

Thursday 13 June 2019

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

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

Support for Government

Madam SPEAKER - Honourable members, with the indulgence of the House I have a statement to make.

As I have indicated very clearly to the House previously, I have guaranteed support for the majority Liberal Government for the term of this parliament on matters of supply and confidence. That remains the case.

I also indicated at the outset on all other matters I consider my position on the merits of the argument - which is what I have done this week. Nothing has changed with my position.

The Liberal Government was elected with a mandate to deliver on its plan. I have voted regularly with the Government to deliver on that agenda. Whilst I may have disagreed with the Government on social issues and process matters - as I did this week- my guarantee on supply and confidence is in place and there is no minority Government.

QUESTIONS

Intensive Family Engagement Service

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER FOR CHILDREN, Mr JAENSCH

[10.04 a.m.]

On your watch, one child - a 12-week-old baby - has died and another, a year-old boy sustained horrific burns. Both these children were supposed to be in the care of the Intensive Family Engagement Service. There were serious concerns for the safety of both these children before these tragic incidents. You have not once disputed these facts. How many other children have died this year on your watch?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question. The majority Hodgman Liberal Government takes the wellbeing and the best interests of children and young people very seriously. A key component of the reforms we introduced on coming to Government, is to better support families before they reach crisis.

I have been very consistent in this place in that I will not be making comment on individual cases. I take my responsibilities in this place very seriously. I will comply with the strict requirements of the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act to the letter. I will not be discussing or speculating on any matters which may be the subject of independent inquiries.

Not providing an answer on this is not due to my ignorance or want to obstruct, but the fact is we are not the Coroner and we do not discuss or identify individual cases -

Mr O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. We are not asking for particular case details. This is a very serious issue. This is about the role of government and the responsibility they have to care for children. We have asked a specific question about a number. We ask the minister, not for the details of any particular case, but to update the House on the number.

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you. That is not a point of order. However, given the seriousness of the subject, I am sure the minister will do his best to address it.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The context of the member's question was the Intensive Family Engagement Service, which was introduced as part of our Strong Families - Safe Kids reforms, which for the first time in Tasmania now seeks to reach out to families and children at risk before harm occurs, to wrap services around them, to assist them to be better parents, and to provide a safer home for their children. This Government brought that reform in. It has been through a pilot program, which has been evaluated independently by the University of Tasmania

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. It goes to standing order 45. I ask you to draw the minister's attention to the question, which was asking him to detail how many children have died this year. It does not require him to breach any acts or his responsibilities as minister. It is simply about providing an update in his portfolio.

Madam SPEAKER - Unfortunately, that is not a point of order either. If the minister has that information, I am sure he will make it available.

Mr JAENSCH - I assure you this is relevant, Madam Speaker.

The Intensive Family Engagement Scheme process is a new one. The families and children involved are not under orders in our child safety system. They engage with the program voluntarily. The service occurs when the Family and Child Safety Service, which has knowledge of the family, agree that there is risk and that family could better do its role of parenting and providing a safe place for children. We wrap the services around them to help them.

I have met some of these families and some of the people who provide these services. As a parent myself, what has hit me is how much it takes for a family to come to a point where they recognise that they are not doing a good job as a parent and that they need help and to open their house to another person to come in to help them to do that job better. I take my hat off to young parents who find themselves in that position and that realisation of bringing other people into their home to help them.

Ms White - Minister, you are not answering the question at all. How many children have died this year?

Mr JAENSCH - These are not children on orders. These are not children in our system. These are children and families who understand they need help. We provide that help to them. The service we provide is not one from the Child Safety Service but from contracted specialist service providers who come into that house. It is not a child safety officer sitting there 24/7 guarding a child from

harm. That is not how it works. It is a service that provides assistance to a family, tailored to their needs to help them do their job of parenting better and keep their children safe.

We have provided this service. They never did. Back in the bad old days, the Child Protection Service turned up with a van and took the kids away. That's what this side of the House believes protection and prevention is all about. We are going away from that. We are reaching out earlier to families who are at risk; we are providing them with the services they need. We are helping them to be better parents and better families, keeping their kids safe before harm happens.

Child Safety Services - Serious Events Review Team

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HUMAN SERVICES, Mr JAENSCH

[10.09 a.m.]

You confirmed last week that there are six cases of children who were known to Child Safety Services currently being investigated by the Serious Events Review Team that has been established to look at deaths or serious injury to children. How many of these six cases are investigations of a child's death?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question again. There is nothing more important than the safety of our children. There is nothing more tragic than the death of a child. There are a number of cases in any year that are under investigation internally or through the Coroner's process, some of them dating back many years, some of them into previous governments and previous ministers' terms. I provided answers in Estimates to a range of questions in this area. We have provided some answers on notice or are in the process of doing so. I will ask my department to examine the detail of the specific question the Leader of the Opposition has raised today and ensure we provide an accurate figure when we are able to do so. I need to be clear of the context so I would appreciate it in writing.

Budget 2019-20 - Social and Economic Infrastructure

Mr SHELTON question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.12 a.m.]

Could you update the House on how the Hodgman majority Liberal Government 2019-20 Budget is delivering our plan to grow the economy and create jobs, support Tasmanians in need and build the infrastructure our growing state needs?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his question and the opportunity to speak about Tasmania's strong economy, which is the strongest in the nation for the first time in 15 years. Now is the time to strategically invest to maintain the momentum of this growth. This is what best enables us to invest in essential services and the things that are important to Tasmanians - Health, Education and Housing. Now is also the time to be investing in the infrastructure our growing state needs - better schools, better hospitals, better public housing, renewable energy, irrigation networks

and safer roads. These social and economic infrastructure investments are also job creating in themselves with this Budget expected to create 10 000 more jobs for Tasmanians.

In the past five years since coming to government we have delivered on our plan to grow our economy, to keep our state's finances in good shape, to support Tasmanian businesses, to create more jobs, and to invest into essential services for Tasmanians. Our Budget is in good shape. This will build on the achievement of net operating surpluses over the past three years with surpluses forecast for the next four.

This Budget will not only continue our plan, a plan that has delivered: 135 more police officers to keep our community safer; 222 more teachers in our schools, giving kids more opportunities through a better education; and over 500 more nurses working to give patients better health care. There are 13 000 more Tasmanians now employed than when we came into government.

This Budget is also about investing for the future. We have a record \$8.1 billion for Health, including better hospitals, building hospitals across the state, with over 1000 more staff to work in them. We have a record \$7.1 billion invested in Education, including building better schools across the state. This is the infrastructure that our growing state needs with an unprecedented \$3.6 billion in infrastructure investments to ensure we have the economic and social infrastructure needed for future generations of Tasmanians.

These are the things we are focused on. These are the things that Tasmanians want us to be focused on. We accept that there are big challenges confronting us. We accept responsibility for dealing with them. We also accept that we will not always get things right and we do not have all of the ideas but we do not want to spend our time focusing on ourselves. We want to focus on the people who elected us to this place to govern, not to play pointless political games nor engage with those who were not elected to govern this state. We will do all we can to help Tasmanians in need.

We are focused on getting on with the job while the Labor Party is focused on political stunts and delaying tactics and has failed the most basic of tests. They could not produce a budget of their own to say what they would do, to outline what they would do differently, to outline what their priorities are, or to show that they are capable of more than political attacks. They have failed dismally.

We were elected to this place to deliver for Tasmanians. Today should be a day about passing the Budget, which will deliver record investments for health, education, essential services, safer roads and the infrastructure our growing state needs. Today should be the day for delivering, not political stunts, not more delaying tactics, but to pass the Budget and let us get on with the job of delivering what Tasmanians elected us to do. We have certainly come a long way in the last five years. I believe our best days are ahead of us. This Budget plans for the future. It deals with the challenges we face now and it is all about investing strategically to ensure all Tasmanians can enjoy and participate in the strong economy that we have that is now the best performing in the country. Let us move on with it.

Mt Wellington Cableway Company - Government's Position

Ms O'CONNOR question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.17 a.m.]

After five years of being cheered on by your Government, supported by the public resources of State Growth and enabled by legislation that was supported by every Liberal and Labor member

in this place, the Mt Wellington Cableway Company has launched its development application to Hobart City Council. In the even odds scenario that council responds to overwhelming public opposition to this project and its many planning failures and rejects the development application, will you rule out using parliament or any other mechanism to defy the will of council and the people to further your Government's pet project?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Clark for her question. It is true that the Government has, for a long time, supported the concept of a cable car on the mountain. We have certainly welcomed the interest that has been shown and acknowledge that, while not everyone agrees with it, there are many Tasmanians who do support a cable car but we have said from day one that it needs to obtain all of the necessary approvals. It has to stand on its own feet -

Ms O'Connor - It never has.

Mr HODGMAN - The Government has said previously that we would not provide financial support to it and we should ensure that it is sustainable. It needs to be environmentally sustainable and it needs to be economically and financially sustainable as well. We have also said from day one that it should be assessed through proper process. The Greens, who so often complain about processes and assert all sorts of things about processes, most of which are not true, would be the people who would have us interfere and intervene in the process -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. The Premier is ignoring the question and misrepresenting our position. We are not asking you to intervene. We are asking you not to intervene if council rejects the development application.

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order, but I am sure the Premier -

Mr HODGMAN - Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have no intention of doing so. We believe it is about time that this project, which has been on the drawing board for years, is finally allowed to be assessed by the appropriate planning authority, the Hobart City Council. We look forward with interest to seeing how that progresses and we acknowledge the efforts of the proponents in getting the project to this point.

Child Safety Services - Death of a Child

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HUMAN SERVICES, Mr JAENSCH

[10.19 a.m.]

Nine weeks ago, in a separate, tragic incident, a four-month-old child died in a home in Southern Tasmania. This child was under the care of Child Safety Services. Are you aware of this child's death? Is this tragedy being investigated by your Serious Events Review Team, or the Serious Events Review Committee?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question. Based on the information provided, I cannot be certain which case the member is referring to. I will not be commenting on individual

cases. However, I can confirm that as part of our redesign process that, in cases in which a child has died, suffered a serious injury or adverse outcome that is known to Child Safety Services, comprehensive reviews are undertaken by our serious event review team. Through a serious event review team review, the department can take account of any assessments, decisions and actions to identify and enable the system and practise improvements to be taken, if needed. These review reports are available to the Coroner. The serious event review committee also receives the report and makes representations and recommendations to the Secretary of Communities Tasmania.

In this Budget, we have committed an additional \$2.3 million to strengthen our quality assurance processes, improve practise in investigation and response, to support this process and to respond to it. The benefit of doing so has been evident in recent times with coroner's reports coming through in the sad event of a child's death; often the Coroner has been able to refer to internal investigations the matters they have raised and action already taken to address anything we need to adopt into our forward work plan toward the future care of children and young people.

I will not be speaking about the details of individual cases. My job as minister is to ensure that, if and when events like this arise, we have the appropriate internal processes to quickly respond to ensure the safety of children in our care, to investigate the cases, to provide continuous improvement in the services we provide and to provide thorough, detailed, timely advice to the coroner and any other body that may be independently investigating it.

Child Safety Services - Death of a Child

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HUMAN SERVICES, Mr JAENSCH

[10.22 a.m.]

Alarming red flags were raised at the time of birth of this child who tragically died in April, including that the child's parents were known to Child Safety Services. Medical professionals raised urgent concerns about the child's safety before the child left hospital at birth. Concerns that death might eventuate should have been treated more seriously. Did this child receive the support that was required, and was Child Safety Services given the resources required to ensure this child was safe from harm?

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Madam Speaker. Given that the Leader of the Opposition has earlier assured the minister she is not asking about individual cases, and that the questions are now going to individual cases, I ask that you allow the minister lenience in answering in that he will not be chided on relevance but nonetheless observe his responsibilities.

Ms O'BYRNE - On the point of order, Madam Speaker. It is entirely appropriate to ask these questions in this House. They do not breach the The Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act. They do not identify the child but they do go to whether this minister is able to assure members of this House that appropriate actions have been taken.

Madam SPEAKER - I am going to rule them both out, in fairness. I will let the question go ahead. But please, we need to be very careful in this House when we are dealing with very sensitive issues. It is important we also recognise that some of the people here are not directly responsible for what has happened - it is further down the track. I feel it is sometimes becoming a bit personal. If you do not mind -

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I must make the comment that ultimate responsibility lies with the minister of the day under the Westminster system. Therefore, the minister should answer questions in this House.

Madam SPEAKER - Yes, you are correct but we are still individuals and I would like you to be respectful of that.

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I am regularly briefed in detail on a whole range of cases by my department as they arise and as they progress through their investigations.

We have discussed this here before and yet again in Estimates, the Opposition is seeking to - without identifying a case - ask me to answer questions about it. I cannot do that. I take my responsibilities under the act seriously. I am not going to provide any assurances or rulings in or out on specific cases when they do not identify the case for good reason. I, for the same reasons, cannot provide a definitive response.

Mr O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. It goes to relevance. It goes to the potential systemic failure of child protection in Tasmania. This is a very important topic. We are here raising these issues on behalf of the community of Tasmania and asking it on relevance. We are asking him to respond in terms of the system that is supposed to protect our children and ask if there is a systemic failure in this case.

Madam SPEAKER - You have been heard on *Hansard*. I am sorry I do have to rule it out and I cannot instruct the minister what to say. Let us allow him to finish.

Mr JAENSCH - Again, it is a sneaky trap. What they are trying to do is say we are not identifying the case. They are asking for me to provide answers about specific cases they cannot or say they will not identify therefore, I cannot provide them with answers.

Ms O'Byrne - You cannot have it both ways. You cannot say the act says we cannot identify and then blame us for not identifying.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr JAENSCH - This came up in Estimates and the Opposition, when asking about the intensive family engagement service, was saying they had heard concerns about some cases. I was unable to give them answers on those cases for the very same reasons and therefore what they are doing is saying there remains concerns about systemic failures and children are dying.

We have provided the independent review of the IFES service by the University of Tasmania, which identifies a very positive report on the impact as a new way of providing services to prevent children coming into harm. It encourages the service to continue. It talks about the experience of families in the process, of workers and service providers in the service and encourages the Government to keep going and continue to improve. There is no evidence in that of systemic failure of the service or the system. When the Opposition raises an anonymous case I cannot respond to, they cannot associate that with any assessment of the performance of the child safety system.

Ms O'Byrne - You should be able to say families are getting the support they need to keep them safe from harm. You should be able to say that in this House.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr JAENSCH - It is another silly game. Unfortunately, in this case it is dealing with matters of the most grave and sensitive nature. It is well out of order. I will not be answering any more questions framed around individual cases. I do not intend to.

Budget 2019-20 - Health Budget

Mrs RYLAH question to MINISTER for HEALTH, Mr FERGUSON

[10.28 a.m.]

Health is one of the Government's top priorities. Can you please update the House on how the Hodgman majority Liberal Government's 2019 Budget is delivering our plan to build a better health system?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Braddon, Mrs Rylah, for her question. I absolutely agree. We all know the Hodgman Liberal Government is taking health seriously, investing in health and making the system stronger so we can provide better support for our patients. It is a core commitment of our Government. Every single year we are investing more funding, investing for growth including in health and supporting our hard-working staff. It is with a goal of delivering more, better and safer services and, importantly, to meet the increasing demand for acute care we all understand.

Tasmania now has the strongest economy in the nation for the first time in 15 years. Our Government has a budget and plan to maintain this momentum in our state. A strong budget means we can enjoy the benefits including; record funding for infrastructure, education and, of course, importantly in health. Our hospitals and our patients have been a top priority for this Government since the very beginning, since day one. We have acknowledged those challenges from the beginning and we have embraced the need to pursue those challenges and to deal with them including ones ignored for years. We acknowledge our hospitals and our staff are under pressure and at capacity. We acknowledge we need to do more and we will. That is exactly what we are doing with our \$8.1 billion health budget and that does not even include the \$350 million of capital projects.

They include completing stages 1 and 2 of the RHH redevelopment, the capacity that we need, delivering the most comprehensive redevelopment of the Launceston General Hospital in decades and finalising the \$35 million of work at the Mersey for its redevelopment and building new capital facilities at the North West Regional Hospital.

These projects are important infrastructure projects, not just for our health system but for our state. It is about creating jobs but importantly building the capacity with the contemporary facilities that our staff and our patients deserve. The facts are that we cannot do any of this service or capital funding without a rock-solid commitment to delivering the funding that Health needs underpinned by strong budget management.

That is why the majority Hodgman Liberal Government is delivering our plan to build a stronger economy and to create jobs. The evidence shows that our plan is working. We need a strong economy so that we can put these extra funds into Health. It has not happened by accident as some opposite would have you believe. It is our policies that are supporting Tasmania to grow;

for more people to make their home here, for more jobs to be created here, which in turn helps to provide government revenue that we can put back into our health system.

I congratulate my Government colleagues, particularly the Premier and the Treasurer, for this year's Budget, which is unashamedly all about maintaining the momentum and investing for growth. I look forward to the final passage of the Budget through our House later today.

Our plan is very clear: more health staff, more health services and better health facilities, including ones that have been talked about for years that the previous people did not get a chance to start. It is that simple. It is in complete contrast to the Labor Party. Not only does the Opposition have no plan, no vision and no solutions, they are being called out by commentators. They have squibbed the chance during a budget debate, which goes for four weeks, to produce an alternative budget. Did they produce an alternative budget? The official Opposition squibbed the chance to produce an alternative budget. They failed dismally.

The Leader of the Opposition is running a small target strategy; no alternative budget that they could be scrutinised for. They have squibbed the chance to try to show their credentials as an alternative government by laying out a clear plan. The shadow treasurer could have shown some leadership here and shown how he would have reframed Mr Gutwein's Budget to do things differently. But no, Rebecca White and Scott Bacon and the Labor Party have made it very obvious. You are very happy to have a whinge about the Budget. You have had a four-week sook session about the Budget but you have not been prepared to show how you would do it better or in a different way.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. Standing order 48 - the minister has been answering this Dorothy Dixier for close to five minutes.

Madam SPEAKER - I am sure he has about finished.

Mr FERGUSON - Madam Speaker, it is an important point. On the one-hand, the Opposition have been complaining about the Government spending too much money and then on the other hand saying we are not spending enough money on Health. You cannot have it both ways. When the opportunity has come for the Opposition to stump up with an alternative budget, to show Tasmanians what they would pretend to offer as an alternative government, they have been unable to do it. They have refused to do it. The team of two Greens were able to do a better job than the official Opposition which puts the Opposition to shame.

Not one change to our infrastructure spending, not an extra dollar for hospitals, not a single extra bed. The Opposition has only confirmed that Labor would show less discipline on budget management and wages which means we would be \$1.9 billion in net debt without delivering any extra infrastructure projects or health funding.

Appeals Against Developments within Reserves - Local Government Rights

Dr WOODRUFF question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.34 a.m.]

Your Government is facilitating the exploitation of wilderness and other natural reserves across the state. You are bending every rule and writing new ones to enable private profit making from lands owned by the Tasmanian people. From the 52 secret developments in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area to the commercialisation of Rosny Hill and a cable car on

kunanyi/Mt Wellington, our natural places are under siege. The Central Highlands Council voted against a private development being built at Halls Island on Lake Malbena in the Walls of Jerusalem National Park. The developers who lost are appealing to the Resource Management Appeal Tribunal, to be held on 24 June.

Is it not true your Government has joined this appeal to remove the right of local councils, on behalf of their communities, to have a say about developments within reserves within their jurisdiction? How do you justify yourself to Tasmanians who love our protected areas and will be again footing the bill for your politicised pro-development agenda?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for what is a re-run of similar questions asked, including in Estimates. I have outlined at length the processes of how the Lake Malbena project is to be assessed, including the additional elements that have been applied, not only through government processes but by the proponents themselves self-referring to the Commonwealth under the EPBC Act. That was not required of them but they did, which allowed that project to be further assessed.

In relation to the others, and this is where it does sound like the Greens are suggesting that we should intervene in matters that are appropriately assessed by local government authorities. We will not do that. We respect the right of our local councils to undertake their responsibilities and exercise their functions and to serve as the approvals process and decision-making bodies where it is required of them. We have added additional layers of assessment to processes which are facilitated, projects where the expressions of interest in the tourism space are low impact but high quality, high grade tourism operations.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order 45, relevance, Madam Speaker, the Premier has talked about additional layers and there aren't any. If he has additional layers could he please tell the House?

