots that will deliver new affordable homes; the review and introduction of new planning policies and mechanisms to increase the supply of affordable homes; 607 social housing dwellings constructed in areas of high demand with universal design features that flexibly meet housing needs; and 88 homeless accommodation units to address increasing demand for homeless Tasmanians in immediate need of accommodation.

These targets come following the successes from the first stage of the action plan which delivered a total of 984 affordable lots and homes, 453 new social dwellings - assistance of 1605 households overall. These results, which exceeded the targets set at the start of the strategy, show that the Hodgman Liberal Government has a strong track record of delivering for Tasmanians in need. The roles and responsibilities for providing housing and homelessness services are spread across the three tiers of government and a number of key stakeholders including the community sector.

Tasmania has the lowest homelessness rate in Australia, but the number of people experiencing homelessness has increased Australia-wide over the last decade. The worrying signs are that there is a widening cohort of families and working poor facing homelessness. Vulnerable families are often dependent on income support and have limited employment opportunities.

The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute released a very detailed report on social housing. The report established that over the next 20 years an additional 6600 will be required in the greater Hobart area, and interestingly, 7600 across the remainder of the state. More affordable homes for low income households are required to address the current rates of Tasmanians experiencing or at risk of housing stress, housing crisis and homelessness. We need to support and promote initiatives such as Huntingfield Housing Land Supply which improves supply and therefore housing affordability for all households.

I have had many conversations with people in my electorate of Lyons. A common theme that keeps coming through is that we need to be maintaining abundant land supplies including short-, medium- and long-term land supply in the pipeline for detached housing sites in conjunction with medium-density opportunities. This includes greater public land releases, setting clear land supply targets to ensure land supply for housing in both green-fill and in-fill sites are maintained.

The Hodgman Liberal Government is delivering for the north of the state which takes in areas of Lyons. By the end of the strategy we will see new supply in the north of at least 241 affordable lots and homes by constructing more affordable homes, releasing more land that is close to services and employment opportunities, providing supported accommodation for targeted groups, enabling Tasmanians better access to housing and support needed. There will be a new youth at-risk centre constructed in the north providing short-term accommodation for children and young people.

The state Government is committed to improving the outcomes for all young people at risk. Youth at risk is a complex problem that requires early arbitration in the lives of vulnerable young people. This new facility will provide a safe and supportive environment for young people, with access to a range of social and therapeutic services intended to help them stay connected, support networks and education.

The Government will work with Anglicare Tasmania to complete their expansion of Thyne House in Launceston. Thyne House offers safe and affordable long-term housing accommodation in self-contained units for young people aged 16 to 24. Rent is 25 per cent of people's income as well as any Commonwealth Rent Assistance they are eligible for. Expanding Thyne House will deliver more support. We will also work with Magnolia House to expand the women's shelter and increase support to women in the Launceston area to move out of crisis and into stable accommodation.

I hope all members of parliament will consider this issue with the respect it deserves and not sit on the fence. These people need a roof over their heads. I, for one, was proud to have done just that and confirm that I support this important motion.

[5.51 p.m.]

Mr GUTWEIN (Bass - Treasurer) - Madam Speaker, I begin by congratulating the minister, Mr Jaensch, for his desire to see more houses built and to actually do something about the challenges we face rather than, as we have seen from the other side, more whingeing and carping. I have said on a number of occasions in this place that whingeing is not a platform, complaining is not a policy, but that is all we see from those opposite.

Ms Standen, who in this place has declared a housing crisis on any number of occasions, now has the opportunity to demonstrate whether she is prepared to stand for something, stand for a solution, stand for the opening up of more land, as was discussed shortly after the election at the summit that the Premier and I attended with Mrs Petrusma along with representatives of the housing sector and local government. One of the initiatives that was put forward was that the Government could rezone land and open up more land to increase the supply for affordable housing and other housing options.

Here we are today, and I must say I have been so disappointed in listening to the contributions of those opposite who have done nothing but twist and turn with a view to ensuring that they do not have to put a position down in this place in respect of what they stand for. When you come to this place, you have to stand for something. We know Labor has turned its back on all of the policies it took to the election. We know they only have one policy because they voted in this place only a handful of weeks ago to confirm that they only had one policy, and that was for TAFE.

Labor has the opportunity today to actually stand for something, to help us provide more land and more supply into the housing market, knowing full well that the planning process will still have to go through the relevant council processes. All this does is open up more land supply, rezoned appropriately for housing.

I have watched the debate and saw Mr O'Byrne in here earlier today doing his very best to whinge, carp and complain about what is before this House today, which is an opportunity for this House together to say yes, we stand for more supply and providing houses for more people. The only way you fix a challenge like we face in terms of housing - one that is so often and so cheaply called a housing crisis - is to build more houses. One of the levers that this Government has to hand is to open up more supply and that is exactly what we are doing today.

I commend the minister for the process he has followed to a tee that was laid out in the legislation and then he took the time to listen through that consultation and made changes to the order before us. We understand that there may be concerns. We understand that not everybody feels comfortable with this, but we can assure you that as we work our way through this in the master planning process, we will take into account the needs of those communities and the challenges that people have raised in terms of transport options. Importantly, what it will do and what this House has an opportunity to do today is to take a stand and support this order which will put more rezoned land out there and available for housing.

I make the point that after watching and listening to this debate today and knowing full well that on that side of the House they wanted to be able to not have to support this and then go out into the community and do what they have demonstrated to be one of their key capabilities, which is to whinge, complain, wind up fear and frighten people in communities. Today you will have an opportunity to demonstrate that you do take this seriously. One thing that we can do in this House today is support this order and demonstrate that the House of Assembly supports the rezoning of more land, the increasing of supply and therefore the opportunity to provide more dwellings for people to live in.

It will be interesting to see what Ms Standen will do. I have watched her time after time in this place carp, whinge and complain, but what she is faced with today is an opportunity to demonstrate her true colours. Does she want to be part of the solution or is she going to continue to be part of the problem? When the housing summit came together and we discussed it with those who are faced with this challenge every single day, one of the key options and levers that they asked us to look at closely and to pull was the issue of providing more supply into the market. That is what this order does.

The members on this side of the House who have spoken about this order today have set out very clearly that it is the Hodgman majority Liberal Government's view that we need to take action to increase supply to ensure that we can put more roofs over people's heads. Those on the other side will have the opportunity today to demonstrate where they stand and whether or not they are prepared to demonstrate that they too want a solution.

We want to see a vote on this this afternoon so I will wind my contribution up there but I want to say very clearly that it is time for Labor to demonstrate where it stands. Do they want to be a part of the solution or are they going to continue to be part of the problem and do nothing but whinge, whine and carp, because at the end of the day that will not put a single roof over anybody's head?

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

[5.59 p.m.]

Mr GUTWEIN (Bass - Treasurer) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Sports Shear Tasmanian Team

[5.59 p.m.]

Mr SHELTON (Lyons - Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise this evening to make special note of an event I was at on Saturday night and something that is dear to my heart, and that is state representation. I was at a function at Cressy on Saturday evening where I had the honour to announce the Sports Shear Tasmanian team which is heading to Dubbo in November to compete at the Dubbo Show. This land was built on the sheep's back in the early days. Shearing is very much a part of our heritage as well as an occupation for many people around Tasmania and of course around the rest of Australia.

I would like to impress on the parliament that it does not come easy. Whatever position you have in the shearing shed, whether it be as wool handler, a shearer, a wool classer or a roustabout, it is hard work and it is eight hours a day. In most occupations nowadays, you work for a couple of hours and you have morning tea and so on. In the shearing shed, it is two hours before you have your morning tea. Then you have a break; then it is another two hours before you have your lunch. Then in the afternoon it is the same thing. It is a full eight-hour day. It is piece work. Shearers get paid per sheep, but it is eight hours' worth of consistent work every day. Some only work seven and a half hours and knock off a little earlier but of course that is sheep that they do not shear. I was talking to one of the young guys on Saturday night and he was shearing 215 sheep a day.

As most people understand, I am involved with my brother on a farm, although he does most of the work nowadays. But whenever it comes around to crutching sheep, I always try to be there to help him. Literally pulling in 200 sheep a day is a fair effort, let alone shearing them when you have them out as well. It amazes me to see a good shearer, and how they work and how smooth they are. Absolutely amazing.

The team has competed at the Campbell Town Show and at other shows around Tasmania to win points to enable them to be eligible to be selected for the Tasmanian state team. What it does is make a connection between the city folk and the country people. Whenever the shearing is going on at Campbell Town there is always a big crowd around them. There is noise and activity and a lot of wool.