Madam SPEAKER - That is not a point of order.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, I have outlined at length and am happy to do so again, all that is expected of those who progress through the EOI process. Yes, we respect their intellectual property. We believe they should be able to bring forward what are world-class ventures and operations in our wilderness areas and have for many years been possible under Tasmanian laws. We have wanted to facilitate and bring forward ideas to help us be the eco-tourism capital of the world, to support jobs in our regional communities. But we will not, as the Greens suggest in their question, interfere in any way with local government authorities that have these responsibilities. We have every confidence in them discharging those functions.

Child Safety Services - Correspondence with Minister

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HUMAN SERVICES, Mr JAENSCH

[10.38 a.m.]

Relatives of the four-month old baby wrote to you on 18 May, almost a month ago, raising this tragic incident. After 26 days why have you not responded to this grieving family's heartbreaking email to you?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question. Again, I am not going to be providing any detailed answers on specific cases. I cannot and I will not. There are matters here that are in processes involving policy potentially, coroners and others. I am not going to be providing any information that may be in contempt of, or prejudicial to, any of those investigations. I want to call the Opposition out -

Ms WHITE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. It goes to Standing Order 45. I ask you to draw the minister's attention to the fact that he was not asked to detail any specifics relating to the child, but simply if he can explain why he has not responded to an email he received. It is an important question. He needs to be able to explain his actions as the minister.

Madam SPEAKER - As you know, that is not a point of order and the minister is trying to explain why he cannot answer. Please proceed.

Mr JAENSCH - It may be disappointing to the Opposition, Madam Speaker, and uncomfortable for me, but I am not going to be discussing individual cases here. I have held that position for a long time. I do so under clear advice regarding my responsibilities to the integrity of the procedures there to independently investigate and follow these processes through.

Madam Speaker, I say to the Opposition, this is rank hypocrisy from them. I am not going to go through the rap sheet of incidents disclosed on their watch and not reaching back there. We do know the last government ignored 15 reports and 600 recommendations for changes to the child protection system on their watch. I do not intend to go through the examples because I am above that. What I can point to is the program of reforms of the child safety system this Government brought in when it first came to office, which are now being implemented, working and hailed as the best of their kind in Australia.

We have taken international -

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. This is not for the details of the case. It is the decency of responding to the family member who has emailed him. All he needs to do is email her back; he does not need to say anything about the case. The fact is he has not had the decency to respond.

Madam SPEAKER - It is not a point of order and it would be good if the minister could wind up, thank you.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you, I will wind up, Madam Speaker. The member who has resumed her seat is asserting I have ignored an email. She ignored 15 reports and 600 recommendations to fix a child protection system failing under independent review. It is the pot calling the kettle black and I am not going to be answering any more questions on individual cases.

Budget 2019-20 - Elder Abuse Prevention Strategy

Mr TUCKER question to MINISTER for HUMAN SERVICES, Mr JAENSCH

[10.42 a.m.]

Can you update the House on how the Hodgman Liberal Government's 2019-20 Budget is delivering our plan to support vulnerable Tasmanians, particularly in the prevention of elder abuse in Tasmania?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank, Mr Tucker, the member Lyons, for his question and interest in this important issue.

Tasmania now has the strongest economy in the nation for the first time in 15 years and the Hodgman Liberal Government has a budget and a plan to maintain the momentum and invest for growth. We want all Tasmanians to contribute to and benefit from our state's brighter future, regardless of their age or stage in life. However, as they grow older some Tasmanians can become vulnerable and need additional protection.

The United Nations has designated 15 June as World Elder Abuse Awareness Day. On this day each year, communities all over the globe take a stand against the abuse of older people. Tomorrow, I will be joining COTA Tasmania, in Hobart, on the Walks Against Elder Abuse. My colleague, Mrs Rylah, member for Braddon, will be walking in Launceston to raise awareness of this important issue.

Elder abuse in any form is never okay and that is why we are committed to protecting Tasmanians in need and keeping our community safe. This is why we have been updating the Tasmania's Elder Abuse Prevention Strategy, which will be released shortly. The new strategy will be supported by an additional \$850 000 in the 2019-20 state Budget. This is in addition to our existing commitment to recurrently fund the Tasmanian Elder Abuse Helpline.

Key actions to be funded from the additional \$850 000 provided in the state Budget include a contemporary community awareness campaign, a new website to help streamline referral pathways, the development of training tools for Tasmanians who work in the sector, and commencement of a review into safeguard for older Tasmanians. This funding will also assist implementation of the National Plan to respond to Abuse of Older Australians 2019-23, which was endorsed by the Tasmanian Government earlier this year.

Our commitment to preventing elder abuse in Tasmania aligns with the Hodgman Liberal Government's Strong, liveable communities: Tasmania's Active Ageing Plan 2017-2022, which was released by the Premier back in May 2017. The Active Ageing Plan is a comprehensive whole-of-government strategy to support older Tasmanians to participate at all levels in our community and outlines four actions to support Tasmanians to age well. One of those is security, which aims to support awareness of and improved response to elder abuse in Tasmania. The updated Tasmanian strategy sets out our plan to deliver this action.

The Hodgman Liberal Government has always considered the safety of our community to be a top priority. During our first term we provided \$600 000 in funding towards raising awareness, addressing and preventing elder abuse in Tasmania. In our second term we committed \$150 000 per annum over three years toward the prevention of elder abuse that enables the continuation of the elder abuse advocacy service operated by Advocacy Tasmania, which provides follow-up support for clients after contacting the Tasmanian Elder Abuse Helpline, a community awareness campaign, and for COTA Tasmania to continue to build capacity of older Tasmanians and raise community and service provider awareness of elder abuse.

I thank COTA Tasmania for organising tomorrow's very important events to raise awareness of elder abuse in Tasmania. Together with our stakeholders we are committed to raising awareness

and preventing elder abuse in Tasmania. I thank again the members of the Statewide Elder Abuse Prevention Advisory Committee, who have been instrumental in the development of the updated strategy that will be released shortly, delivering on our election commitment to do so.

Intensive Family Engagement Service - UTAS Evaluation

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HUMAN SERVICES, Mr JAENSCH

[10.46 a.m.]

A UTAS evaluation on the Intensive Family Engagement Service had to be dragged from your desk during Estimates hearings last week. This report was delivered in February, two months before a four-month-old child tragically died and contains extremely serious concerns about the effectiveness and the flaws of this program, which was introduced by your Government in 2017. Why did you keep a report hidden that contains serious concerns about whether children were receiving support to help keep them safe?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question. It is ironic that she said the report was dragged from my desk when it was apparent that the Opposition was not aware of it. They did not drag it; we provided it.

Ms White - Because we asked for it.

Mr JAENSCH - We used the report in Estimates to provide answers on how the Intensive Family Engagement Service was going. We gave the committee the report. It was not dragged, it was gifted and -

Mr O'Byrne - Day one, no, day two, you had no choice.

Mr JAENSCH - It is a report with 40 or 60 findings that were delivered to my department, which then ran the pilot and is now reviewing the outcomes of the pilot.

Ms White - Seventy-four findings.

Mr JAENSCH - Seventy-four findings, excellent. You have looked at the report we gave the Estimates committee. The Department of Communities Tasmania commissioned the report to evaluate the service they had piloted for the first time. The service had been piloted to assist families to keep kids safe. The report produced 74 findings and recommendations we can use to improve that service going beyond the pilot into full operation, which we have funded with \$7.5 million in the Budget. The UTAS report is very, very positive about this initiative. It identifies areas for improvement but that is why we commissioned the evaluation; to see what is working best and what needs improvement. We have recommendations and we are working with them.

It was not dragged out of us. We gave it to the committee. I will continue to work with that report and that information and we will make the service even stronger.

Budget 2019-20 - Job-Creating Infrastructure

Mr SHELTON question to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.49 a.m.]

Can you update the House on how the Hodgman majority Liberal Government's 2019-20 Budget is delivering our plan to build the job-creating infrastructure and the skilled workforce our growing state needs, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, the majority Hodgman Liberal Government is delivering our plan to build a stronger economy and create jobs. The evidence shows that our plan is working. Only last week, the economic growth figures confirmed that Tasmania has the strongest economy in the country. To support this strong economy, the 2019-20 state Budget -

Mr O'Byrne - How do you do that? It's a miracle.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Mr O'Byrne, you know I do not like to throw you out but you are now on warning number one.

Mr ROCKLIFF - To support this strong economy, the 2019-20 state Budget delivers a record investment to build the job-creating infrastructure and the skilled workforce our growing state needs. Our strong commitment to roads and transport infrastructure investment continues in the 2019-20 Budget with a total of over \$1.6 billion that will support the creation of jobs and deliver massive support to businesses and families in our communities. Our Budget provides total funding of \$184.16 million over the forward Estimates to upgrade education facilities -

Mr O'Byrne - It is a bit like Harry Potter's chamber of secrets.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Mr O'Byrne, that is warning number two. There is only one left.

Mr ROCKLIFF - around the state. We will be building new schools at Legana and Brighton and six new early learning hubs.

Dr Broad - What about Ulverstone Primary? What are you doing about that?

Mr ROCKLIFF - I know Dr Broad has an interest in education. I look forward to reading the Labor member for Braddon, Dr Broad's educational qualifications in the *Hansard* of last night. It was an unedifying experience. We had Dr Woodruff and Dr Broad in some sort of 'doctor off' in the adjournment debate last night.

Ms White - You are meant to be talking about infrastructure.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I am talking about education infrastructure and Dr Broad appreciates that because he values education. He talks about education, particularly as it relates to himself. As Education, Skills and Training minister, I talk about the aspirations of our young people, that is fantastic, and Dr Broad talks about what he has achieved. I commend you, Dr Broad, for what you have achieved.

Members - Hear, hear.

Mr ROCKLIFF - I have not reached your exalted heights. I am a farmer with a diploma in farm management. I try my best but, Dr Broad, it was a very interesting contribution last night and I look forward to reading about you today.

Ms O'Connor - Dr Woodruff gave a good contribution in response.

Mr ROCKLIFF - It was a fantastic 'doctor off', it really was.

While we are investing record amounts into infrastructure in this Budget, we are also supporting the people who will build it. Infrastructure is important because it is about people, it is about jobs to support the skilled workforce our growing state needs. We are continuing to invest over \$100 million each year on skills development. This year's Budget saw us direct an additional \$2.9 million to train more apprentices and students in growth industries including construction, electrotechnology, plumbing, welding and nursing. These qualifications will help create a pipeline for future workers for the building and construction sector which is experiencing unprecedented growth. That pipeline is important, despite the relentless negativity of those opposite. We released the first 10-year pipeline ever: some \$14 billion worth of investment into infrastructure over the course of the next 10 years and \$8 billion of that has been earmarked as Government investment.

TasTAFE will employ an additional five teachers across building, construction and allied trades, a dedicated team of three welding teachers and a dedicated apprenticeship co-ordinator and industry liaison officer. We will continue to provide small business grants, helping employers take on new apprentices and trainees and we have extended the successful payroll tax rebate until 30 June 2021.

These initiatives are central to helping young Tasmanians secure training and matching the demand of key industries to the training of apprentices and trainees.

The member asked if I was aware of any alternative approaches. The answer is still 'no'. They have failed to deliver an alternative budget or a credible plan, proposed no changes to our plan, none whatsoever, and essentially endorsed our infrastructure measures.

I can talk about the relentless negativity of particularly the Opposition spokesperson for infrastructure when it comes to his commentary on infrastructure. The Opposition member cannot have it both ways. Last night he was commending himself on our infrastructure initiatives, taking credit for it all. Our record on infrastructure investment in this Budget will support local businesses, it will sustain jobs, will provide more skills development and training opportunities. It will help improve the lives of people, individuals and families right across Tasmania.

Intensive Family Engagement Service - UTAS Evaluation

Ms WHITE question to MINISTER for HUMAN SERVICES, Mr JAENSCH

[10.56 a.m.]

The UTAS study into the Intensive Family Engagement Service shows that there are very serious concerns about its effectiveness in protecting children at potential danger. It shows service providers are confused about how the service works, there are concerns about delivery of care not

being actively monitored and that there is not enough oversight of the program by your department. Some families referred for intensive support were too high risk to take part in the program. Your department needs to undertake risk assessment when the program is concluding to determine whether children are safe to stay in their homes. At least one child has died and another has suffered serious injuries while in the care of this program and we know you have had this report for more than four months. What action have you taken on these very serious concerns identified by this evaluation?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for her question. The Department of Communities Tasmania commissioned this work to identify areas for improvement in the program, which we have piloted for the first time to fill a very important gap in providing child safety, not just child protection. We are reaching out to those families we know may be at risk in the future, entering them into our Child Safety System, helping them to parent better, make a safer place for kids to live and keep families together. We now understand that the removal of a child from a family in itself contributes to the trauma of that child and that family that they carry for life.

That is clearly understood these days. This is best practice now. This is where we are taking our Child Safety System reforms by introducing initiatives like IFES. That is why we asked the University of Tasmania to review our pilot program. That is why the 74 findings have been received by and are actively being considered by our Department of Communities Tasmania as we roll over into the longer-term delivery of the program.

Ms White - You have ignored the alarming findings this evaluation identifies.

Mr JAENSCH - There are not 'alarming findings' in this evaluation. There are a number of recommendations for review and improvement of how we contract the services, how we train people, how we conduct risk assessments at either end, but overwhelmingly the results have been positive. Families and children have been diverted from entering the Child Safety System, which is exactly what the program is for.

We have introduced this. They never did. It is working and we will continue. This report will assist us to make it even better.

Budget 2019-20 - Support for Small Business

Mrs RYLAH question to TREASURER, Mr GUTWEIN

[10.59 a.m.]

Can you update the House on how the majority Hodgman Liberal Government's 2019-20 Budget is delivering our economic plan for Tasmania's future, including support for small business?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs Rylah for her question and for her interest in this very important matter.

The first thing I will say in terms of how we are supporting small business is that we have the fastest growing economy in the country. On our side the fastest growing economy in the country; on that side no policies, no platform, nothing, zero. Here we are at the end of almost four weeks of the budget session and what have they delivered? Zip, zero. To quote Mr McKim from a few years ago, a big fat bagel is what the other side of the House has put up. They were provided with an opportunity to bring forward an alternative budget, to explain to the people of Tasmania what they stand for, what they would cut, what they would change in our Budget. What did they do? They did not one thing.

This Budget is about building things. We unashamedly will get on with the job. This Budget will build bridges, roads, schools and hospitals. It will build the infrastructure that will service this state for the next 100 years. Dams and irrigation infrastructure - in 100 years', time people will still be drawing water from the dams we are going to build. They will still be irrigating crops. They will still be watering stock. It is truly inter-generational infrastructure. What have they proposed on that side of the House? Two weeks of whingeing about our Budget. Two weeks of saying that we do not have enough projects in it. What have they put forward? How many new projects? Zero.

The question was, what will this Budget do for small business? Well, \$3.6 billion worth of infrastructure investment will drive small business. It will give small business the opportunity to tender for opportunities. They will help us to build Tasmania's infrastructure of the future. As those tradies drive past shops, they will buy goods. They will buy their lunch. They will support our retail sector. On this side of the House -

Ms White - What are you doing about the trade waste problems?

Mr GUTWEIN - From that interjection, I point out that, from 2006 to 2014, with a hospital to build, what did they do? They did not lay one brick.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Treasurer, a man of your experience knows better than to bring a prop in. I would like an apology to the House, thank you.

Mr GUTWEIN - Madam Speaker, I am sorry I brought a brick into the House. I thought it would be educative for those on the other side to understand that it is what you build stuff with.

We come to the end of the Budget session. On this side of the House we stand proudly behind our Budget. It is a budget that will grow the economy. It will create jobs. This Budget will deliver 10 000 new jobs and \$3.6 billion worth of infrastructure and, importantly, it will drive our economy to generate the revenues that we need to invest into essential services.

Time expired.

RIGHT TO INFORMATION AMENDMENT (APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW) BILL 2019 (No. 14)

First Reading

Bill presented by **Ms Archer** and read the first time.

SITTING DATES

[11.05 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business)(by leave) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 30 July next at 10 a.m.

[11.05 a.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I move an amendment to the motion. I move -

Leave out the words after 'until' and insert instead 'Friday 14 June 2019 at 10 a.m.'.

We do not move this amendment lightly and move it in the face of what is a clear and present crisis issue surrounding housing.

It has been clear in a debate of this House and in community debate over an extended period of time the issue of housing is something that the people of Tasmania and those in the sector are seeking leadership from the state Government.

It is clear when you hear comments from the Chief Executive, Kym Goodes from TasCOSS, who has said this is now a crisis. It requires leadership and a strategic approach that moves beyond the current business as usual options and initiatives. Time and time again, we have seen identified by stakeholders, the Property Council, the sector, Council of Social Services and individual and community groups, housing is a clear issue demanding leadership and a change of business as usual.

This House and parliament needs to lead on this issue. When coming to Government in 2010 the Liberal Party inherited a public housing wait list at its lowest in a decade. The latest figures show applications have since tripled to more than over 3 200 families on the housing register with 75 of those high priority. The average time to house priority applicants has blown out now to 60 weeks. This is more than a year.

These are ordinary Tasmanians who through no fault of their own find themselves in difficult circumstances and seek leadership from their government. This Government has identified it as a key part of their agenda when re-elected. As one of their first acts on re-election last year - prior to this House being reformed - they convened a housing crisis summit; a summit where even this Government acknowledged housing was a significant issue. Yet, we have seen the situation deteriorate. The situation is worse for ordinary Tasmanians. Business as usual and the response of this Government has been manifestly inadequate to deal with this challenge.

This House needs to reconvene tomorrow - in unusual circumstances - to deal with this crisis, because the people of Tasmania have demanded it. On the record in *Hansard* the quote from the Minister for Housing yesterday. He said:

If there was one simple solution, it would be done by now. We are listening to the sector, we are caring about people in need and we are prepared to put in place solutions that are as complex as the problem. By the end of this week I hope to be able to announce the next stage of our action.

Well, we are seeking an urgent debate tomorrow on these actions and these announcements.

Mr Ferguson - More words.

Mr O'BYRNE - These are not words, this is this House elevating the issue of housing to a level where we can demand the time. This Government has been afraid of transparency and accountability. You prorogued parliament earlier this year, because of your own disfunction losing members hand over fist. You pushed back and delayed the sittings of parliament this year. Over the last couple of weeks, every time we use the forms of this House to demand accountability you say you have confidence in your ministers and have taken the unusual and unreasonable steps to gag debate of this House. We could not even debate the motions because you were too afraid. Not three months ago, not six months ago, not 12 months ago but barely 24 hours ago, members of your own Government called your plan and your response to the housing crisis incompetent. It is upon all members of this House; we have the responsibility to debate it and keep coming to work.

You have had a shocking four weeks: a budget which drags Tasmania into over a billion dollars of net debt with no pathway out of it and an infrastructure and a narrative you cannot defend because there are no new projects. Your performance last week in Estimates was woeful. You could barely answer questions. You had a Treasurer who refused to answer questions and you had a Premier who could barely answer a question without leaning in and taking advice. You have, time and time again, failed to respond to the Tasmanian people. You are all up and about, thinking this is the last day of parliament so we can scuttle off and away from accountability and transparency.

We are ready to turn up to work to debate this issue of housing. Are you ready? If you vote against this amendment, if you run away from this House, you run away from accountability and you have shown yet again to the Tasmanian people that you have no solutions, you have no vision and you are afraid of accountability. We move this amendment because we believe this is a matter of importance. Are you brave enough to turn up and debate and protect your own record?

[11.11 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) - Madam Speaker, I will try to bring some calm to the debate. The manager of opposition business, with his breathless attempt to outshine his actual leader, has overstepped on a number of issues. The Government will not be supporting this stunt motion. It is an attempt to amend a motion that goes to the sitting dates of the House. As the member who has resumed his seat has indicated, it is a highly unusual step; another way of describing a stunt. It calls a number of things into question. I will be happy to make a couple of comments about the issue of housing the member is trying to raise there. This goes to an attempt by members opposite to have a de facto confidence motion so we will not be having a bar of it from the Labor Party. They have been doing this all week -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr FERGUSON - This brings the number of stunt motions you have done on question of confidence to four and for that simple reason we will not be supporting that. I certainly reject -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr FERGUSON - You expect to be listened to but you will never listen. It is a chance for me to explain the Government's position as to why we are not supporting your amendment. The claim the member made that voting against it is running away from accountability is rejected, not that it goes to the actual amendments for the Chair at the present time, but it may assist members to understand that the Minister for Housing has specifically set his day aside tomorrow to -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr FERGUSON - Hang on, he has told you this already and because he has told you what he is doing tomorrow, you want to run interference on him taking action - to meet with stakeholders. You have to have a criminal mind to understand the Labor Party these days. That is what you have been up to. You want to interfere with the minister taking action -

Ms WHITE - Madam Speaker, point of order. I ask that you ask the minister to withdraw that statement. It is very unparliamentary.

Mr FERGUSON - I withdraw the statement that you need a criminal mind to understand the Labor Party.

Madam SPEAKER - I would like you to withdraw it wholeheartedly.

Mr FERGUSON - I withdraw it again wholeheartedly.

The Labor Party is doing this because the minister told the House that he is sitting down with TasCOSS, Shelter Tasmania and Colony 47 tomorrow. You want to interfere with it and play stunt politics because he told you that he is meeting with them to develop an urgent response to the expansion of homeless shelter capacity and services, work which is underway now with the input from the Liberal member for Clark's proposal. We are committed to action, not more talk and further debate, and because he told you that, you want to interfere with it. This goes to confidence. Again, the Labor Party is the most easily offended on the planet but this is a stunt motion. It is your fourth for the week and we will not be supporting it.

[11.15 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, Dr Woodruff and I are prepared to be here tomorrow if the sole focus is on the housing and homelessness crisis. If we can make it an outcomes-based debate that is not just members shouting at each other that would be very helpful. The Tasmanian community would expect us to be dedicating our hearts and our minds to this issue in the most constructive way possible. We do need an emergency response to the homelessness crisis and we have not seen any evidence of that coming from the minister yet, who has been in the job for more than a year.

The delivery of the minister's next stage of actions in the portfolio tomorrow does provide the House with an opportunity to look at that document and engage with the minister on its substance. Ideally, we could have a full briefing for all members with Shelter Tasmania, TasCOSS and Colony 47. We could book the reception room, sit there and pay attention while community sector organisations on the front line of housing and homelessness provide the most up to date details on the situation and engage with the whole of the parliament on finding solutions.

We are more than happy to work in this place tomorrow. I acknowledge it is much easier for a Hobart-based member to say that. We are talking about letting kids down tonight, so this is not a matter the House should deal with lightly. There are children waiting at home to see their parents in other parts of the state and it would only be for something as important as making sure this parliament is working cooperatively to increase the supply of social and affordable housing that Dr Woodruff and I would want to let those kids down.

Should the House resolve that we will sit tomorrow, Dr Woodruff and I will be here early seeking to work constructively with other parties in this place. We would be very willing and glad to sit down with key housing stakeholders with whom we have very good relations and work through some of these issues. Dr Woodruff and I will be voting to sit tomorrow, get to work and engage with the minister on the next stage of his action plan and hopefully have an outcomes-based debate tomorrow rather than an ugly slinging match.

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Human Services) - Madam Speaker, as indicated, we do not support scheduling a day of parliament debating the political aspects of this. We are very committed and I am committed as minister to addressing this continuing issue of housing shortage and homelessness in our city and in our state with action rather than more talk. We already have an inquiry scheduled. We have meetings with Hobart City Council next week. There is a lot of talk and discussion, which is good, positive debate, but the overriding obligation is for us as government and a parliament to deliver action.

As you know, through our discussions and in the work with the sector, that you and I and others have been involved with, there is a plan forming that we hope to provide some more detail on -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr JAENSCH - as a result of a meeting tomorrow afternoon. I do not believe that parliament reconvening for a day of debate is what Tasmanians think constitutes action on homelessness. As you know, we have scheduled for tomorrow afternoon a meeting with the group of sector peak bodies and your good self to follow-up on some actions we discussed earlier in the week.

I propose an invitation to be extended to Labor and the Greens to each nominate a delegate to attend tomorrow's meeting and participate in the discussions on the actions that we can take. I invite you to participate and provide support across the parliament for the work being done and the partnership that is building across the sector to act on the expansion of homelessness services and their accommodation capacity in the city of Hobart in particular, but also looking statewide.

This is an offer that this Government puts on the table to engage Labor and the Greens, one member representing each party, to participate in that session tomorrow afternoon along with yourself, as the member for Clark to continue the discussion we started some time back.

[11.21 a.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition) - Madam Speaker, we want to work and we are ready to work tomorrow. We want to address the issue of housing and homelessness. The Budget will be dealt with by today. There has been an impediment for us to deal with any of these other matters because it does take precedence and we respect that. We will deal with the Budget today. Tomorrow we can come back and we can collectively, as elected representatives from our communities, put our 25 heads together and work on this issue together.

What happens in the other place, is that when there is a briefing available on an issue, it might be homelessness or housing, the House is suspended. They collectively go to the briefing, hear the evidence from experts, then come back to the Chamber and debate the matter. We could have the same process here. There is nothing preventing us from doing that.

I respect the offer from the Minister for Housing but what that fails to recognise is that we are here in this formal structure of parliament and that we each represent different communities and different electorates. We each have different experiences and different skill sets. By limiting it to only one member from the Labor Party, you ignore the experiences of every other person on this side of the Chamber and you ignore the representation that they bring from each corner of the state.

I implore the members of this House to vote for us to sit tomorrow. We can work differently tomorrow. There is nothing preventing us from, together, getting the briefing in the afternoon and then debating the matter in this Chamber and talking about the solutions. The community expects us to work on these issues and there is an opportunity for us to do that tomorrow. There is no reason why we cannot sit. It is also imperative, given that the minister has said the meeting takes place tomorrow as -

By the end of this week I hope to be able to announce the next stage of our action.

with respect to the Affordable Housing Action Plan.

That is a very important next stage that will be announced by the minister tomorrow. This parliament should be involved in what those actions look like. We need to ensure that there is urgency with respect to the action taken for winter. There has not been the urgency shown by this minister to do anything to provide shelter for people this winter.

The sector, yourself, members of this place, suggested last year that vacant properties be looked at and utilised, that other opportunities be utilised to house people. It was not taken up. We are now in June and still have not seen action from the minister in respect to providing shelter for people this winter.

We can explore all of those issues tomorrow with the sector, talk about what can be done and come to a conclusion together. We can dedicate the whole day to housing and homelessness. It would be innovative for the parliament to use its power collectively to focus on one issue. We do not have to do things the way they have always been done. We could do things a little differently tomorrow and we should. It can only be done if we all bring our collective experiences from across the state and from across electorates. That would be a really exciting way for us to do something together in this parliament.

It would make a difference to the community members who expect us to do this. So many members in the community come to me and say, 'Why are you shouting at each other? Why can't you get on with the job and work together?' Tomorrow we could do that. It is a good opportunity for us to show the people of Tasmania that we are mature, we are professional and that we do care and that we can find solutions together to one of the most important and pressing issues facing so many Tasmanians.

There are 1600 people sleeping rough across Tasmania. That is not good enough and it is getting worse. We should be able to focus our attention on this issue tomorrow. I implore members of this House to vote in support of us returning for one day. It is not a big-time commitment. It is not a big challenge for people to turn up to work tomorrow from 10 a.m. and work through this issue together. Surely, we owe it to our constituency to do that, Madam Speaker.

The House divided -

AYES 11

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

NOES 11

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Ms Courtney
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gutwein
Mr Hodgman
Mr Jaensch
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mrs Rylah
Mr Shelton (Teller)

PAIR

Ms Houston

Mr Tucker

Madam SPEAKER - The result of the division is 11 Ayes and 11 Noes. Therefore I have to use my casting vote.

Whilst I personally support the House sitting more often than is currently scheduled, the initiative for any extension or change of sitting dates by tradition sits with the Government. Whilst some of you may be very disappointed and totally disagree with me, I believe the offer for representatives of your parties to be part of this very important meeting, making decisions tomorrow with experts in the housing sector has been made in good faith and I encourage you to attend.

In accordance with the undertakings I gave this morning, I am not able to support an amendment which may be perceived as placing the confidence of the House and the Government in question.

Accordingly, I cast my vote with the Noes.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Infrastructure and Jobs

[11.32 a.m.]

Mrs RYLAH (Braddon - Motion) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the House take note of the following matter: infrastructure and jobs.

On our side of the House we are delivering. The Tasmanian economy is now the fastest growing in the nation, which is a testament to the last five years of the Hodgman Liberal Government. The 2019-20 State Budget provides record funding to deliver our election commitments.

As the Treasurer has said, over \$3.6 billion in funding for infrastructure and 80 per cent of this, or thereabouts, will go to Tasmanian small businesses, our major employer in this state. It will build roads and bridges, public transport, it will fix congestion management and it will build in the cities and the regions right across Tasmania. This means there will be more jobs, better infrastructure, more homes and better services, and more training and education.

The key primer is to deliver via infrastructure spending. At its heart are jobs - jobs for Tasmanians. Our economy is strong, but there is evidence of external head winds and we are acting; passing the Budget is our priority and with the priority to deliver for all Tasmanians.

We are funding major infrastructure programs and a number of smaller but very important local projects supporting our communities right across the state: significant freight rail upgrades to support resource industries; further investment in upgrading popular visitor travelling routes and the iconic West Coast Wilderness Railway; and supporting regional tourism programs to manage traffic congestion and make public transport more attractive, especially in the greater Hobart, Launceston and the Tamar Valley.

The 2019-20 Budget invests a record breaking \$3.6 billion into job creating, intergenerational infrastructure with new spending of around \$700 million and the vast majority of this new spending being funded by the state. In total, the 2019-20 Budget delivers a record \$1.6 billion in partnership with the Morrison Liberal Government to build the job creating transport infrastructure our growing state needs with total state funding of \$925.7 million and a total Australian Government funding of \$690.8 million across the forward Estimates.

It is a Budget based on strong financial management and fiscal discipline, notwithstanding the relentless negativity we have been hearing and the misleading spin from those opposite.

Mr Deputy Speaker, our budget has been very warmly welcomed by the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Civil Contractors Federation, the Australian Logistics Council, the RACT, Traffic Management Association of Australia, the Tasmanian Transport Association and Roads Australia, the president of which, David Stuart-Watt, has said -

It's not just about having safe, reliable transport infrastructure, it's also about creating and maintaining jobs for Tasmanians.

Infrastructure investment supports local businesses, as I said. It sustains jobs, it provides skills development and training opportunities and it improves the lives of real people, individuals and families across Tasmania.

Let us just talk about some of the strong pipeline of projects we have funded in this Budget that we will get underway this financial year -

- the Midland Highway upgrade at Spring Hill
- the Hobart Airport flyover interchange upgrade

- the Melton Mowbray to Lovely Banks section
- the Arthur Highway overtaking lanes at East Sorell
- the Bruny Island major road sealing between Alonnah and Lunawanna
- Richmond Road
- the new Cambridge link road and the upgrade of three additional sections
- West Tamar Highway traffic Solutions First project, including the upgrade of intersections
- a safer highway for bikes between Brisbane Street and Legana
- the Great Eastern Drive with more passing lanes, junction upgrades and safety work
- the Esk Main Road shoulder sealing and works east of Fingal and west of St Marys
- the Bass Highway upgrade junction at Boat Harbour School
- the Bass Highway safer access for the Rocky Cape Hall
- the West Coast Wilderness Railway upgrade to start rail replacement, bridge maintenance and rolling stock
- steel sleeper and rail replacement of tranche 2 of the freight line upgrade
- the Huon Highway and Sandfly intersection safety works.

The Leader of the Opposition, in her audition for the top job, expressed much criticism about a wasted five years, but, as I said, we are the strongest growing economy in the nation, and that is a testament to the five years of work we have put in with very careful fiscal management. Labor can desperately try to keep up this faux narrative about its previously announced projects, but it is this Labor government that has actually delivered infrastructure projects right across Tasmania -

Ms O'Connor - Which Labor government?

Mrs RYLAH - Sorry?

Ms O'Connor - You said it is this 'Labor government'.

Mrs RYLAH - It is this 'Liberal Government'. I apologise, there you go - that is a mistake. Thank you.

Since 2014, we have delivered transport infrastructure projects across the state, including significant progress in the \$500 million Midland Highway 10-year action plan, the biggest Midland Highway upgrade ever, transforming our key north-south corridor. Our action plan has delivered 14 upgrade projects along the highway, and five more are currently under construction, including the biggest single road project in decades, the \$92.3 million Perth Link Road. By August this year,

we expect 91 kilometres, or 62 per cent, of the action plan will either be completed or under construction.

Labor desperately wants to be able to claim the record of delivery on the Midland Highway because its policy was to put up signs saying, 'Rough uneven road surface ahead', ignoring its totally unacceptable safety rating -

Mr O'Byrne - How is the four-lane Midland Highway going?

Mrs RYLAH - You had to put up 'Rough, uneven surface ahead' signs all over the Midland Highway, an unacceptable safety rating in atrocious conditions. It was Labor's goat track legacy.

Let us talk about some of the other projects that we have delivered -

Time expired.

[11.39 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Mr Deputy Speaker, on this matter of public importance, on jobs and the economy and infrastructure, there is no stronger supporter of job-creating infrastructure than the Australian Labor Party. In fact, we are the party that over 16 years of government, invested significantly in infrastructure that created jobs and built the foundation of the modern Tasmanian economy. We will not be lectured on the importance. You talk about the goat track. What we did not do is mislead the Tasmanian people and commit to something that could never be achieved by a party.

In the lead up to the 2010 election, there he was near Breadalbane at Devon Hills, or Deviot was it?

Ms O'Byrne - Devon Hills.

Mr O'BYRNE - Devon Hills - spelt the Midland Highway wrong. There was a big photo of the then Opposition leader, Will Hodgman, saying, 'We will build a four-lane Midland Highway'. Well, where is it? Do not talk to us about goat track. We will not make irresponsible commitments - you know you will never achieve and will never build, because you are not able. You do not have the ticker to do it.

Under Labor - even in the teeth of the global financial crisis when the economy was at its worst - we had a billion dollars worth of investment in road and rail infrastructure. When the global economy and the global financial crisis was kicking us we were investing in the Brighton Bypass, the Brighton Transport Hub, the East Tamar Highway, the Kingston Bypass and roads across the state, despite the toughest economic conditions we had faced in a generation.

This Government crows about job levels and job standards. Since the last election there are 2100 fewer Tasmanians employed; 4400 fewer women employed; 3800 fewer people are employed full-time. Unemployment is up, despite the economy going well, despite our terms of trade - Tasmania is an export-oriented economy and our terms of trade are a key indicator of the success or otherwise of our economy - when we were in government it was up around \$1, \$1.08, so really tough. It is now down below 70 cents. Despite the economic winds at our back, in our sails, the unemployment rate is up 1.7 per cent to 6.7 per cent, the worst in Australia.

You have presided over apparently a strong economy, but the worst unemployment rate in the country. The unemployment rate for women is up 1.7 per cent to 7.3 per cent. Youth unemployment has increased to 14.3 per cent, well above the national average of 11.9 per cent. This is despite participation falling. There are less people looking for work in Tasmania, the participation rate has fallen and is 5 per cent below the national average. Do not get up here with this rubbish narrative about saying you are the only ones who can manage an economy and can build infrastructure that creates jobs. That is a no-brainer.

Labor, over 16 years, investigated in irrigation, roads, our tourism economy, and our GBEs to ensure we could build the jobs of the future with renewable energy projects like Woolnorth. We understand the importance of it, but let us not pretend you have a strategy. Your minister promised a 30-year infrastructure strategy, by Christmas last year. Fail. You then say, 'No, no, we will deliver it by the end of March 2019.' Fail. You then said it would appear later maybe in the Budget, but we did not see it did we, no. It is apparently going to appear later in the year because it is apparently a bit complex, like this is a surprise and it should be surprising it is complex.

In the Budget, the Infrastructure minister is lauding the investment and the port strategy, for example, but no money from the state to back up that port strategy. No support for the port strategy. It is just taking credit for the work of others.

I acknowledge success has a thousand parents, but do not get up here and say the Midland Highway is your strategy. I understand in this term of Government you are delivering it, but it is a Labor strategy. It is a Labor strategy we established with the federal Labor government in 2013-14. You talk about bricks. We built the brick wall. You came in and put the last brick on and are claiming you built the wall. That is the pathetic nature of your Government.

You came into Government and wiped out the Infrastructure Advisory Council, which was industry-led with GBEs from all over the state contributing and you replaced it with a single bureaucrat.

Then you talk about the pipeline strategy. It is not a pipeline strategy - it is a list of projects in the public domain that everyone is aware of. Anyone could have done it. Just open the paper -

Mrs Rylah - But you could not.

Mr O'BYRNE - We did, but you have called it a pipeline. Listing projects is not a strategy. It is not a pipeline of work. What work are you doing to deliver it? The only document you point to is your 30-Year Infrastructure Strategy, which you hopelessly failed on delivering.

The Labor Party supports infrastructure. We are the party of infrastructure and it is economic and enabling work. We saved TasRail and put in the above and below rail investment to ensure we could move heavy freight off our Midland Highway and major freight routes, particularly the non-time sensitive freight. The Labor Party built the Brighton Transport Hub to move traffic out of central Hobart. All we hear is an announcement from the last election of an underground bus mall. It is more like Harry Potter's chamber of secrets. Are you going to build it, where is it, does it exist, is it down there; are you all meeting in there with your caucus? Where is the underground bus mall you promised at the 2018 election and later in Estimates? We understood it might be at grade and now you are hiring a consultant to find out where it is -

Time expired.

[11.46 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Deputy Speaker, it has been interesting listening to this debate this morning, which is a Liberal matter of public importance debate, after around 20 minutes of question time was dedicated to Dorothy Dixers, and the best the member for Braddon can come up with as a topic is infrastructure and jobs.

There has been a lot of discussion about roads and bridges, and it is important. We understand that infrastructure comes in many forms. The kind of infrastructure the House needs to be debating more is social infrastructure, housing infrastructure, 21st century infrastructure like cycleways, pedestrian accesses, light rail and ferries. The member for Braddon's interpretation of infrastructure is very linear. It is confined to roads and bridges and, in the 21st century, we need to have a much more diverse mix of infrastructure, we need to make our cities more liveable and we need to make sure that our infrastructure is climate resilient.

Sea levels are rising and we are facing much higher temperatures. I do not know if anyone caught one of the most horrifying pieces of news I have read all year. At Cape Grim this week, they have recorded CO₂ equivalent readings of 500 parts per million. That is a horrifying figure. It compels us to look at every piece of infrastructure in Tasmania and at our forward planning through the prism of climate adaptation and the need to build infrastructure that is strong, resilient, zero-emissions and that protects people. That is our obligation as a parliament and as leaders in our community.

In this Budget, for all the talk of infrastructure and jobs, we have little to nothing to deal with the congestion problem that Hobart faces daily. It is chaos between 8 a.m. or 8.15 a.m. and 9.15 a.m. every morning in the city of Hobart. It is a big clag-up. It was clear to me this morning when I was coming into work that the lights are not properly synced. The flow of traffic through the city is not smooth-running; it obstructs easy movement through the city. There is a failure of this Government to even have a look at some of the basics like the synchronisation of lights.

All we have in this year's budget is \$1 million for a traffic study for greater Hobart. What an insult to people who live in and around Hobart. For five years the Liberals have been in Government and the best they can do is spend \$1 million on a traffic study. All they need to do is stand on the corner of, say, Murray and Davey Streets on any given morning and vox-pop motorists. You could do that for a week and there is your traffic study. They will tell you exactly what is wrong with the system as it is. To give the impression they are doing something about congestion, which they are manifestly not, this Government has allocated \$1 million towards a traffic study.

There is also a \$2 million council matching grants program for cycleways. Only \$2 million? That is nothing relative to a \$1.6 billion roads and bridges infrastructure budget. It pains me to say this but we saw it during the federal election campaign; the Liberals in Government prioritise spending in the north at the expense of the south and they will not take the congestion issue in and around Hobart seriously because, for many of them, it does not impact on their lives on an ongoing basis. It is a failure to service the people of southern Tasmania because everyone, whether coming in from Sorell, the Channel or from Brighton, is affected by this Government's failure to deal with traffic congestion.

I also wanted to talk about the target of 10 000 jobs the Government says it is going to create. This is one of the biggest scams in the Budget because it looks like, if you go to page 278 of State Growth, we will be importing around 6000 jobs over the same period with skilled visas; imported

labour. This Government is counting on the importation of labour to meet their jobs target and we are talking about 6000 extra workers coming into Tasmania through the State Growth visa program.

My concern, and the Greens concern, is to make sure that young Tasmanians who need a job, who deserve a job and who have the talent and capacity, are given every opportunity. If there are going to be 10 000 jobs created, do not cheat, which is what this Government is doing. It is cheating on the numbers because two-thirds of that projected jobs increase will be skilled labour that has come in from overseas. Do not give false hope to young people. Take their concerns for the future seriously and dedicate those jobs to young Tasmanians.

Time expired.

[11.52 a.m.]