I do need to make sure that everybody is aware of the team that is going away. The manager is Daniel Fish. Many people know the Fishes at Epping Forest. The shearing team, three in the team, Rob Glover, Josh Hazelwood and Jamie Bryant. If you have ever been to a Campbell Town show or where these contests are happening, you will know that as the wool comes off the sheep, the handlers pick it up, throw it out and skirt it. Kellie Hazell, Michelle Walker and Casey Patterson are the three wool handlers. There are also shearing judges because you need to judge. Max Flood and Shane Bryant are the shearing judges and the wool judges are Patrisse Leckie and Emily Pennicott. They are the senior team. A development squad is also going away as well. The development squad in the shearing area consists of Jack Glover and Sam Byers. The senior wool handlers are Tiffany Collins and Lucy Byers. Intermediate shearing, Phil Bryant and James Spencer. Novice shearing, Bailey Freeman and Ricky Horne, and novice wool handling is Elly Burke and Grace Smith-Pullen.

I congratulate those members for making the Tasmanian side and wish them all the very best at Dubbo - it is the last weekend in November.

Willow Court - New Norfolk

[6.05 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I wanted to raise the issue of the wonderful heritage precinct of Willow Court at New Norfolk. As every member of this House knows, Willow Court has a dark history but it is one of those sites in Tasmania that we need to look after. We need to make sure it is open to the public and that it provides the opportunity to tell its own story of the history of the way we used to treat people in Tasmania living with disability or people experiencing mental illness. There are some concerns within the community at the moment about what the Derwent Valley Council's plans are for the Willow Court precinct so I want to read into the *Hansard* correspondence that we have received from Diane Cowburn in relation to Willow Court.

The current decisions being made by the Derwent Valley Council around proposals for the Willow Court precinct set up the opportunity for those precious buildings and surrounds to be forever taken from our community and all of the exciting possibilities for its future removed along with its cultural and historical integrity being compromised.

The premise seems to be development at all costs in an attempt to reinvigorate our region which seems to me to be a very short-sighted approach and fails to take into consideration all aspects of the Willow Court precinct's potential.

There is an ideal opportunity for Derwent Valley Council to build on the 2011 Malcolm MacDonald comprehensive and forward-looking business and development plan, especially as it currently has no policy for the adaptive reuse or conservation of Willow Court.

One of the Willow Court expressions of interest proposals includes an enhanced contemporary version of that particular plan, including provision for the extensive and unique historical collections and artefacts to be showcased.

With this proposal there would be a balance of commercial and community uses, providing access and activities for the community that are proven to have mental and physical health benefits, the ability to enhance self-esteem, increases in social engagement and economic value, and a community identity, amongst other benefits.

The Willow Court precinct has a strong and special association with our community and its culture and would be best served had the Derwent Valley Council taken all these aspects into account when they made the decision on 20 June to endorse two proposals that are just concepts for use of buildings, while at the same time disposing of the proposal that would have provided a framework for developing a community vision and management plan, staged redevelopment, and a planned approach to fitting proposed uses to the most suitable buildings, with the balance of community and commercial uses for the buildings.

Interestingly, the council dealt with these agenda items on 20 June when earlier in the meeting, during public question time, the general manager announced that he had commissioned 'an independent probity assessment in relation to the

process used in seeking expressions of interest by council in relation to the Willow Court site'.

Should the Derwent Valley Council have continued to deal with proposals for Willow Court when the process they have used to date is under question?

Yours sincerely

Diana Cowburn

There is an organisation that has a long-standing interest in and passion for the future of Willow Court and that is the Friends of Willow Court. One of the key individuals who is part of the Friends of Willow Court is Anne Salt. I will read Ms Salt's concerns -

It is now a matter of urgency that this matter be clarified as the Derwent Valley Council are in discussions to finalise the lease agreement (of three buildings) with the New Norfolk [Rum] Distillery with the view to sale later down the track. It will soon be finalising a lease agreement for the large Carlton yard to the Agrarian Kitchen and the 1830s Barracks building and Frascati House to Derwent Valley Arts.

Ms Salt, therefore, requests that we ask the state Government. That is what we are doing now. What was the state Government's intention for the Willow Court Barracks precinct when the site was handed to the Derwent Valley Council after its closure in 2000?

The DVC has made the decision to subdivide and lease, and possibly sell off buildings in this historic precinct in the absence of a long-term vision or management plan, and they have ignored all previously prepared plans to develop the site as a community asset.

The decisions of council to subdivide and lease buildings and spaces within the Barracks Precinct were based on acceptance of concept proposals, with no actual plans provided, or due diligence conducted on each proposal to my knowledge.

In addition, the DVC has made no provision for ongoing community access and use of the site, and has made no provision to bring the many hundreds of artefacts back to the site for secure storage, interpretation and display. These valuable artefacts are currently held in shipping containers, storage rooms and cardboard boxes.

Ms Salt, along with all members of the Friends of Willow Court, is extremely concerned at the failure of the Derwent Valley Council to consult with and inform the community on their intention to subdivide and lease this significant community asset.