Mr TUCKER (Lyons) - Mr Deputy Speaker, the Opposition spokesman, Mr O'Byrne, has really taken relentless negativity to the next level this morning. This is just a massive smokescreen to cover the fact that Labor still has no plan and that the shadow treasurer failed to deliver an alternative budget. You have very little credibility in this area, I am sorry. You cannot even properly add up the federal and state infrastructure funding split in the Budget. You misled the House on this detail in your Budget reply and have still not corrected yourself, nor this false narrative that Mr O'Byrne continues to parrot that everything, every project, idea and proposal in infrastructure were all from Labor.

Mr O'Byrne, more specifically, is ridiculous. You have a history of lots of talk but failure to deliver. Mr O'Byrne, you should not pour your scorn on the Government's important 10-year investment projects pipeline which industry has broadly welcomed. If it were so simple, why did you not deliver it? You could not deliver anything like the 10-year pipeline. You certainly did not deliver a long-term, 30-year infrastructure strategy; nothing like it. You did not deliver a Derwent ferry service, not a single seat. You did not deliver a 10-year action plan to upgrade the Midland Highway, nor one single stone of any project north of Brighton. You did not deliver a single dollar toward a dedicated visitor roads upgrade program, which RACT called for and you ignored.

The Liberal Government has delivered it and our \$72 million visitor economy roads program. You did not deliver the refurbishment of the *Spirits* or the additional day sailings. This Liberal Government did and Labor opposed it. Stop trying to claim credit for things that Labor opposed.

You did not deliver the \$200 million extension for the TFES for transshipment of export goods but the Liberals did. You did not deliver the funding for the replacement of the Bridgewater bridge. Labor had 16 years to do this and you failed. It took the Liberals to lock in the state and federal funding for a new Bridgewater bridge. Federal Labor endorsed and supported our Hobart City Deal. You had no alternative plan, so you had to adopt the Liberal policy.

Stop trying to claim credit for everything, Mr O'Byrne. You are not the minister anymore. Let us do all the worrying for you. The relentless negativity, exaggeration and the relentless attention seeking is tiring frankly. I would now like to bring up a comment Mr O'Byrne made back in May:

Not one road infrastructure project has been commenced in Tasmania that was not already announced by previous Federal and State Labor governments.

What absolute rubbish. I think he has a case of the collywobblers. Labor's most desperate weasel words.

Mr O'BYRNE - Point of order. I seek he withdraw that. I take offence at 'collywobbles'.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - I do not think that is a point of order.

Mr TUCKER - Labor's most desperate weasel words claim yet about the state Budget. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot criticise the Government for not doing things, but claim credit for things getting done. For a start, the Hodgman Liberal Government's \$72 million roads to support Tasmania's visitor economy program is the first funding program specifically for regional tourism roads. Labor has never announced funding for any of these roads like Hastings Cave Road, Arve Road, Stormlea Road or the Great Eastern Drive.

Labor has ignored the tourism industry and the RACT, which consistently advocated for a dedicated funding program like this. Our Midland Highway Action Plan has delivered 14 upgrade projects and five more are currently under construction. You did not even announce one of these.

You lost the 2018 state election and the 2019 federal election. You need to deal with it and move on. You need to stop these ridiculous attempts to claim credit for the Liberal's record infrastructure investments.

The 2019-20 state Budget unashamedly invests record amounts to build the infrastructure our growing state needs and to deliver our vision for Tasmania's future. It will underpin a strong economy, support businesses large and small, attract investment and it will create more jobs. It has been enthusiastically welcomed by key local and national stakeholders in the transport infrastructure sector. The Tasmanian Transport Association Executive Director, Michelle Harwood, put out a media release on 23 May 2019. She said -

The continued commitment to improvements to roads, bridges, rail and infrastructure for key freight corridors is welcome for our industry and supports those industries we serve.

The RACT Executive General Manager, Stacey Pennicott, released a media report on 23 May 2019 and she said -

Today's State Budget has set a clear timeline for the delivery of the Bridgewater Bridge.

This Budget sees the Government funding its election promises. While there are no new major announcements, the budget sets out a funding path for a number of key commitments, including the delivery of the Hobart Airport interchange by 2021.

Congestion and future planning for changing needs of people travelling in the greater Launceston is an area of concern to members.

We are encouraged to see the Government looking to address this through development of a future Vision, including undertaking planning ...

Time expired.

[11.59 a.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon) - Mr Deputy Speaker, we might have the strongest economy in the country but also some of the poorest socio-economic indicators in the country. As for the Government's mantra around 10 000 jobs for Tasmanians, I want to know how they are going to ensure Tasmanians get those jobs. How do they know 10 000 jobs will be created?

This Government talks a lot about job creation, but they do not talk a lot about the requirement for business and industry, right across this state to have been able to achieve that investment in infrastructure and their requirement for a highly skilled workforce. Nowhere is that more evident than across regional Tasmania.

You certainly talk a lot about your pipeline of investment in infrastructure and your touted strategy. You do not have any workforce development program that runs alongside to look at how, in fact, Tasmanians will be given every opportunity to participate in the growth of the economy from that infrastructure spend.

Tasmania is at a crossroads, having experienced significant growth over a period of time, but now faced with the challenge of decentralising this growth into regional Tasmania and addressing growing inequality in our community. Investment in infrastructure alone will not ensure this growth. A diverse economy and investment in our people through education, skills and training, and essential services will.

The Budget handed down recently and the investment in infrastructure it details also brings the state into net debt and will see cuts to essential services. What services will be cut from each and every Government department and what impact will this have on regional Tasmania? We need to ensure this economic growth in Tasmania is sustained and inclusive and full-time employment opportunities for regional Tasmanians are improved.

The theme of today's MPI is jobs and infrastructure in line with the Government's mantra, but this government does not talk a lot about access to essential services which, arguably, should also be their key focus at a time of crisis for this Government. These services and service industries are the highest growing in our regional economy, particularly in mine and the member opposite's electorate of Braddon, employing 35 800 Tasmanians currently.

Attracting investment to our regions is reliant on access to a highly skilled workforce. If the state's present economic climate is truly to influence long-term social economic change and opportunity for Tasmanians, more effort needs to be made by Government to ensure upcoming projects in regional Tasmania are planned for effectively and Tasmanians in regional areas are given every opportunity to gain employment.

I refer the House to the Brotherhood of St Lawrence's recent report, which talks about 17.8 per cent unemployment in south-east Tasmania, including the regional communities of Oatlands, Huonville, Swansea and Nubeena. What does your Budget do for those young Tasmanians and how will your budget and Government assist those young Tasmanians into this pipeline of work you keep touting?

It is important to place on record: new job data released today shows 600 full-time jobs have been lost in Tasmania in one month.

Mr O'Byrne - What was that? That was the -

Ms DOW - The new job data. I wonder why you did not mention that in either of your speeches.

Up until the state Budget, the Government had not targeted investment in skills and training in the service sector industry around health and social services in Tasmania. It does not appear to appreciate the valuable contribution this industry makes to our economy and significant influence it will have in the future. In fact, our health and education services are important contributors to regional economies, their employment opportunities and the ability to attract higher wage earners to live and work in our community. This sector offers tremendous opportunity for economic expansion and the highest sector of employment growth.

In my electorate of Braddon, the Government and the federal government have thrown a lot of money at skills and training initiatives, arguably aimed at employment and pathways to employment like skills hubs and skills packages, but to date there is no coordinated approach to their implementation. Serious consideration must be given to the implications for TAFE with this funding coming into the electorate and some of these programs may even fragment services further.

We have a number of new projects in Braddon, be that for renewable energy, plantation-based forestry or agriculture and there will be a requirement for 12 800 jobs over the next five years in that electorate alone. What is the Government doing to prepare local people for this work?

Infrastructure jobs are really important, but so is investment in human capital. Our people who reside in the regions are older and experience poorer health and educational outcomes. I am interested in the Government's move towards strategic growth, but I was really unimpressed during Estimates when a succinct description of this strategy could not be provided by the Premier or the Minister for State Growth. What will this initiative look like? How will it relate to job opportunities for people in regional Tasmania and particularly our young people? How will the Government work strategically with communities and other tiers of government to ensure its success? Will it be evaluated and will there be a whole-of-government approach to the initiative?

This Government is obsessed with record spends, tallest buildings, bricks, numbers of beds and this infrastructure focus only addresses one component of the issue with supply and demand in Tasmania. Simply continuing to build things the way we have done for the last 50 years is not the solution to important social and economic pressures currently being felt in Tasmania.

Wraparound and community-based services are absolutely essential and they must be decentralised out into our regions. New modes of public transport, different options and new infrastructure around communities, as was advocated strongly by the Local Government Association in their submission to the state Budget around cycleways and better community infrastructure -

Time expired.

Matter noted.

TABLED PAPERS

Estimates Committee B - Additional Information

Mrs RYLAH presented additional information provided by to Estimates Committee B by the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industry, the

Minister for Health, the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management and the Minister for Science and Technology.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2019 (No. 21)

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) 2019 (No. 22)

In Committee

Resumed from 12 June 2019 (page 143)

DIVISIONS 2 and 10 -

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Women, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Disability Services and Community Development)

[12.15 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER - Madam Deputy Chair, I rise to make a contribution to the Estimates output. This is a vital area of government. My main line of questioning in Estimates to the minister was around Disability Services. Disability Services in our state is a massive time of transition investment with many challenges.

I was disappointed with some of the answers provided by the minister. It was very positive to have the people from the department at that committee to provide some answers to questions asked. I am choosing my words carefully. I kept feeling quite frustrated with the lack of information on, or maybe the understanding of, the complexity of the NDIS rollout and where we fit as a state, and the way in which the Minister for Disability Services is managing the rollout. It is a challenging time for people in that sector. It is fantastic and very positive. The NDIS is an amazing initiative. It is actually a Labor initiative, a Jenny Macklin/ Bill Shorten initiative. It will assist many people across Australia and increase the quality of life for people living with disability, their families and carers. It is a fabulous initiative.

I am concerned about the manner in which it has been implemented in Tasmania and how the Minister for Disability Services is managing the transition and managing the gaps and challenges that the transition has created. If it is rolled out correctly, according to the principles and integrity of the policy, the NDIS should change the lives of, as I said, thousands of people in our community. There are 10 000 people who qualify for the NDIS in Tasmania but there are 80 000 to 90 000 that are not eligible and never will be. That is not spin. It is not negativity. That is truth. It is real.

It is very important that we approach this transition with a business mind. This is a business, but how would we professionally transition the rollout of the NDIS into our state? There can be no excuse for not understanding or knowing information. It is too big and too important to not understand it. I was heartened that the information provided by the department was astute and dedicated. They are really dedicated to what they do; it is such an important area. However, I was not entirely convinced that the minister had the same level of understanding of the detail which I think is required for such an important policy implementation.

The people who are not eligible rely on state-funded disability-support organisations, yet we know that 18 Tasmanian disability support organisations have had their funding dramatically cut. We talked about Information, Links and Capacity Building funding in the Estimates briefing quite extensively. That ILC funding is about programs. It is not about core funding.

I was heartened to hear an announcement this morning that those organisations have been given a lifeline of sorts by the federal government - the minister will correct me if I am not right. They will be given 12 months' funding. After that there is no strategy around what happens to these 18 organisations. If they have been given this 12-month reprieve, it is good, but it is still a bandaid. This is too big and too important and so vital to people's lives to slap a band aid on it and say, 'Off you go. Come back begging in 12 months' time'. It has to be bigger and better and more professional than that. It has to be treated respectfully and professionally. In Estimates, the minister could not commit to ensuring that all disability-support organisations would receive that funding. There was a bit of uncertainty around that. They had no idea about what services they would be able to provide 18 organisations after July. People are heavily reliant on these organisations. The work they do is super important. It often goes far and beyond what other organisations may provide. They are providing services for people with disability, their families and their supporters. It is important work.

I express my disappointment with the quality of the answers we received from the minister during the output group. I know Disability Services will see a massive change with the introduction of the National Disability Scheme. I am aware of that and I know that there is always a risk around uncertainty. When you are dealing with this level of funding you still need to have models based around risk and the adverse effects of risk.

I would like to think that there are minds working on this. That is what I picked up from the department; that they know what they are doing. The problem was I did not get the impression that the minister did. That for me was quite disappointing.

Tasmania has one of the highest rates of people living with disability in Australia and one of the fastest growing sectors to support this. One of the set-backs experienced in Tasmania during the roll-out of the first stages of the NDIS has been the lack of skilled, appropriately trained, workers. A lack to undertake the vital demand for workers in areas such as community services and activities, health services like physiotherapy related to a person's disability and support workers to help people with personal care, transport to and from community access and work activities are some examples.

There has been little movement by the Government to meet the gap between the demand and supply for those workers. That was something which I went back to repeatedly during the Estimates Committee. I did not receive any information from the minister in relation to the gap that gave me any form of comfort the minister was managing the situation in a competent fashion. I was disappointed the Budget has not invested in this deficiency. The minister seemed unaware of any gaps or employee shortfalls and instead stated the Minister for Education had been training people for the last seven years, in anticipation for this demand.

It was agreed during the Estimates process that the sector requires around 5000 workers, but the minister could not indicate that the Government is on target track to meet the demand. The minister said the deficiency in meeting the workforce employee shortfalls could and most probably would be an impediment to the successful roll-out of the NDIS.

We have all met families really excited about the NDIS and the appropriate support and funding they could have, but the workers to implement that support have been lacking. There is not much in the Budget for this major issue and the minister was not quite aware other than 'we are training people'. He is not aware of how many workers there are, what the demand will be, and whether we

are going to be able to meet supply. That is an important part of the implementation and roll-out of the NDIS.

The minister quoted figures of student enrolment in a course but did not give any data about the people who have actually completed the courses, who are qualified, transitioned into the workforce and working actively in the industry.

You also had no idea what the deficiency between the demand for work is and the actual supply of the workforce in the industry is. You took offence for me saying 'gap' in the Estimates. That is a logical and professional way to talk about a deficiency between demand and supply of workers.

I was left with the sinking suspicion there is no effective strategy to ensure the workforce will be ready to meet the demand. Nothing gave me the impression there is any real concern by the minister in this area. It could be the Achilles heel of the whole roll-out. One of the riskiest aspects of the whole roll-out is not having the staff or the workforce capacity to implement the NDIS successfully. What a shame that would be.

The integrity and policy establishing NDIS is absolutely brilliant. It is there to make people's lives better. If we cannot deliver this because we do not have the workforce, it will fall on your shoulders, as the Minister for Disability Services. I hope that does not happen, because we have to get this right.

I doubt the Government and the Minister for Disability Services and Community Development maintain an investment in sector development including that workforce strategy I was talking about, or an intellectual understanding of what the NDIS is about and the structures required to roll that out properly.

One of the painfully obvious aspects of Estimates Committee B was a lack of understanding of the NDIS in detail and what the NDIS might mean to Tasmanians, especially to Tasmanians who do not fit into the categories for NDIS. There are people who are 65 and over with disabilities and who will not be able to apply for or be covered under the NDIS.

The first question I asked of the minister was to outline for me how the Disability Care Australia Fund - DCAF - funding will be distributed in Tasmania. I will have to get a correction on *Hansard* because on *Hansard* it says that the Minister for Disability Services and Community Development provided the actual definition of the acronym when it was actually me who provided the definition of the acronym. Sorry, I digress. I asked the minister to outline for me how the DCAF funding of \$223 million over 10 years will be distributed throughout Tasmania. I was provided a quick budget. Actually, it was more like a budget 101 tutorial like first year university. It was pretty funny. It comes through the consolidated fund so it is a matter for the Treasurer. Boom. When I questioned further, the minister could not clearly articulate how that funding will be distributed across Tasmania over 10 years. The question was not really answered and it did not matter how many times I went back to it, it was not answered; how you intended as the minister to distribute \$222 million over 10 years. You shrug your shoulders and say, I am not sure, I will get someone from the department to answer that.

What responsibilities does the Minister for Disability Services and Community Development hold? The minister could not guarantee support for the disability service organisations that service the non-NDIS clientele beyond the end of this calendar year. The grants you refer to also had no guarantee. I noted that the minister seemed to have quite a good relationship with the department

and, in seeing some of the expertise that comes out of that department, they are very good at what they do. It was obvious during that Estimates process that they are carrying a lot of the responsibility and the groundwork around the portfolio. I hope we do not end up having that massive gap between what we can provide to the community in workers and what people with disability require because the Government has not been effective, strategic or intellectually connected enough to a policy to implement it properly. I will leave it at that.

[12.24 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR - Mr Chairman, I rise to speak on Mrs Petrusma's Estimates hearing and to restate a point I have made a few times this week and last. We asked the Minister for Women if she was on the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet and the answer we received from Mrs Petrusma is that Cabinet matters are a matter for Cabinet. But Mrs Petrusma had detailed the membership of the family violence sub-committee of Cabinet in a previous Estimates hearing. The then minister, Mr Hidding, had also detailed the infrastructure sub-committee of Cabinet to the Estimates committee, so this is not standard procedure and it is not a question of Cabinet confidentiality. This is the Treasurer being secretive. The reason the Greens are pursuing this is because there has to be transparency and accountability about the people who are making decisions about which services to cut and which roads and bridges to fund. It is a particular question that I wanted the Minister for Women to answer because if there are no women on the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet that impacts on the decisions made by that sub-committee of Cabinet, which is colloquially and widely known within the public sector as the razor gang. That is because they make those hard decisions about what services to cut, what roads and bridges to build and what houses not to build.

The minister would not confirm whether she was on the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet. The Treasurer wilfully stonewalled questions about who is on the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet. I think I asked Ms Courtney if she is on the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet and had the same stonewalling. We will keep asking and we will hope the journalists start asking, too, because it is inexcusable not to be open and transparent about which faceless people are making these decisions.

Also, in the Women's Estimates section, I questioned the minister about the Tasmanian Honour Roll of Women. Having attended that ceremony, I warmly congratulate those outstanding women in our community who volunteer their time selflessly with heart and years of conviction and who are rightly inaugurated onto the Tasmanian Honour Roll of Women. I do not believe, and I will maintain this until my last breath, that a person should be nominated to the Honour Roll of Women simply for doing their job, for which they are paid around half a million of taxpayers' money each year. I hope that the next Tasmanian Honour Roll of Women utilises a much more robust selection process that does not disregard nominations for two outstanding women from opposite ends of the political spectrum but who have had a lot in common in terms of their heart for people. That is Christine Milne, former Tasmanian Greens leader, former Australian Greens leader, vice-president of the International Union for Conservation of Nature, a leading advocate for climate action, and the late attorney-general, Vanessa Goodwin, one of the best people to ever come out of the Liberal Party into public office and who is widely respected within the community sector.

We need to make sure that women of that calibre who are nominated are prioritised over the Secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, who earns half a million per year. I simply reinstate our call on the minister to make sure the process is robust and you are not undermining the integrity of the roll by inaugurating people onto the roll who have not yet earned their right to be on that roll, in my view.

We also talked about the critical issue of Aboriginal Affairs and the minister's Aboriginal Affairs portfolio. It is a matter of public record that no lands have been returned by this Government in the past five years except for a small piece of land at nirmena nala, which I began the process of returning when I was the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. It was hydro land up the River Derwent, in the valley and that piece of land has gone back to its original owners. Other than that, there has been no significant return of lands to the people our ancestors stole this land from, and that brings shame on this parliament. I call on the minister to make sure that we are giving it back to the people whom our ancestors stole it from and who never ceded it in this term of the Tasmanian Parliament. There was never a treaty, as there was with the Maori people of New Zealand. There was no agreement by the First People, the palawa pakana, to have their land taken away from them. They were banished to the Furneaux Islands where they suffered terribly. We still have not made anywhere near amends for what happened to Tasmania's First People and we must do that. I wish the minister all success.

We cannot continue to marginalise Aboriginal people from decisions about their land while paying lip-service to reconciliation. The point I make here is that leaders across the Aboriginal groups do not support the expressions of interest process for development inside the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage area, other reserved lands and Crown lands. They have not been consulted about that process. This is a two-faced Government when it comes to Aboriginal affairs. It says that it wants to reset the relationship but at the same time, cuts the First People out of any sort of negotiation about what happens to reserved lands within which there is the most spectacular and remarkable living cultural landscape that dates back tens of thousands of years.

We must involve Aboriginal people in discussions about developments, the use of land, particularly those reserved lands which their ancestors looked after for tens of thousands of years before the first Europeans came here in 1803. If we are serious about resetting the relationship, that is something we must take on.

I will talk about the NDIS and Disability Services that are not eligible under the NDIS. This is a matter that has been raised in this House a number of times and at Estimates and simply puts the minister on notice.

The minister said that the Government will walk hand-in-hand with those organisations like TasDeaf, Guide Dogs for the Blind, and the Brain Injury Association of Tasmania, as they go through the ILC grant round. That is somewhat reassuring to hear for those organisations perhaps, but until the funds are in the bank and their future is secure, we will keep watching this minister. To lose those organisations from the fabric of advocacy and community in Tasmania would be a travesty. It would undermine the effectiveness of the National Disability Insurance Scheme and leave a whole lot of people who are not eligible for the NDIS without any representation by those organisations which, in some cases for decades and more, have been representing their interests in the community.

Finally, I place on record my disappointment that while last Friday I stood quite gladly with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for a Tasmanian AFL team, it was off the back of a most regrettably parochial federal election campaign which absolutely undermined Tasmania's bid for its own AFL team. I hope that some of the damage has been repaired by that show of bipartisanship plus one, Mr O'Byrne who came along on the day. We should have our own AFL team. We have produced some of the best talent that has ever been in in the VFL or the AFL from Darrel Baldock to Peter Hudson to Nick Riewoldt; bless him because he did not support the fish

farm at Okehampton Bay. We have produced some the finest talent for the AFL. We are doing so now with the AFL women's league. I want to see it go from strength to strength.

Time expired.

[12.34 p.m.]

Mr TUCKER - Mr Chairman, I rise to speak on the Estimates committee on Mrs Petrusma. She covers a number of very important portfolios that are of great importance and consequence to nearly every Tasmanian in some way. I will make a comment on the matters examined and probably just as importantly the way they were not examined by other members of the committee who were more interested in themselves, in time-wasting, than genuine scrutiny of the budget papers, as representatives of the people of Tasmania.

I may only be relatively new to the parliament but I was very frustrated to see how Labor and the Greens members deliberately and repeatedly attempted to ask questions that were not related to the outputs for examination. They were wasting valuable parliamentary time. It indicates they either did not do their homework, are exceptionally lazy, or do not understand who is responsible for what areas of government. Quite clearly, they are a long way from being the serious alternative government. That does not bode well, given in nearly every case, they were shadow spokespersons for one or more portfolios. That points back to the underlying problem they have. While they may have some smart members, they are completely undermined by their laziness, their unwillingness to do their homework, their treatment of committee time with contempt, and their shabby, retail politics.

Quorum formed.

Mr TUCKER - That approach was proven by the fact that one member did a television interview on a subject that he completely made up in his line of questioning. Shame. This is not what people of Tasmania want or expect from their elected representatives. However, I was genuinely interested to understand more about the outputs that were the subject of the committee. I will recount now some of the important things that I discovered through questioning the minister on her large number of responsibilities.

We heard updates on the significant achievements and ongoing activities under the Government's reset agenda. I especially noted the additional \$542 000 invested in the Budget and across the forward Estimates to support the reset and related activities. It was good to see the \$90 000 to support the involvement of Aboriginal communities to participate in government policy processes and the awards program, the first of its kind in Tasmania, an initiative to support emerging Tasmanian Aboriginal female leaders. The hard work of the minister and the Government does not stop there. We learned that the Tasmanian State Service Aboriginal Employment Strategy is now finished. This aims to increase the number of Aboriginal people in the Tasmanian State Service. This is positive. We know that policies like this will make a genuine difference to the outcomes for the lives of Aboriginal people, while also spreading benefit to families and community connections.

We also heard about the brand-new Aboriginal dual-naming policy which was tabled. It shows a new way forward for incorporating Aboriginal names alongside current official names for places. The key part of this is that it was clear from all the input to Government that the overwhelming majority of Aboriginal organisations felt disempowered, excluded, discriminated against by some of the design elements of the 2013 policy. This is not to criticise the first policy as it started a conversation, but clearly there was a lot of improvement needed as it was dividing the Aboriginal

community. Under the reset, the minister has acted to address these concerns. I note the new policy is thoroughly inclusive; it excludes no-one. It explicitly builds on the historical work done to reconstruct language with the palawa kani. The minister especially acknowledged this in her comments.

Finally, we received an update of the review of the Aboriginal Heritage Act Review which is underway and has invited input from all Tasmanian Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people to participate.

There was some disruption to the committee from the member for Clark, who does not understand Parks is the responsibility of the Premier. From observation, that was a common tactic exercised every day to disrupt proceedings, to avoid scrutinising the Budget and to make political points to satisfy the dark green power base.

Ms O'Connor - The dark green power base. Geez, it did not take you long.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order.

Mr TUCKER - While we are on to embarrassment for the member of Clark we saw how she forgot the Greens when in government returned no land to Aboriginal people.

Quorum formed

Ms O'Connor - Mr Tucker, it is parliament that returns land and we had legislation in this place knocked off upstairs. It is not government that returns land - it is parliaments and we gave parliament an opportunity. So if you are going to say something on the record, make it factual.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order.

Mr TUCKER - I have.

Ms O'Connor - Well, you have not. You do not understand. It is parliament that administers the act. It is parliament that decides.

Mr TUCKER - In fact they achieved nothing regarding land return, despite presenting themselves as the only people who care.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Chair. Standing Order 144. I take offence to Mr Tucker's untruths. Mr Tucker was not here at the time, but parliament passed land returns legislation which was blocked by the upper House. He should tell the truth.

Mr CHAIRMAN - It is not a point of order. It was not a personal reflection; it was on the party in general.

Mr TUCKER - Moving on. It was pleasing to hear from the minister the continuing and strong progress being made to increase the percentage of women on government boards and committees as part of the Women on Board strategy. Under the minister's watch, there has been a 33 per cent increase in the ratio of female board members which shows under the leadership and policy direction of a positive minister, you can make change for the better. This clearly stands in contrast to the lack of action and fancy catch phrases used by the Labor release.

Time expired.

[12.43 p.m.]

Ms WHITE - Mr Chairman, I rise to contribute on this output and talk in the first instance about the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio held by the minister. We did not have a very long time to debate or ask questions about the different elements of her portfolio, but there were a couple of matters I was hoping the minister might be able to address when she speaks today.

We spoke about the review of the dual naming policy. It is not new, as Mr Tucker suggested. That is not true. It has been altered and there is a reference committee. The nomenclature board will have provided advice to it regarding the name of landmarks and places. In the Estimates committee Mr Giudici said, 'The nomenclature board actually meets tomorrow afternoon and will be the first time it has been able to consider this properly'. Obviously, this is last week so it met last week and would be the first opportunity for the nomenclature board to examine the new policy, consider who might be a member of the reference committee and the terms of reference for that process.

I was hoping the minister in her contribution today might be able to update the House on whether she knows how that meeting went, whether they were able to decide on terms of reference and what the process is next: calling for nominations for that reference committee and the time frame for this. That will be a really important reference committee that supports the nomenclature board to fulfil the policy outlined by the minister to provide dual naming to significant places across Tasmania, to recognise our first people. I hope the minister can provide an update if possible, when giving her contribution on this today.

We spoke about the Office of Aboriginal Affairs and the staffing allocation and that the manager's position is and has been vacant for a long time. It was recently advertised as a de-identified position, which means it did not have to be filled by somebody from the Aboriginal community. The minister explained the reasons. I am interested if the minister has anything further to add with respect to the recruitment to the position and if there are any changes since last week. It is important to make sure the role is filled, especially given there are a number of matters in her portfolio the Office of Aboriginal Affairs will have to support implementation of. Part of this is the dual naming policy. The minister also spoke on the Aboriginal Employment Strategy of increasing the participation in the public service to 3.5 per cent from 3 per cent.

It is not an overly ambitious target to increase employment in the public sector by 150 people from the Aboriginal community by 2020. I hope to see in our workforce of about 24 000 people a more ambitious target and support more people from Tasmania's First People to have employment with the state service.

It is an important role the Office of Aboriginal Affairs is going to have to support the minister in delivering, so they need to be properly staffed and resourced and current vacancies are a challenge.

There were also discussions on land hand-backs and land returns, a very slow process. It is true to say in the last government we did present legislation to this House, because it is a decision for the parliament to decide where and what land is handed back. It did pass the lower House, but it did not proceed through the Legislative Council. It is a shame we have not been able to progress land hand-backs to Tasmania's First People since that occurred. I know there are many who would

love to be able to go back on country and know it was theirs; it is theirs now, but to have it recognised formally by the parliament.

We started to speak about the current unallocated abalone quotas. Recognising self-determination for Aboriginal people in Tasmania requires them to have economic independence and the ability to generate revenue. The question I put to the minister was whether she was aware of the request from the community for the unallocated abalone quota to be provided to the Aboriginal community so they could generate income to support employment and their activities in a more sustainable way because they would have their own source of revenue.

Unfortunately, we were not able to examine in detail as time for the output concluded. I am unsure whether it was examined in the other place. I would have to check the *Hansard* upstairs, minister, but we did start to talk about that but unfortunately, ran out of time. I do not know if it is something you can speak to today. I am sure you would be aware of the proposal from Rodney Dillon to examine whether the unallocated abalone quota could be provided to community. If you are able to today, I would be grateful if you could update the House on whether that is something you have sought to progress as a policy initiative of the Government.

We also spoke about the Aboriginal Heritage Review underway and looking at the act and how it works. I asked questions of the minister whether she considered Aboriginal heritage to belong to Aboriginal people. This is important because it will frame up the context of the review and the intent the Government has for the outcomes of that review. The question I put to the minister was, either the Aboriginal heritage belongs to the Aboriginal people and therefore they should be empowered to look after it or, if it does not, there should be strong protections in place to ensure it is not destroyed and that people are better aware of their obligations and responsibilities to ensure we do maintain and protect Aboriginal heritage in this state. That process is underway with the review being announced by the minister but it would be nice for her to clarify, as the minister, because that is ultimately where the policy direction will come from. She will have the responsibility to set the direction for the policy and the position she takes to the Cabinet.

We also looked in the examination of the minister on an output on Sport, and another one on Women and Disability. My colleague, the member for Lyons, Jen Butler, has spoken about disability and the member for Franklin, Ms Standen, will also do so. I was present for the outputs on Women and Sport and Recreation, with a pretty unedifying display by the minister regarding what is happening because there were very few questions she could answer. She was unable to go into very much detail regarding funding for hockey, cricket, football or soccer, and referred most of those questions to the Premier with a responsibility for the Events portfolio.

The Minister for Sport and Recreation has a responsibility for a range of areas including all those sports and it is not just about the one-off events, it is the grassroots participation and the pathways for girls' and boys' participation. It is about ensuring that she, too, has a say about the big sports events that are attracted to Tasmania and how we can encourage that to occur and what efforts she makes as an advocate and the Minister for Sport and Recreation to ensure that does happen. My colleague, the member for Franklin, Mr O'Byrne, will talk about that in detail because it was only half an hour again for this particular output and you probably only need five minutes because that was about the extent of the minister's knowledge on the topic of sport.

It was a similar situation in the output for Women. A limited amount of time was allocated to examine the output, only half an hour, and it would have been sufficient to just have five minutes because the minister was unable to talk in very much detail, apart from the percentage of people on

boards who were women. However, the minister could not provide a breakdown in numbers and took on notice the number of people on boards who are women across Tasmania. My colleague, the member for Bass, Ms O'Byrne, will speak to that as the shadow minister for women and perhaps shed a bit more light on why the minister was not able to provide that information for scrutiny at the table.

Time expired.

[12.53 p.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE - Mr Deputy Speaker, I am still interrogating some data and it does look like I will have time to look at little bit more closely this afternoon. What I was most concerned about during the Estimates scrutiny of the portfolio of Women was that Mrs Petrusma was very quick to say, 'I am the first and only Women's minister'. It is in the Government's statement of achievements, which is really odd because both Ms O'Connor and I have held the women's portfolio before. It did seem a little odd that we focused a bit on how she claims to be the first woman minister for women.

What really concerned me is that there does not seem to be clarity of what the role of the Women's minister might be in most of the areas under the Women's portfolio, which is to coordinate and pull together all of those things that impact our women and to create a level of oversight and engagement about all the issues that impact on women. Bring it together so you can make sure that you inform that policy.

The opening statement indicates a commitment to women across the board in terms of their economic participation, their health and wellbeing, and their safety. Yet, when we got to those questions, Mrs Petrusma was unable to answer any questions in that portfolio. When we talked about the termination services, which is a fundamental issue affecting women, Mrs Petrusma pointed out that had nothing to do with her, which is odd because it is something that women campaign for. Full participation and access to health services is part of self-determination for women. If women do not have full agency then other levels of discrimination that naturally flow from that continue. Mrs Petrusma, if she was a genuine Minister for Women, would know how that works.

Women's economic and employment participation was discussed. That is something that Mrs Petrusma says she is responsible for, yet she could not explain to us why women's employment decreased by 3.6 per cent in Tasmania, some 4400 women from April 2018 to April 2019. I do not yet have the women's data on the new unemployment figures out today but 600 fewer jobs have gone in Tasmania in a month. I am pretty sure that if you look at how the data has tracked so far, you will see that a large percentage of that number are women. Women are most represented in the areas of under-employment. When we tried to interrogate that, Mrs Petrusma said it was nothing to do with her, either, saying we have created jobs and it is all fine and there are a lot of opportunities in the new investment in TAFE. We were not allowed to ask questions about how many women would be able to access these apprenticeships, or how many they thought would be employed in the new investment area because that was a question for a different minister as well.

We talked about women's policy. There seems to be a generic role in the minister's office and people work on some policy areas and there are some we were able to interrogate but, primarily, Mrs Petrusma does not have any responsibility. She was able to answer questions about a scholarship program and that is the only real thing we were able to get answers for.

We talked about women on boards. I have received the data. I want to interrogate a little further because I have only just received the question on notice, but thank you for providing an answer to a question on notice before your output is interrogated. You are the only minister who has answered any of the questions I put forward before we interrogate that output. I commend the minister's office. I suppose they do not have a lot to do with women's policy so being able to answer this should not be too hard, given that answer the minister gave was - and I did think it was odd that you could not answer at the time - that one of her two main roles were the scholarship program and the participation of women on boards.

She gave us some percentage figures and she is keen to because the percentages go up. However, what I wanted was the head count and the minister was unable to provide that on the day but we do have it now. I want to have another look at it because I would hate to misrepresent the data but, as I can see it, there are 53 fewer board positions overall that the minister is counting. There are 76 fewer women on paid boards this year from last. I want to look at it because I have only just received the answer.

Mrs Petrusma - There are a lot fewer men, too.

Ms O'BYRNE - Yes, but if you have 53 fewer board positions overall, it does appear that the bulk of positions that have gone are women's. I will come back to you because I will have time after lunch. The answer has only just been emailed through and I was looking at the data as we spoke. We have gone from board positions of 934 down to 881 last year, which is 53 fewer board positions in total. Of that, it appears that there is a reduction of five women's positions. What does seem to be quite concerning is the reduction in paid positions. Women's numbers have dropped 76 in paid positions but jumped in unpaid positions. One of the things you would be aware of is that it has not always been the challenge to put women in to unpaid positions. What has always been the significant challenge is putting women into paid board positions.

The minister talked a lot about her responsibility for increasing women's safety, yet we were not able to get much information around how that plays in the Family Violence Action Plan. At this point it became clear that the minister was defining her role and the Premier's role. We have written to the Premier on initiatives around women's safety and he has referred us to Mrs Petrusma. We wanted to know exactly what it is that the minister does. We asked a number of times because Mrs Petrusma kept telling us that different ministers were responsible for different initiatives. She does not seem to have an overall understanding. We kept asking, minister, can you tell me what you actually do so we can ask the questions that you can answer? When you say you are responsible for economic participation, engagement, employment, health, wellbeing and safety, we assume you can answer questions on those topics. What was clear, minister, was that you could not.

We even asked you about one of the things the Government staples itself to such as the White Ribbon Initiative. Members would not be surprised to know I have significant concerns with White Ribbon, the type of organisation it is and how it works, but the minister could not even tell us how much other departments had spent on the standout action across government, to protect women who are employed in government and to increase understanding and awareness of how we treat women. We did find out that, out of the minister's area, there is \$80 000.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2019 (No. 21)

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) 2019 (No. 22)

In Committee

Resumed from above.

Ms O'BYRNE - Mr Chairman, when we were interrupted by the break, we were discussing White Ribbon training. I said I have different views on White Ribbon, which I am happy to share with any member at any time. Please do come and see me.

The issue we had is that the minister, despite being the Minister for Women and somehow holistically responsible for women in the state, and for women at least against Government portfolios, she could only tell me how much the Department of Communities Tasmania had spent, which was \$60 000 with a further \$20 000 for accreditation. So \$60 000 on training and \$20 000 for a sticker. That's great. I am feeling women are much safer as a result of this investment. Well done you, minister.

I raise this as a significant issue because the Government pins a lot on its White Ribbon status. We have a Minister for Women who cannot tell us holistically what was spent. The Minister for Women cannot explain the impact of women across government, across the state, around employment, training, health, safety, wellbeing and the programs we run to increase women's safety in these environments. The only thing that the minister could address and chose to address was the percentage of women on boards.

The minister said that from 2016-17 to 2018-19 in the document I received, the percentage of women on boards has jumped from 40.1 per cent to 44.9 per cent. Unfortunately, the type of document that we have needs some interrogation on what the minister might mean. I will seek some guidance about writing a letter, or I am happy to put an RTI in if she thinks that is the most appropriate process.

Mrs Petrusma - The Women on Boards Strategy Annual Report has more information and is up on the website.

Ms O'BYRNE - I have gone to the report. I have a copy of it. I am interested in the changing nature of the boards. When I look at state-owned companies, for instance, in 2016-17 there were 20 women on Tasmanian boards, according to this answer and now there are 22. I know of one board that has increased its membership by two. What I do not know is what changes have occurred in the other boards? On the simple reading of this study, you would think that no other board has changed its membership, but it may have been that some boards have increased women's membership and some have declined. It may be that some boards have become smaller and that would have an impact as well. It is that kind of data that gives us a more genuine understanding of women's participation on boards.

The minister is right when she says that there are also fewer men on boards as there are fewer women on boards. We have 48 fewer positions for men on boards, 53 fewer overall. What does not seem to add up, and it may be that we have a crossover, is whether people are sitting on paid and unpaid boards. The point I was making before is that we have never had a problem in our community of getting women onto unpaid boards. That has never been an issue. Our issue has

been ensuring that women are properly recompensed on paid boards and that goes to agency and engagement.

Time expired.

[2.34 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE - Mr Chairman, I rise to make a contribution in response to the Sport and Recreation output for the minister, Mrs Petrusma. I assume in her contribution, the member for Clark, Ms O'Connor would have made this reference. Whilst we know we only have so much time across all the outputs, we were a bit disappointed we only had half an hour for Sport. There is a big argument to say that there should be more time for sport, but it is hard thing to juggle.

In terms of the Opposition's opportunity to cross-examine and to interrogate the Budget, we were very concerned. Whilst I was able to lead off with a question, Ms O'Connor did not receive the call as the second question. It was offered to a Dorothy Dixier from Mr Tucker, who was then offered a follow-on question as well. Two questions in a row for a Government member in a half-hour interrogation of an output is really inappropriate. Not that I have to speak on behalf of Ms O'Connor, I am not; I am speaking on behalf of the crossbenchers. In terms of allocation of time, we do not think it is appropriate.

I will not reflect on the Chair but we think that circumstance should be looked at. We do not think that is an appropriate way to ensure that there is an appropriate opportunity for crossbench members to raise questions. I will just do that at the outset. I did not think that was appropriate.

On the matters I raised in the Sports portfolio, it was a quite frustrating half an hour. Obviously, Sport encapsulates a range of activities in Tasmania from school-based, community-based and regionally based programs, as well as the various codes across the state. It is crucially important that not only are the grassroots supported, but there is a coherent pathway to elite level. There is a whole range of Tasmanians who are inspired by seeing their heroes on television, both male and female. It is important for every government, particularly in the Sports portfolio, to have a vision not only about how to increase participation at the grassroots, but how elite level sport is played. Also, it is important that there is opportunity for Tasmanians to represent Tasmania on the national stage.

In junior sport we have a number of opportunities. We have the Tasmanian Tigers, both men and women, in the national league. We have hockey, but there are a number of other sports at the elite level, where we do not have a Tasmanian team. I thought it legitimate to ask the minister about her strategy and her view around those matters. It was frustrating for the minister to say that basically it is really not a matter for her, it is Events, and we are focused on just grassroots sport. I think it undermines what you are trying to do at grassroots. If you are trying to encourage grassroots level, it is very important to show young Tasmanians, young athletes, young sportsmen and women and their families that there is a pathway and journey towards elite level in their chosen sport.