The Minister for Local Government and the minister for Heritage needs to take a close personal interest in this and respond to the questions that we have asked on behalf of the Friends of Willow Court.

Huon Highway - Sandfly Intersection

[6.11 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I raise an issue regarding changes to speed limits in the section of the Huon Highway from Cemetery Corner of Vincennes Saddle and down through to Sandfly. The department has proposed a 20 per cent reduction in speed limits on what is a four-lane dual carriage highway. They have not written to the two local councils involved and they have not engaged in proper community consultation. They have put a notice on social media and spoken to some people and given two weeks for feedback. We are very concerned about this. This is off the back of the \$2 million proposal to upgrade the Sandfly intersection.

A number of community members have raised concerns about the intersection over a long period of time. Upon seeing the proposal that has been put forward by the department, a larger number of community members have raised concerns about the design and the proposal.

I have written to the minister about the Sandfly intersection after meeting on a Saturday morning with a number of local residents who were not notified about the proposed changes and the upgrade. They were not spoken to or asked their views, given they are local residents. Despite the minister saying that there has been consultation and that people have been written to, a number of local residents were not written to and were not aware of public meetings. They only became aware of the upgrade due to media and activity on my Facebook page.

We join with the community to raise concerns with the minister about the lack of consultation, not only about the Sandfly intersection upgrade but what seems to be a shock proposal to significantly reduce speed limits with little or no consultation with the community and no reference to established protocols of meeting, discussing, raising and consulting with local councils who are impacted.

Tassal - Scientific Permit Application

[6.13 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Deputy Speaker, I raise a matter of serious animal welfare concern which has come to our attention.

The DPIPW website's wildlife management page has opened an application for so-called scientific permit, that is available for public comment until 18 September. The applicant is Tassal. It is requesting so-called research into the effect of water stream deterrent on human-seal interactions for the protected long-nosed Australian fur seal.

This raises so many issues. Principal among them is that there is total silence about everything to do with animal welfare, seals and fish farms in Tasmania. There was a report last year by the ABC's Henry Swarts, who did an amazing overview through Right to Information. He identified that since 2013, 8700 bean bag bullets were shot at seals in Tasmania. Since 2016 there were 39 000 rounds of underwater explosives used. These are phenomenal numbers. Seals have been attacked by various methods, including shooting. Large numbers of seals were shot and dumped in a grave down in the south. There have been numerous attacks on seals. There has never been openness and transparency about the animal welfare methods used by the fish farm companies in their operations.

We are looking at profit over animal welfare. The seals have been shot at. They have had explosives thrown at them. They have been relocated in their tens of thousands from southern Tasmania up to the north, an incredibly cruel process. It has not only caused the animals to be dislocated and dumped in a far-flung part of the waters of the state, but it has caused huge disruptions to native fish populations and the fishing industries in the north-west of the state.

Tassal now has another proposal to undertake yet a new technique for harassing and managing seals that are around workers. We have no truck with companies keeping workers safe, but we are outraged on behalf of all Tasmanians who care about protecting native animals that this is all done in secrecy.

After the ABC expose on what is happening to Tasmanian fur seals, on behalf of the Greens I sought briefings on this with the minister. Ms O'Connor, in her capacity as member responsible for animal welfare, has sought briefings on animal welfare issues. We have been denied information. I asked questions in budget Estimates and was not given answers by the minister, despite him saying that he would do so. I was not given updated information for this year.

At every turn the Government is trying to hide the reality of the harm that is being done to seals by fish farm companies in Tasmania. The DPIPW claims on its website that there is a seal management framework that regulates the use of seal deterrent activities is garbage. How would we know? How would we know what is happening to seals in Tasmania in the name of profit for fish farm companies?

I suggest that the Government, prior to this so-called scientific research being undertaken, makes totally transparent to the Tasmanian people what is happening to seals and how management, or mismanagement, is occurring. It is clear there is a need for companies to explore another method of controlling seals. We want to know answers to questions. What is happening to the seals? How many of them are being harmed? How many of them are being relocated? How many of them are being killed? What is happening to all the plastics that are being shot at them and dropping to the bottom of the water around the fish pens? Hundreds of questions. Just open the doors. Tassal should open their doors. If they want to try yet another suspect animal welfare-concerning issue then they should open their books and come clean with what they are doing with seals. They, along with the other companies - it is not just Tassal, Huon Aquaculture is in the same situation - have problems with the way they are managing seals.

The Government must make information available to the public and to people putting a submission in before 18 September.

The House adjourned at 6.19 p.m.