We were very frustrated by the minister's lack of ability to articulate how those things were playing out. There is a big question mark about the NBL licence. There is a question mark about an A League licence. We were trying to find out what view the minister had on those matters, but there were no answers, which was quite frustrating with only half an hour and a fair bit of it taken up with Dorothy Dixers. We were not able to interrogate the minister's vision and see what her view was on the allocation in the Budget in her portfolio.

The issue of women's games at the ICC 2020 World Cup was raised. I want to correct the record. The member for Lyons, Mr Tucker, in his contribution to this output mentioned that I was wrong; I told the media and said things that were wrong. We had a number of senior people in cricket circles and cricket fans around the country who were quite rightly disappointed that Tasmania missed out on hosting women's games in the ICC. There was a strong rumour going around that Tasmania had not put in for it. We asked the minister. She initially said that it was not her portfolio. That is not good enough. The Sports minister really does need to be involved in those discussions and those decisions. Although, initially, the minister said that it was nothing to do with her, she did advise that a bid had been made. Given the level of concern when we did not win any women's games and there was a strong view we had not put in a bid, we asked for the bid to be produced. We are still waiting for this to give evidence, particularly for women cricketers, that the Government actually did try to get women's games for those cricket fans across the state; that we actually did try to get ICC World Cup 2020 matches in Hobart. I take the minister at face value that a bid was put in, but it was such an abject failure when other places, Canberra for example, were very successful in getting women's games. We are very disappointed.

I did not say in the media that the state Government had not asked for women's games. After the Estimates Committee session, the media was following up on a story. I said the only way you can clear this up is by producing the bid. I take the minister at face value that she has advised, but very disappointed she was not across the detail. You would want the Sports minister backing those kinds of opportunities, not only for fans of sport, but also for the young women who play cricket across Tasmania to go to Blundstone Arena and watch their female cricketing stars from around the world playing. I am very disappointed.

I am also very disappointed by the lack of engagement of the minister around the very cynical campaign by the federal Liberal Party in the last federal election regarding AFL sport in Tasmania. Having a commitment from a federal party to support a Tasmanian team in the AFL, then have the opposing political party to the commitment characterise it in the north of the state as a southern based AFL team is dishonest. Based on comments from a number of former Tasmanian and AFL greats this set the Tasmanian case back. It sends a message to the AFL and the mainland that if politics is valued over participation and the ability to have a team in the AFL the Liberal Party will pick politics.

The irony is having a federal Liberal Party campaigning against funding for a Tasmanian AFL team when the state Government had allocated money to try to get an AFL team. Yet the Premier, the Treasurer and other Liberal Party players all stood next to him handing out flyers at elections, talking about a southern-based AFL team, whipping the parochialism horse. It has set Tasmania back in terms of getting an AFL team. The Sports minister, by her silence, clearly supported that campaign. It shows this is a party and Government that will put politics above the best interests of sporting fans and those people who want to have a team in the AFL that genuinely represents Tasmania and all Tasmanians.

We were very disappointed in the short half hour we had. There was clearly no vision or comprehension of what was required to build an elite program that could inspire thousands of young Tasmanians. Again, another disappointing session.

Time expired.

[2.44 p.m.]

Ms STANDEN - Mr Chairman, I rise to contribute on feedback of the Estimates on the minister for Disability Services. Unfortunately, I was unable attend the Estimates Committee, but as

spokesperson on disability services in the lower House, nonetheless I want to - and I will turn towards the minister so she can hopefully hear my comments.

I have not had an opportunity to fully digest what occurred within the Estimates Committee but will make a couple of comments in the hope that the minister is able to address these concerns in her wrap up. I have been informed by our shadow for disability and ageing, Jo Siejka, of a lack of satisfaction and that there are concerns that the minister was unable to clearly articulate her responsibilities in the Disability Services portfolio, or the differentiation between federal and state responsibilities during Estimates, at least in the upper House.

As I have mentioned many times, I am concerned about the NDIS transition process and what support the minister can guarantee for disability service organisations that service non-NDIS clientele beyond the end of this calendar year. I understand that she has referred to ILC grants on a number of occasions but they have no guarantee of applicants being funded.

I noted in the news this morning there was comment, I think it was from TADPAC - the Tasmanian Association of Disabled Persons Abilities Centre - that indicated they have received bridging funding for some 12 months. I understand from conversations this morning with service providers in disability services that that is not necessarily the case across the sector. Others have only received five month's bridging funding from July through to November, and then only if these organisations intend to apply for ILC funding through the Commonwealth. I put on record the significant financial and human cost to these small organisations to commit to applying for ILC funding. As a former state and Commonwealth bureaucrat with significant experience in grant management, I understand the challenges of these small organisations, some of which are heavily dependent upon volunteers, many with a small number of core staff, in many cases, I would go so far as to say, without the experience in applying for grants that are national and competitive in nature.

I understand that the four brain injury organisations have decided to team up and engage a consultant in order to assist them in preparing for an ILC grant. That is because of limited capacity of the organisations to do that in and of themselves, and because the conditions of grant, particularly from the Commonwealth in this instance, expect collaboration between organisations. These organisations, particularly if they rely on fundraising and various streams of funding, whether it be state, Commonwealth or through the philanthropic sector, are competitive by nature. It is good to expect collaboration between these organisations but it not realistic to expect that there is no competitive tension between these organisations. It is not always an easy thing for them. These four brain injury organisations engaged a consultant at a cost of approximately \$5000 each, together with a significant time that these small organisations provided in order to develop that grant application. These organisations are not funded for the process of applying for grants. They are dependent upon the state government to provide ongoing core funding in order to keep the doors open and the lights on.

The fact that there are three more grant rounds signals opportunity but significant risk in that there is a limited time frame under which these organisations need to commit to significant resourcing, beyond what is provided through their traditional funding streams, in order to have a chance to complete. It is a bit like not even being able to walk up to the start line of a race. With the small amount allocated to Tasmania, some \$570 000 I was told, there is a realisation that the Tasmanian Government contribution is a small pie for which organisations are competing.

The other thing is that the bridging funding is offered at the current rate but there is significantly increased demand. The existing bridging funding is only until end of November, putting constraints on organisations in being able to keep people who may have been on short-term contracts. BIAT received a grant through the ILC of \$194 000 but that included GST and so it was much less. It was 12 months of specific purpose funding that did not include activities like grant applications and so on. It is not the core funding and, therefore, the long-term reassurance and security of funding that these organisations need.

It is an ongoing frustration of mine with this Government, whether it be in this instance, disability, or climate change, or housing, is that we continually received answers throughout the Estimates process of, 'Well, that is not my area'. We are talking about a massive cohort in Disability Services; I think it is one in five Tasmanians. In Tasmania, we have the highest rate of disability of any state, with the highest rate of autism, cerebral palsy and multiple sclerosis, for example, with rates only likely to increase. Although there are around 10 000 people who are eligible for support through the NDIS, that still leaves 80 000 to 90 000 people who fall outside of those parameters.

In the case of Brain Injury Association Tasmania, the issue is that the funding being provided through the ILC does not provide core funding needed to keep its doors open to continue its work as an interface for people with brain injury, their families and clinicians, as well as service providers, advocacy organisations and the criminal justice system. They work across family violence, child protection, mental health, homelessness, disability and alcohol and drug services so they are the safety net in the community for thousands of Tasmanians living with or impacted by brain injury.

It is highly simplistic to focus just in the Disability Services area when there are demands of those different responsibilities right across government. These are real people who demand and need more. The NDIA refers to itself, the scheme, as a plane being launched while still being built. The issue is that the NDIS goalposts have moved so much over the past six years. Given the amount of funds Tasmania contributes to the NDIS, I would have thought it incumbent on the Tasmanian Government to ensure Tasmanian taxpayers' funds are appropriately managed by the Commonwealth and, more importantly, to ensure any changes to the NDIS after the past six years did not and will not disadvantage Tasmanians with disability.

Minister, if you are thinking about the NDIS plane and whether it is going to land safely with no lives lost, I urge you to think that the reality is that we are heading for a crash landing with all lives on board at significant risk.

Time expired.

[2.54 p.m.]

Mrs RYLAH - Mr Chairman, I held the position of Chair of the Budget Estimates Committee B and I thank Mrs Petrusma, departmental officers, staff and members for their contributions. I congratulate Mrs Petrusma for her commitment and contributions to the portfolios of Aboriginal Affairs, Women, Sport and Recreation and as the Minister for Disability Services and Community Development.

The issue of proportionality of questions was repeatedly raised in this committee. I note that the questions asked in this section were 63 per cent Labor, 3 per cent Liberal, and 33 per cent Greens. As you know from the orders for Estimates, the actual allocation of proportionality is 60 per cent Labor, 20 per cent Liberal, and 20 per cent Greens. As you can see, the Greens received

65 per cent more than their allocation at the cost of the Liberal allocation under my chairmanship in this division.

Estimates is a wonderful opportunity to learn a great deal about the detail and the operation of projects currently underway and planned in the Budget. I wanted to note a number of those areas that I particularly found of interest.

In Aboriginal Affairs, I thought the dual-naming policy was an interesting development, as was Aboriginal employment and the issues on Closing the Gap. Our progress on women on boards and the employment of women, particularly Aboriginal women, in the state public service has to be commended. In the disability sector, the understanding of the NDIS and the intricacies of how it is being applied is also significant as is the work we are doing in the Tasmanian Autism Diagnostics Services. I really appreciate that.

It is an excellent development that we are building accessible buses built in the state.

Quorum formed.

Mrs RYLAH - I want to bring to the House's attention an incident that occurred during the Estimates Committee B of this House of which I was Chair last Wednesday 5 June. I raise it today because it is serious, unparliamentary and underscores the need for members to conduct themselves appropriately, both when the microphones are turned on and when they are not in this place. I have written to the Speaker and seek leave to table my letter that provides further detail of the incident.

I understand that Ms O'Connor has also written to the Speaker and admits using inappropriate language but stands by her claim that I am a biased Chair. While I understand that Ms O'Connor has given an undertaking to the Speaker to meet with me, I believe it is incumbent on the member to apologise to this House for her behaviour. I hope that occurs.

Unfortunately, Chair, this is not the only incident that has occurred over this Budget sitting. Many members would be aware of other allegations of unparliamentary behaviour in the parliamentary dining room involving Labor members of parliament and a member of this side of the House and his guests. The Leader of the Opposition has privately apologised to the Premier for that incident. One other member, who witnessed the matter, has also privately apologised to Mr Barnett but the offending member has not made an apology for himself. This behaviour is not good enough. When inappropriate behaviour occurs in public, it is only fair that the apology is made in public.

Last year, all members of the House endorsed a code of conduct which, among other things, subscribed us all to acts of fairness, courtesy, respect and understanding without harassment, victimisation or discrimination, with respect for differences, equity and fairness in political dealings with other fellow members of parliament.

I have only recently returned to this place and it is deeply and personally upsetting to me that such behaviour could be swept under the carpet. All members should accept responsibility for their actions, both within and outside the House. They should be accountable and they should learn from their mistakes.

I seek leave to table my letter.

Leave granted.

[3.02 p.m.]

Mrs PETRUSMA - Mr Chairman, Budget Estimates show that in my portfolios of Aboriginal Affairs, Women, Sport and Recreation, Disability Services and Community Development so much is being delivered and there is so much that we can be proud of as the Hodgman Liberal Government.

I put on the record my deep thanks and appreciation to my ministerial staff and all the department staff with whom I have the pleasure of working, for their passion, dedication and commitment to making a real difference in the lives of nearly all Tasmanians that these portfolios intersect with.

Last week I welcomed the opportunity to reflect on the fact that the majority Hodgman Liberal Government is delivering on our plan to build a stronger economy and to create jobs, especially as the evidence shows that our plan is working. Last week's state final demand figures have confirmed that Tasmania has the strongest economy in the nation for the first time in 15 years. These figures have not happened by accident. They are because of the policies of this Liberal Government, which is supporting all Tasmanians and the Tasmanian economy. That is why this state's Budget is about maintaining the momentum and investing for growth, especially as almost 13 000 jobs have been created in the past five years for all Tasmanians, including women, while at the same time focusing on the things that matter most to Tasmanians, including looking after the state's most vulnerable.

One of the fundamental commitments of the Hodgman Liberal Government was to review the Aboriginal and dual-naming policy. This is because this Government heard from a number of Tasmanian Aboriginal people that they felt unfairly excluded from the previous policy. After a widespread consultation with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Tasmanians, the now-revised policy enhances inclusivity, procedural efficiency and broader promotion. The policy also for the first time, provides for the establishment of a reference group of experts in Aboriginal languages under the Nomenclature Board Tasmania, with expressions of interest to be called later this month, including the board writing to Aboriginal communities and organisations, inviting them to express their interest in being involved in the reference group.

The revised policy also recognises and acknowledges the decades of work by the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre in developing palawa kani and therefore provides for names to be informed by palawa kani as well as other recorded languages. Scholars believe that between eight and 16 distinct Aboriginal languages may have been spoken prior to European settlement. I also note the media release from the Tasmanian Regional Aboriginal Communities Alliance - TRACA - whose members represent Aboriginal people from all over Tasmania. TRACA said that the revised policy now ensures that all Aboriginal communities can have a say about place nomination in their areas, with chair Rodney Dillon stating -

We congratulate the State Government announcement on involving local Aboriginal communities to make sure their own decisions about dual naming in their areas. This is true self-determination that we have been calling on for many years.

Assigning Aboriginal and dual names is an important way to acknowledge Tasmanian Aboriginals deep connection between people and place.

The Premier and his minister have shown courage and commitment as part of their Resetting the Relationship in the review of this policy.

Aunty Patsy Cameron, co-Chair said -

We are thrilled that this policy will at last ensure each of us feel empowered to be able to name features and places that reflect and respect local community groups.

In regard to the Office of Aboriginal Affairs, I can indicate the recruitment process is still ongoing. Regarding land return we remain committed to exploring joint land management arrangements and land return with Tasmanian Aboriginal communities. This is why we are reviewing the model for returning land to the Aboriginal community. I am looking forward to the finalisation of the stakeholder consultation and feedback report in line with our agenda 2019 commitment.

Last week I also released the Tasmanian State Service Aboriginal Employment Strategy to 2022, which aims to attract, retain and support Aboriginal people in the state service workforce by building a culturally diverse, safe and respectful workplace, while also valuing the inherent and unique qualities, knowledge and experience Aboriginal employees bring to the State Service. The three-year plan sets out a number of strategies to increase the proportion of Aboriginal people working in the State Service. It is supported by an action plan, which includes development and delivering workshops for Tasmanian Aboriginals on how to apply for jobs in the State Service and developing a mentoring program for Aboriginal employees.

We also recognise that Tasmania's Aboriginal cultural heritage is a legacy of Tasmania's First People, their places, objects and traditions passed down through thousands of generations. We are currently reviewing the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975 to consider the design and operation of the legislation through broad consultation and consideration of the views of Tasmanian Aboriginal people, non-Aboriginal stakeholders and the Aboriginal Heritage Council in its independent and statutory role. We have released a discussion paper to help inform submissions to this review.

Since 2015 the Tasmanian Government has been demonstrating its commitment across government to resetting the relationship with the Tasmanian Aboriginal people. This is why whole-of-government expenditure on Aboriginal Affairs is projected to be over \$10 million in 2019-20. There is funding for supporting services for Aboriginal children and women experiencing family violence, a focus on Tasmanian Aboriginal history and culture in our schools and training Aboriginal rangers.

Because the previous Labor government abolished the position of minister for women, I am honoured to be appointed the first Minister for Women since 2006. The reason the Premier created this role for the first time since 2006 is because the Hodgman Liberal Government is committed to creating a more inclusive Tasmania that empowers and enables women and girls to fully participate in our economic, social, political and community life through policies and actions that increase financial security, leadership and participation, safety, health and wellbeing and gender equity for women and girls. Therefore, as Minister for Women, my key role within Government is to advance and promote the overarching policy framework for women in Tasmania through the women's policy output that sits within the Department of Communities Tasmania.

What stood out for me most during Budget Estimates was how little Labor knows or remembers about how portfolios or government works. Their questions also reflected pure laziness on their behalf as they had no idea which minister they should be asking questions of. If Labor wants to ever be taken seriously as an alternative government, then they really need to start acting like one. However, throughout Estimates they made it very obvious all they could do was complain about our Budget. When the time came to present an alternative budget, they could not do it. Not only that, but the Opposition Leader's budget reply speech did not propose changing a single thing in our Budget, including for women.

In regards to women, I note in an article by columnist and Sky News host, Gemma Tognini this week about the federal Labor Party. I want to quote from parts of her article as it is very relevant here to the Labor Opposition in Tasmania. Ms Tognini states that:

Whatever you're doing right now, if you stop and listen closely, you'll hear the sound of shattering glass. A glass house, to be exact. Being destroyed from within by the weak-kneed, lily-livered apologists who live there.

This is the house that federal Labor built along with their mates from the union movement and it's from this house that they peddled the same fare; a relentless and frankly wafer-thin narrative accusing conservative parties of having a problem with women.

This house is now crumbling before their eyes, shard by shard, and the overdue demolition is an inside job.

...

... because of what the leaders of the ALP and the union movement have so far collectively failed and are repeatedly failing to do.

...

The message is loud and clear. The leadership of the ALP and the union movement are all about women, as long as those women are there to fill quotas ...

The other women, not so much.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order.

Mrs PETRUSMA - She also adds -

It makes me think how women are still the ultimate accessory and political football when time and circumstances present.

Women are super handy when you want to point out how diverse and inclusive you are, how many quota boxes are being ticked.

...

It says to women, all women, you don't matter unless we need you to tick a box somewhere.

That same attitude to women was on display during Budget Estimates last week -

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order, the minister has the call, order.

Mrs PETRUSMA - where women were, for Labor, the ultimate accessory and political football. What last week especially showed, that the days when women elected to this parliament were willing to work together to help and support all women in Tasmania, are gone.

Ms Butler - How hard have we worked for these positions?

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order, Ms Butler, order.

Mrs PETRUSMA - In the past, Ms O'Connor, and the honourable member for Franklin and former Labor premier and leader, Ms Giddings, and I, as the spokespeople for women in our respective parties started an important body of work, a campaign in regard to saying enough is enough when it comes to family violence against women and their children. Through saying no to women experiencing family violence and making family violence a truly tripartisan issue, an extra \$26 million was provided under Tasmania's very first Family Violence Action Plan, and another \$27 million has also been delivered in this Budget. This tripartisan work demonstrated to all Tasmanians that significant, once in a generation reform can be achieved for women in Tasmania when all parties truly work together. Sadly, like Ms Tognini said, Labor is no longer interested in women unless they can tick a box somewhere, a political football to kick around or something to tear apart in this parliament.

Unlike the Opposition, this Government remains steadfast in our commitment to gender equality, which is why we consulted widely on the Tasmanian Women's Strategy 2018-21, with nearly 1400 submissions received so as to ensure the strategy is a whole-of-government policy that maps a pathway forward to achieving gender equality in Tasmania.

Ms O'Byrne - If only it was and you knew how to answer a single question, minister.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order, Ms O'Byrne.

Mrs PETRUSMA - As Minister for Women, I was responsible for driving this new strategy, with actions being driven by respective agencies and their respective government ministers who are accountable for delivery of these actions, supporting Tasmanian women and girls with a broad range of policies, programs and services.

Ms O'Byrne - Is that like abortion access? Tell us about that. You could not answer questions about that. You could not answer about jobs, health or employment.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order, Ms O'Byrne.

Mrs PETRUSMA - Under the strategy, agencies report annually on their progress in implementation of the strategy. There is also a women's strategy inter-departmental committee that is responsible for helping to drive the actions and to report on progress annually. There are four whole-of-government action plans to be developed -

Ms O'Byrne - What is your portfolio, again?

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order, Ms O'Byrne.

Mrs PETRUSMA - under the Tasmanian Women's Strategy with the first, the Financial Security for Women Action Plan already released. The second, safety, will include the Family and Sexual Violence Action Plan that will be released later this month.

Ms O'Byrne - Safety, which you could not answer a question on, or women's housing, or women's health and wellbeing. Who wrote this?

Mr CHAIRMAN - Ms O'Byrne, order.

Mrs PETRUSMA - Eliminating family violence remains a top priority for this Government, which is why the 2019-20 Budget commits a further \$27 million over three years to fund a single, combined, Family and Sexual Violence Action Plan, an approach that is informed by findings from the Family Violence Service System Review.

Opposition members interjecting.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order, Ms O'Byrne, Ms Butler and Ms Haddad, interjections should cease. All members from the opposition were heard in silence and I would expect you to do the same.

Ms O'Byrne - To be fair, we did not mislead this House or behave so inappropriately, Chair.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Order, Ms O'Byrne, you are challenging me to throw you out. You only came to the House to interject -

Ms O'Byrne - I came to the House because this minister was misrepresenting this -

Mr CHAIRMAN - Ms O'Byrne, order. Some respect, please. The minister has the call.

Mrs PETRUSMA - Thank you, Chair. The findings from the Family Violence Service System Review include contemporary research and best practice research and will support -

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Chair. I refer you to the *Hansard* of Estimates. Mrs Petrusma could not answer questions on the service review during Estimates. I am not sure why she is addressing it now.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Ms O'Byrne, you know that is not a point of order.

Ms O'BYRNE - I am sorry, Chair. I am asking whether we were allowed to ask questions.

Mrs PETRUSMA - the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children 2010-2022. Work on the health and wellbeing action plan will commence later this year and will be launched in early 2020. Other important initiatives that are being delivered under the women's output include biennial fact sheets as evidence-based practice is key to implementation with the Tasmanian Women's Strategy.

Ms Butler - Isn't that what Tony Abbott said? We are too busy ironing for the nation because that's what we're used to, aren't we? We're only good for filling a quota and that's about it. It is so disgusting. It's not funny. I am outraged.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Ms Butler, order.

Mrs PETRUSMA - This statistical reporting will help us to measure change over the coming years and assess our progress in achieving gender equality for women and girls in Tasmania.

The Tasmanian Honour Roll of Women is awarded by a totally independent judging panel that assesses each nominee and selects inductees based on the information provided to ensure that it is at arm's length from any political interference. Our new International Women's Day small grants program has supported 25 International Women's Day Events across Tasmania and the Women in Tasmania website and Facebook page, which were launched in March 2017. We showcase programs, policies and events of interest to Tasmanian women.

Regarding leadership and participation, the Women on Board Strategy 2015-20 is another key initiative, with our target of 50 per cent female representation on government boards and committees by July 2020 that I am delighted to inform you is going exceptionally well.

Ms BUTLER - Point of order. I would like to outline that this minister would not have her job if not for feminists. How dare you imply that we are here to fill a quota.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Ms Butler, you realise that is not a point of order.

Ms Butler - I am sorry, but it had to be said. Disgraceful. It's not funny.

Mr CHAIRMAN - Ms Butler, order.

Mrs PETRUSMA - As at 31 March 2019, 44.9 per cent of government board positions are now held by women, which is a massive increase of nearly 33 per cent in the ratio of female board members or an increase of 11.1 per centage points since July 2015, when it was only 33.8 per cent.

Ms BUTLER - Point of order, Mr Chairman. The point of order is that not only would the minister not have her job if not for feminism, if not for quotas, on the point of order, I might relate you to the pay gap, minister -

Mr CHAIRMAN - Ms Butler, please, sit down. I understand there are women here who might not want to listen but the minister has listened to the points put to her in this debate. I expect some respect for the House and the minister during her contribution. Please, stop interjecting.

Mrs PETRUSMA - Thank you, Chair. The 2019-20 Budget further supports women in leadership, with \$200 000 over four years from 2019-20 to 2022-23 for scholarships to support women who are emerging leaders, particularly those who face the most barriers to leadership opportunities, including board appointments. The Government is also providing \$5000 in 2019-20 and over the forward Estimates in additional funding to support the new young Tasmanian Aboriginal women leaders' awards to support emerging female leaders and to promote and advance career and academic pathways for Aboriginal girls. Through the Tasmanian Institute of Sport, in partnership with Women's Sport and Recreation Tasmania, we are also providing assistance to women coaching our athletes via the women in sport coaching scholarships, with applications currently open and which will provide to \$5000 for quality coaching opportunities for women and to increase the number of female coaches in Tasmania.

We know that there is more work to do, which is why the 2019-20 Budget builds on our commitments to date, and reflects our strong commitment to reduce gender-based inequalities and to promote gender equality in Tasmania. This includes providing significant investment in removing known barriers to female sports participation, especially inadequate female sport and recreation facilities, through our highly successful Levelling the Playing Field Grants Program;

\$10 million over two years that is ensuring that our sport facilities are of a more appropriate standard. With 21 projects already funded throughout Tasmania under the grants program we are already reaping the benefits of improved changerooms and facilities, with more to come in 2019-20.

The Government is also supporting grassroots and development pathways opportunities for Tasmanian women and girls through our \$250 000 per annum partnership with Netball Tasmania. We also have new funding of \$240 000 per annum to Cricket Tasmania to support high performance and pathways for women in cricket, as well as \$400 000 over four years to Hockey Tasmania to assist participation for our women's and men's teams in the new elite domestic league, both commitments of which have been very warmly welcomed and endorsed in the media.

The Sport and Recreation portfolio continues to contribute to another of the Government's objectives through the delivery of a range of policies, programs and services with the investment in 2019-20 of over \$28 million. Some of the key deliverables include increasing the capacity and governance capability of sporting organisations, implementing plans to increase participation of sport and recreation by all Tasmanians especially those who face the biggest barriers to participation including people with disability, women, children and young people, contributing to a healthy Tasmania outcomes, the delivery of the sport and recreation major and minor grants program and facilitating sport infrastructure assessment studies.

The output is also responsible for providing the best possible opportunities for Tasmania's elite athletes and para-athletes. We saw outstanding success by Tasmanian athletes at the 2018 Gold Coast Commonwealth Games and assistance for their future performance in national championships and the 2020 Olympic Games and Para Olympic Games.

CSR is also engaging with local government, sport and recreation clubs, the disability sector and not for profit organisations to network, educate, train and collaborate on community health and wellbeing, governance, good practice and opportunities in sport and recreation.

The Government is also providing more opportunities for children and young people - from age five upwards - to participate statewide in sport through Ticket to Play and through funding RecLink Australia to expand their programs into George Town, Glenorchy, Risdon Vale and Brighton. We are also facilitating opportunities for children through sporting schools and will be linking sporting organisations to our new regional sports coordinators so children, parents, educators and sports are better connected to make it easier to participate in sport, an initiative strongly supported by AFL Tasmania.

In regard to Tasmania having its first AFL and AFLW teams, on 1 July we will have the Football Tasmanian board to speak with one united voice to progress the vision of a Tasmanian AFL and AFLW team which will work in conjunction with our newly established Tasmanian AFL Project Team, responsible for developing the business case for a Tasmanian AFL and an AFLW team.

In regard to the ICC World 2020 bid, the Tasmanian Government did bid for both women's and men's matches. Regrettably, the ICC did not award us any women's games, but I along with many other Tasmanians are looking forward to the eight matches we will be hosting.

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Chair. It would really useful for the House if the minister could table the bid.

Mr CHAIRMAN - That is not a point of order.

Time expired.

Estimates of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Minister for Women, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Disability Services and Community Development agreed to.

DIVISIONS 2, 10 AND 11 -

(Minister for Primary Industries and Water, Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Minister for Energy)

[3.22 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE - I rise to speak in response to the Estimates hearing. It is always a good robust exchange with the minister. The minister is very strong in his opinions and sticks to his lines. He is a very disciplined minister, I will give him that. We may not always agree or see eye to eye on a range of matters, but as in question time we have a good spirited exchange and I genuinely think he wants the best for the state but it does worry me. It is not an unqualified pat on the back, minister, because there is a range of concerns and issues out of the Estimates hearing last week which do need to be prosecuted and discussed in the best interests of the state.

Obviously, Tasmania, given the opportunity it is connected to the Battery of the Nation and the broader Marinus Project and the opportunity for Tasmania, it is crucially important we get it right. In a national energy market, we are but one player with a partial role. It is a massive opportunity for Tasmania and I will not go to the history of the Labor Party in terms of our commitment. We are absolutely committed to renewable energy in Tasmania. The Labor Party, not me personally, has good form. Just letting you know I did not build the dams. Labor Premier Eric Reece did much of that work. There is a unity ticket in terms of the importance of renewable energy for Tasmania and we need to ensure we put our best foot forward and provide the economic and social and environmental opportunity that renewable energy has played in Tasmania for many years and will continue to play for generations to come. There is a whole range of benefits to that. We are on a unity ticket philosophically about the importance of renewable energy.

Under questioning the minister on the Budget line items we were very concerned about a lack of clarity around the \$86 million commitment to the broader renewable energy projects, Battery of the Nation and Marinus that connect, the second and potentially the third connector. There was an inability for the minister to define what that would get us. That is a crucial challenge for the state. You need to be able to define what you are going to get with that money. Some of the money is allocated there is no doubt about that. It is very defined but in terms of the broader business case and the proposal for the Battery of the Nation projects and the second connector there is a real lack of clarity. When you are committing close to \$100 million as a first instalment to such a project, you have to make sure that you are getting it right. We are very concerned that the best that we have to date is that the projects will cost between \$1 billion and \$3 billion. It is a big gap. It is a big range.

We understand that it is early days but if we do not know what we are getting for those millions of taxpayer dollars from federal and state. That is a concern. Those concerns were not allayed during the hearing. Also, we know that we are but one player in this market. The National Energy Market and national energy policy is crucial for Tasmania. We need to know what the national policy framework is going to look like and where it is heading so that we can play the right cards for Tasmania. We know, particularly under the coalition government, the national energy policy is an absolute dog's breakfast. It is a mess.

We have the blind coal lovers who want to create more coal-fired energy on the mainland. We have a whole range of ideological differences in the Liberal-National Coalition. The differences

and the fissures that are opening up between the different factions of the Liberal-National Coalition are creating so much investment uncertainty. It is bad for business.

We have the National Party which has no clarity around national energy policy. It became very apparent during the Estimates hearing at a meeting that the minister was not present at that Tasmania exercised a vote that the New South Wales Liberal minister had put on the table in the COAG, the national forum for us to try to land some coherent national energy policy. The New South Wales Liberal minister wanted to move a motion about carbon, about how we reduce the carbon footprint in Australia, and a carbon neutral future to 2050. That motion is in Tasmania's interests because we have, as the minister says, what the nation wants. We have a renewable energy resource.

We have to make sure that we have energy security in Tasmania first. All the people who were involved in driving us in to the energy crisis in 2015-16 are virtually still in place in the GBEs and in Government. We know that energy security should be the first and foremost policy initiative of any state-based energy policy but we also know that if we are able to achieve that and if we are able to lift our capacity through pumped hydro, wind, solar and other renewable projects there is a massive opportunity in the National Energy Market. If there is a lack of clarity about what is happening nationally, you will not get the security of investment. You will not get the kind of projects up because the business cases will fall apart because there is no certainty.

Underwriting in coal energy really is bad policy. We do not support that from a Tasmanian perspective. We want renewables. We know that if we are able to make the business case stack up that renewables will explode in terms of the projects in Tasmania, which is good for Tassie, good for the environment and good for the National Energy Market. We need to know that there is going to be a market and our opportunity will not be undermined by the politics of the Liberal-National Coalition.

During the hearing, I raised questions about Tasmanian Senator Eric Abetz and his advocacy for non-renewable energy sources. The early work of the business case has identified that with coal assets being retired interstate in the next 10 to 15 years, if they are replaced by other coal-fired energy assets or other non-renewable assets, it creates a massive question mark about the second connector and the third connector. The business case is reliant on a change of mix interstate. I raised these concerns with the minister. He dismissed it, saying that I was playing games and it had nothing to do with him. It has everything to do with him. At a national COAG level and within your party, you should be advocating and telling those naysayers and those people who want to play politics on energy and climate change, that they are undermining their own state. Senator Abetz should be the senator for Tasmania, not against Tasmania. His advocacy on a whole range of levels is concerning.

I am serious about these things, but I flippantly raised Senator Abetz's dalliance with nuclear energy. It was laughed off and dismissed as being silly. Well, yesterday in a press conference the National Energy minister said that he would not rule out reversing the nuclear energy ban if the business case stacks up. Angus Taylor, the minister who is controlling policy at the national level, has said he would not rule out reversing a nuclear energy ban if a clear business case showed the economics were sound. They are clearly working on nuclear energy as a viable option in the national energy grid. If that investment happens and if there is a federal Liberal Party government which underwrites that investment that is of significant concern to the Tasmanian community. What it does is it that it kills Battery of the Nation. That is not an exaggeration.

In the Estimates hearings we hear \$86 million is being invested and we are not even getting to building stage. We do not even get to financial close stage with those dollars. We are still unclear about what that money gets us to, but if all of a sudden you have a national government underwriting non-renewable energy generation, including coal and nuclear, you can say goodbye to the Battery of the Nation. The business case does not stack up. By the time you hit the market, there will be an increase in supply by non-renewables interstate. They are closer to the energy source. Other projects will get up, and all of a sudden there will be a flood of energy onto the market. Some people inside the L-NP say that is a good thing because energy prices will come down. They have never been able to describe and explain how that happens but that also has a massive impact on the business case of projects that are being planned.

There are a number of private companies working on renewable energy projects in Tasmania on the basis that there will be a level of connectivity and they can sell their energy into the mainland or they can sell their energy into the grid at a good price. If they know that the spot price is being pushed down because non-renewable energy is being provided, their business case, their return on investment and their backer investors all of a sudden get nervous and you lose the investment. The opportunity for Tasmania is lost.

Minister, you dismissed it and said I was playing games and that this is a state matter and I was talking about federal politics. The energy market and the renewable energy opportunity for Tasmania - you keep referring to the mainland wanting what Tasmania's got - they do, but not if your federal Liberal Party completely undermines that and takes our legs out from under us in terms of opportunity. It is a clear and present threat.

Even the early stages of the business cases identify that the business case may well rely on an early retirement of a coal-energy generation in Victoria. When you have the national federal energy minister saying he would not rule out reversing the nuclear energy ban if a clear business case showed the economics were sound - maybe for his politics the economics might be sound - it is terrible for Tasmania. For the minister to dismiss it and say it is game playing is disappointing and we are concerned. We are on a unity ticket in terms of the opportunity for renewable energy for Tasmania if it is done well, but not if you do not do the work with your federal party to ensure we can deliver on the opportunity for us.

Out of the Estimates we saw significant dollars and know it is profiled over a couple of years. It would be good for the minister in his summing up, if he is able to explain the profile of the money and why it is over the two years and what that means for the timing. It is a couple of financial years, but there is an opportunity cost if we do not get in first and do the work to get into the market. There is a whole range of investors looking at projects on the mainland and if they know there is a window of opportunity and we are dragging our feet, they can quickly invest in a project and get it up, there is a market advantage, and of concern to Tasmania. We need to understand, whilst we know it is not a small project and it is not going to take a matter of weeks or months, it does take time, understanding the profile of the money, given it has been committed for the federal government and now in our books, why you would do that over two years? Why would you not front end that money into the project team to ensure we can get the job done? That is of concern.

The principles of the beneficiary pay concept was debated. I asked the minister about how the advocacy was going. He had conversations and we heard from Mr Swain who talked about a number of projects being done. It would be good to hear from the minister upon reflection from last week, if he could outline to us clearly when that was raised at COAG. If the officers supporting

that COAG process are working on a committee process or working on papers for the next COAG, it is important for us to be briefed on this.

One issue we raise every time there is an election or media opportunity is the Government says they are bringing jobs back to Tasmania and Tasmania First. There has been a commitment for a number of years about the Momentum call centre jobs. We are yet to hear any details. It has been raised in GBE Estimates. It has been raised in Estimates last year. There is a real lack of detail: we have heard 70 and, in some cases, up to 100 jobs. That creates a level of concern there are no jobs. Years down the track now and the call centre was supposedly being brought back to Tasmania. Last year we heard they were identifying an appropriate site. There has been no update from the minister. These are jobs that the Government crowed they were bringing back to Tasmania, yet we have seen no evidence and under questioning last week there was no indication.

A crucial issue is the beneficiary pays for Marinus Link. It is important to ensure Tasmanians do not pay over and above what we think they should pay for the Marinus Link connectors. Under the current rules, Tasmanians would have to pay for that. The beneficiary payment principle means the jurisdiction or the state where the benefit is realised should pay, which is clearly Victoria and to a lesser extent, New South Wales and South Australia. That is a crucial point and should be a key part. If you cannot say who is going to pay for it then again, the business case falls down. We do not want Tasmanians bearing the brunt of another infrastructure payment whilst the energy businesses and the Government will see the uplift in the dividend policy. We are also concerned about the dividend policy and the amount of money being dragged out of these GBEs and the infrastructure program for their existing assets, let alone their new assets.

Understanding the beneficiary pay principle is important as is the de-linking of the energy price. That was a key announcement by the Liberal Party at the last state election. To avoid price shock they would de-link from the Victorian pricing mechanism and there has been no detail. Treasury has produced a document but there is no clear, articulated position of the state Government. Was that all spin and bluster for the election and hoping it goes away and you will work out another way to deal with it later on down the track? The Government needs to be clear about what their position is and the minister should report on it.

The dividend policy is very aggressive with over \$100 million being taken out of the businesses, propping up the state budget. We are going into over \$1 billion of net debt, even with the massive grab from those business enterprises.

The savings target of the Government is a little under half a billion dollars that they have been required to identify. We asked the minister about how that would occur. He was not able to answer. That is of deep concern because there is a lot of work, particularly in the energy portfolio space.

The Government is significantly under-cooked in terms of advice and we worry you have effectively contracted out that advice to Hydro, TasNetworks and Aurora. There is a real lack of capacity and it is not reflecting on the individuals in those areas, but there is a need for significant work inside Government to provide good high-quality independent advice from the GBEs. We have that concern.

The minister, in such a small output area, cannot identify where the savings will come from and given the form of this Government, it is usually staff. If you already take the axe to an under-done policy unit, you put the state Government into a very difficult position in terms of energy policy. What that means is, the best interests of Tasmanians, and the Government must play that

broad interest role will not be served. Whilst there are good people working in those GBEs, they are playing a role.

I hope the minister will get up and say he will commit to advocating against nuclear power and the actions of the senator against Tasmania, Senator Abetz.

Time expired.

[3.43 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR - Mr Chairman, I rise to make a brief contribution on Mr Barnett's Estimates, particularly in relation to the issue of Veteran's Affairs.

The history of conflict in Tasmania does not only reach back to the Second World War, the First World War and the Boer War. We need to acknowledge the sacrifice of Tasmanians who went to those wars and the loss felt by the people who loved them back home when they did not come back. All of us share respect for the veterans for the past century's wars and the families they left behind.

The history of conflict in Tasmania actually goes back tens of thousands of years. One of the most significant wars in Tasmania's history was actually fought on this soil and they were known colloquially as the Black Wars. They began in Tasmania some 20 years after the arrival of the first Europeans at Risdon Cove in 1803. They were particularly brutal and destructive wars that led to significant loss of life both amongst the colonists and the Aboriginal people of Tasmania. I had a conversation with Mr Barnett at the table about recognising the first Tasmanian warriors, who are the palawa, the pakana, recognised by Professor Henry Reynolds, who talks about the extraordinary skills of the first Tasmanians in his remarkable book *Fate of a Free People*. He says -

Anzac Day will never be an inclusive national day until the nation also commemorates and mourns black Australians who died defending their homelands from invading Europeans.

Such a development might benefit all Australians by providing an antidote to the national tendency to romanticize warfare, to emphasize dying rather than killing, bravery rather than brutality, sacrifice rather than suffering.

With frontier warfare as part of the story, the dawn landing at Gallipoli could be juxtaposed with the many dawn raids faced by sleeping Aborigines; heroic bayonet and cavalry charges with such incidents as John Batman's murderous assault on an unsuspecting Aboriginal camp in north-east Tasmania and the assassination of two wounded survivors.

Earlier in Professor Reynolds' book there is another reference to the skills held by the Tasmanians when the first Europeans arrived. This is the language George Augustus Robinson used to describe the warriors -

They have a tradition amongst them that white men have usurped their territory, have driven them into the forests, have killed their game and thus robbed them of their chief subsistence, have ravished their wives and daughters, have murdered and butchered their fellow-country-men; and are wont whilst brooding over these complicated ills in the dense part of the forest, to goad each other on to acts of bloodshed and revenge for the injuries done to their ancestors and the persecutions offered to themselves through their white enemies.

What I put to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs is that it would be a long overdue and fitting recognition of the sacrifice that was made by Tasmania's First People after the arrival of the first Europeans for us to have a monument of some sort to the Black Wars, a monument that recognised the incredible skill, the tenacity, the sacrifice and the terrible loss endured by Tasmania's First People after the arrival of the first Europeans and the settlement in 1803. All in this House are deeply grateful to the ANZACs, to those of our sons and daughters who have gone to far shores ostensibly in the defence of freedom. This proposition takes nothing away from that.

This is proposed as a true act of respect and reconciliation and until we, as a state, fully absorb, accept and are prepared to compensate for the terrible history of this island as it was experienced by Aboriginal Tasmanians, reconciliation will continue to be too slow a process. There are all sorts of aspects to reconciliation and justice for Tasmanian Aborigines: the return of lands, negotiations over a treaty, moving to change our national day but this is one step that is legitimate, it is inclusive and it acknowledges the true history of Tasmania's First People.

It is only in relatively recent decades that, as an island community, we have even started to come to terms with that history. I am sure the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs would agree with that because she talked about the removal of the offensive and racist 1876 cut-off date in the Relics Act of 1975 during the Aboriginal Affairs component of Estimates. That 1876 date was the marker of when Truganini died. In our schools, the history told to young people was that Truganini was the last Aboriginal Tasmanian. We know that is not true. Within our statutes was this racist provision which stated that there was no Aboriginal heritage after 1876 because the last of the Aborigines had died in 1876. We know that is not true and, as a parliament, we have corrected that and it was an important thing that we did.

We have a responsibility to be genuine about justice. I am standing in front of the Aboriginal flag of Australia in a Chamber that is far too homogenised and pasteurised. There is not enough diversity in this Chamber and it is a matter of regret. I know Ms Houston is a member of the palawa pakana and I hope Ms Houston would agree that we need to acknowledge, pay respect to, the first Tasmanians and the sacrifice of the warriors - and they were warriors. They were defending their country just as the ANZACs were sent to defend their country, freedom and democracy.

Mr Barnett and I had quite a constructive conversation about this. I knew it was a bit uncomfortable for him at first because, in Veterans' Affairs, it is not usual to talk about the veterans of far-past wars. Arguably, the most lethal war intimately connected to Tasmania was on our land mass and it led to enormous suffering, dispossession and the banishment of Aboriginal people to the Furneaux group of islands where, as we know, they were ravaged by disease, depression and heartbreak. I hope Mr Barnett, the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, can take on board in good faith the proposition the Greens made at the table that it is time we acknowledged the Black Wars and that this is an important step towards reconciliation in the Veterans' Affairs portfolio.

Time expired.

[3.53 p.m.]

Mr TUCKER - Madam Deputy Chair, I was privileged to hold the position of Deputy Chair of Budget Estimates Committee B during the hearings last week. It was enlightening experience for me as a newcomer to the House of Assembly in that it gave me a deeper understanding of the Government's program across various portfolios. Equally, it gave me a better understanding of why our opponents, the Labor Party, cannot put together a credible alternative government budget. Might I add, given the shallowness and the insignificance of Labor's questions last week, it is plain

to see that they still lack a coherent strategy. As for the Greens, they are right at home in the wilderness.

I am proud to be part of the Liberal Party brand. Why? Because we listen and we have a plan to support the Tasmanian economy, its workforce and the primary and secondary producers - people Labor has forgotten. The Hodgman Liberal Government is not a perfect beast. No government ever is, but it has been a plan across several fronts, especially in the Energy, Primary Industries and Water portfolios that I am a part of the primary industry portfolio, being involved with that industry all of my life.

I am excited about the Government's plans to build pumped hydro schemes and a second Bass Strait interconnector with the help of the federal Morrison Government.

We are driving renewable energy developments including pumped hydro and wind farms which will inject billions of dollars into our economy and deliver thousands of jobs over the years to come. We heard during the committee hearings that with these initiatives Tasmania is well on the way to achieving 100 per cent self sufficiency in renewable generation by 2022. The Budget also delivers on our commitment to keeping energy prices down by capping regulated electricity prices at no more than CPI for a further two years. We are committing \$5.5 million to extend the energy rebate for commercial and industrial businesses coming off contract.

Other initiatives supporting farmers and rural communities include: the popular \$750 000 On-farm Energy and Irrigation Audit and Capital Grant Program to help farmers reduce the cost of doing business; and continuing the Farm Energy Advocate services through Aurora Energy to help business customers better manage energy and usage costs.

I also fully comprehend the obvious equation that a strong economy enables a government to continue to build on the growing economy and also fund the many public services Tasmanians depend on.

Quorum formed.

Mr TUCKER - We are also a Government that knows the economic and social value in giving a hand to those in the community who are struggling with the rising costs of living. That is why we also heard about how we have capped power prices and provided about \$45 million in concessions for those struggling with power bills. Tasmania is well on the way to boosting the lowest residential and business power costs in Tasmania. While other states strive and struggle to achieve 50 per cent renewable energy, the Tasmanian energy system is about 95 per cent renewable and easily on track to be 100 per cent renewable by 2022.

When it comes to primary industries we heard about how the Government is delivering on its plan to grow the value of agriculture to \$10 billion by 2050. Tasmania's Sustainable Agri-Food Plan 2018-23 also targets growth in our wild catch and farmed seafood sector too. The Government in cahoots with the Morrison Government is pouring \$170 million into the tranche 3 Pipeline to Prosperity irrigation program. This will enable the first phase of at least five irrigation projects to proceed while Tasmanian Irrigation continues with the planning for other proposed schemes. Like the earlier tranches, this is a boon for farmers. It is a boon for rural communities, producers and employees. As a farmer I understand that.

We also heard how we are providing more than \$30 million to Biosecurity Tasmania this year. We have \$2.6 million per year into greater border protection for our primary producers. This means more biosecurity inspectors doing more inspections of high-risk produce in imported freight and goods as well as a new program to engage tourists in the importance of biosecurity. I also appreciate the investment into more partnerships with industry groups on biosecurity education, awareness and training. Such programs already exist with TFGA and Fruit Growers Tasmania. Our biosecurity system can only get stronger through more farmers and small businesses being well-informed and prepared.

The Budget also confirms the ongoing delivering of initiatives commenced in the 2018-19 Budget, including truck and machinery washdown stations, working with industry to address skills and on-farm hygiene strategies, biosecurity officers on the Bass Strait Islands and additional inspectors, a specialist fruit fly advisor and an industry collaboration manager in Biosecurity Tasmania.

We are also investing in a prosperous red meat industry. We heard how the Government is accepting all 26 findings and recommendations of the Red Meat Working Group, including supporting Tasmania's base processing, ongoing investment in biosecurity and the Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture and industry marketing and development. One million dollars is being invested to drive development in the red meat industry and to deliver the working group's recommendations.

Through the Department of State Growth more than \$800 000 is helping smaller processors increase Tasmanian base capacity. This adds up to more than \$2.4 million across two Budgets when including the \$648 000 Pasture and Livestock Productivity Project, which is working with the TFGA, TIA and farmers to increase production in the supply of red meat. However, on both of these issues, biosecurity and red meat, we saw nothing but cheap political stunts and scaremongering from Labor.

Quorum formed.

Mr TUCKER - People know what we stand for. They have no idea what Labor stands for. At least the Greens are predictable. We know the Greens oppose the salmon industry. We saw this at the committee hearing. The Government is getting on with the job of delivering on a sustainable industry growth plan for the salmon industry, targeting responsible growth and job creation, sound environmental regulation and increased transparency and information to the community. Across the Estimates we had name-calling and general abuse towards ministers, a trend I have noticed since entering parliament. I was always taught as a kid that abuse is a poor substitute for debate. If all you can do hurl insults you have no case to argue. Simply put, when they start being abusive you know they have run out of ideas and you have won.

Time expired.

[4.03 p.m.]

Dr BROAD - Madam Deputy Chair, I rise this afternoon to discuss the Estimates committee, especially in respect of primary industries.

I spent a lot of time talking about issues such as the meat industry, irrigation and so on. First of all, I would like to talk about the meat industry. We heard the member who has resumed his seat, talk about the meat industry and in particular the Government's response to the Meat Industry

Working Group. I asked a series of questions of the minister about this report of the Meat Industry Working Group but also Meridian Agriculture's report into the meat industry that was commissioned by the working group and the Government's response.

Going through some of the findings, the Government is not taking into account some of the risks that the industry faces and is not addressing them. One thing I find disappointing about some of the minister's responses is simply in asking legitimate questions about what the Government is doing, or what the Government is considering, there were calls for, 'No, you just need to back it in. You need to support this and if you don't you are being obstructionist and you do not support the industry'. That could not be further from the truth. It is our job in opposition to the Government to call to account, to ask questions and to get answers.

We can put things on the record, we can have the Government consider things they have not potentially considered and that is what I will go through now with this Meat Industry Report.

One of the issues I raised about the Meridian Agriculture Report, which a lot of the Meat Industry working groups findings hang off, is some of the key assumptions they made in writing their report. I quote from the key assumption section on page 10 of the report -

... Tasmanian consumers are similar to those from the whole of Australia demographic which has been extensively studied ...

It goes on to say -

... price is ultimately the dominant consideration in the decision to purchase red meat.

The lowest cost processor is able to deliver the lowest cost price to the consumer.

This assumption is pretty much saying the consumers in Tasmania do not discriminate between where the product comes from, its branding in other words, and the industry should be headed towards lowest cost processing, which is always going to be the mainland Australia. We cannot have a facility as big as JBS Swift's facility at Brooklyn which they run 24/7. They employ about 4000 people and receive stock from all over the country. They are always going to do us over on scale. What this key assumption does not consider is the power of the Tasmanian brand. I argue for the Tasmanian brand to be front and centre. The meat has to be processed in Tasmania. What we have seen is there have been a series of closures in the meat industry and more stock being exported to the mainland to be processed. How can consumers have confidence in Tasmanian product that has been processed in Victoria? Where is the traceability and the brand assurance? These are the key questions I was asking and simply responded to as, 'You should back the industry, you should back the report'.

Another issue is with pig processing. With the closure of JBS's facility at Devonport, the pig industry was in dire straits and the Government stepped up to the plate and put in an interim solution, which is obviously welcome. The problem is, that facility is going to see a 25 per cent reduction in its kill from September onwards and one of the state's biggest producers is pulling out. He has telegraphed that, is selling all his pigs, and constitutes 25 per cent of the pigs going through Devonport. Is the Devonport facility the Government is supporting and TQM currently running, going to be viable with a 25 per cent reduction in the pig kill? Instead, 'No, you should back the report and back the industry'.

The biggest pork producer in the state is Scottsdale Pork. It is more than likely they will get their own facility up and going. They are already working on a boning room, et cetera, but what about the rest of the industry? We need answers. The pig industry is in dire straits and at significant risk, especially smaller artisan producers like Mt Gnomon. Where would they get their pigs killed?

We have to talk about the Quoiba Sale Yard and Abattoir, which is a key part of the whole set up.

One of the other findings says -

While there is sufficient processing capacity in the national context, a large volume of sheep and lambs leave Tasmania to be processed off-island. The return on capital required to construct a new green field sheep processing plant to annually process in the order of 700 000 units would need close examination from an economic perspective.

I do not see any action on 700 000 sheep currently being exported since Devonport shut and since JBS Longford facility shut their lamb line. We do not see any work towards this. They are hoping TQM manages to receive funding from the federal government. That will not be 700 000 sheep. It will be significantly less. We are still going to see a lot of lambs sent to the mainland together with the jobs that go with it. That is the whole issue. The potential to brand Tasmanian lamb goes across the Strait with it.

In section 6, 6.2 beef processing in Tasmania. Prominence branding has been successful in the Tasmanian beef sector and several companies including Tasmanian Feedlot Pty Ltd rely heavily on local Tasmanian processing -

... any significant reduction of the current supply of beef processing capacity in Tasmania would pose problems for these companies which, if not resolved, would have wider and probably adverse effects on the Tasmanian beef industry.

I do not hear anything about this significant risk of closure of Longford. We do not want to see it happen. Nobody would want to see that happen but we have to have some risk management in place and I do not see any in the Government's response to the meat industry working group.

We could see exactly the same situation we have seen in lambs. Why do I say that the Longford facility is at risk of shutting? You have to look at the history. Swift has shut King Island. They have shut the lamb line at Longford and they have shut Devonport. This has happened over successive years. There is the risk of Longford being shut because the behaviour is that they have shut everything apart from the beef line in Longford. Meridian Agriculture's report says that is a significant risk.

I will read something that was also addressed in the report in appendix 11, page 77. These are the thoughts of a former colleague of mine, Richard Rawnsley. The Deputy Chairman also knows him very well. He says -

I do feel that the growing dependence on off-island processing creates a risk to the Tasmanian brand ... There is also the risk of any further closure of processing capacity in Tasmania. How will the state respond and is it able to? The impact

of processing closure on employment and rural communities are of understandable concern.

He goes on to say -

Are we becoming too reliant on the consolidation of product and accepting the commodity production and price model? Think we need to create an enabling environment that leverages Tasmania's brand. Much effort goes into creating a high-value-quality product at the farm gate. We should aim to enhance this value and quality through the supply chain and share in the value for the betterment of Tasmania.

That sums up a lot of things. The reliance; we need to have a Tasmanian brand and it needs to be front and centre. If our animals are not processed in Tasmania, we can have no guarantee that our Tasmanian brand will have any value. I do not see these risks being mitigated. This report was supposed to be talking about risks and what we are going to be doing in response to those risks. The risk of reduced production and reduced processing capacity in Tasmania is there for all to see.

The risks are there for all to see, just like the risks of Devonport closing were there to see and the Government thought they had solved the problem by putting in place four years of bridging funding for Swift at Devonport but it only lasted two years. The industry came to Government two years ago and said that the industry was at risk, yet the Government tried to put a patch on it by putting funding in place for four years and it fell over after two. There are significant risks in the meat industry that will have a massive impact on rural and regional Tasmania and these are not being addressed.

Many other issues are not being addressed, such as trade waste. In the letter from TasWater, the Chair, Steven Gumley, said -

As we have seen recently, the situation for meat processing trade waste was exacerbated when JBS Australia recently closed its Devonport abattoir. This increased demand on other smaller local abattoirs and is driving up the volume of trade waste they produce.

How did the Government respond? The Government undertook to work with the Australian Government to seek support. It is not good enough. The horse has already bolted.

Time expired.

[4.13 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF - Mr Deputy Chairman, I attended part of the Estimates Committee B for the portfolios of Mr Barnett. I will comment in relation to his responsibilities under Primary Industries and Water. Ms O'Connor sat in for the Energy portfolio.

I would also like to respond to comments made by Mr O'Byrne recently, and in response to the discussions in Estimates about Project Marinus and the Battery of the Nation. Mr O'Byrne gave a long discourse about the failures of the federal Liberal Party as well as at state level but particularly at federal level; comfortably distant. He called them utterly conflicted in their Energy policy and made a very good point that the business case for a Battery of the Nation, Project Marinus-type second interconnector to enable pumped hydro fundamentally relies, as we have seen in the business

case developed for that project, on immediately shutting down coal-fired power stations across Australia but especially in Victoria. That means starting that process so that they would be shut down in the next five years. That is what is required in order to even consider the possibility of a viable business case for a second interconnector, such as is proposed for the Project Marinus.

Mr O'Byrne is quite right in pointing out that the federal Liberals are totally conflicted on this. The Prime Minister has made no indication that he has the guts or is prepared to show the leadership this country desperately needs on the climate emergency. We still do not know if he can control the rogue elements in his party who are still determined to push for coal over renewable energy. Will he continue to hold up the policies our country desperately needs to immediately cut down our massive emissions, heading toward what the United Nations has told us we need to do by 2030 - a huge reduction of business as usual emissions in Australia? Scott Morrison has shown no indication of taking that step. Quite the opposite; he is open for business as usual in all measures of the area of coal investment. But so is the Labor Party. The Labor Party is utterly conflicted, as much as the Liberal Party. The head of Adani Australia on 16 April, around the federal election, said that he was confident a Shorten government would not be a risk to the Adani mine going ahead.

Why would we say that? He knows that the Labor Party sat on the fence the whole way through the campaign and continues to sit on the fence because they are addicted to the easy short-term jobs provided by simply approving another coal mine. They are not prepared to do the work. They are not prepared to stand up to coal for coal workers and give them a just transition out of coal. Whether we like it or not, the rest of the world will not continue to carve a special little niche in coal exports. Just today, the Adani coal mine looks as though it has technically advanced itself to the level of being able to start and have ticked off the corrupted processes for approvals. Those approvals, at every step of the way, put the local environmental issues to the side; the issues for Queensland in water supply, and issues for the planet in the emissions from that mine. All those issues have been put to the side in the corrupted processes surrounding the approval of the Adani mine and it is technically set to go ahead.

The people of Australia will rise up against this mine, thanks to Bob Brown and the Stop Adani Convoy that left Tasmania and gathered thousands of people. Thousands of people protested against this toxic mine in the week before the election and these people will be back. We will be back: the Greens, environmentalists and people who understand that we have to close that mine and never open that mine again.

Labor needs to get on board and, instead of doing what the Queensland Premier did in April, which was to approve the Olive Downs mine in the Bowen Basin that will emit from 4.5 million tonnes of carbon, as soon as it gets up and running, to 15 million tonnes. The Labor Party is in lock step on this; a pox on both your houses. You both have to get your federal colleagues in order if we are to ever have the prospect of making the most of renewable energy on this island. We need a genuine business case that is not going to suck billions of dollars out of Tasmania and is going to come from the federal government. It has to be based on coal mines shutting down, so the business can flow to Tasmania. That is what we need.

I want to say, Mr Chairman, how incredibly disappointing it was to hear the minister's woeful abjectly inadequate response to the serious concerns of *Centrostephanus* on the east coast of Tasmania. It was pathetic to hear all the responses to this terrible decimation of east coast rocky reefs where within the next two years 32 per cent of the entire east coast reef will be lost according to the predictions of the IMAS scientists. Fifty per cent, they say, has gone already, including around your neck of the woods up near St. Helens. This is devastating on an ecosystem level, for our rock

lobster industry, abalone industry and everything. It supports the life of the east coast. The response of this Government is nothing. That is the thing. It is a rock lobster translocation program. I repeatedly asked the minister where was the evidence that this is going to have any effect on reducing sea urchin barons on the east coast. He could not point me to it. Instead, I finally received a response in a roundabout way from Ms O'Byrne. A department attendee said -

We have asked IMAS to do some additional work to conduct an evaluation and provide us with some information as to the efficacy of the current translocation program toward its current aim. The translocation program is not aimed at a *centrostephanus* control. It is aimed at increasing the stocks on the east coast.

Fortunately, Mr Deputy Chairman, the officer provided factual information about the truth. It will do nothing to manage the *Centrostephanus* problem. It is shameful such a major ecological issue is getting zero effective response from this Government.

I also wanted to point out that it is fascinating and instructive that the abalone industry gets taxed fees that are six times the amount exacted upon the salmon farming industry in Tasmania. What a joke. The damage the fish farm industry does in Tasmania, the enormous profits it reaps relative to the profits of the abalone industry and yet the abalone industry pays six times the amount in licence fees than the salmon farm industry does. That just tells you a whole lot about the way marine farming approvals are conducted in Tasmania, and the power of the salmon farming industry to get what they want, when they want it out of both the Liberal and Labor parties in Tasmania.

Time expired.

[4.23 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER - Mr Deputy Chair, I rise to make a contribution to Estimates Committee B in the area of Veterans Affairs. Unlike my other responses to Estimates Committees, I found the Estimates Committee and the responses provided by Mr Barnett to be informative, articulate and fair. He was well informed of his portfolio, really not reliant at all on the department to provide him with information and had the ability to relate statistics, figures and percentages - and correct percentages. We actually quite enjoyed our Estimates hearing.

I was pleased to hear the information provided by the minister on the Teddy Sheean Memorial Grants Program and how important that memorial grant has been to the RSL and communities, especially in Lyons where it received grant funding. With the indulgence of the House I might read out - minister, I was saying I found our Estimates Committee to be really informative and you were over your portfolio areas. It was very good and we enjoyed it.

The minister provided information on Teddy Sheean grants. I am going to talk about the grants awarded to the RSLs in Lyons, which is my electorate. In Round 1 we had St Helens and St Marys RSL replacing the copier and security system and the amount was \$1698; and the Ross RSL sub-branch, the Ross World War 2 memorial stone upgrade of \$277.

In round 2 for this 2018-19 financial year, Bicheno Bowls and RSL sub-branch, internal improvements to existing clubhouse of \$8000. I believe there will be an opening soon of the facility, which we will be looking forward to. The community is really looking forward to this. They were so pleased to have some investment within their RSL.

The Swansea RSL sub-branch; some urgent electrical upgrades of \$4400. The Vietnam Veterans Association; purchase and laying of carpet \$2100. Also, Vietnam Veterans Association floor insulation; \$1854. There is quite a significant number of Vietnam veterans who reside in Lyons. They all keep in contact and I have a lot to do with the Vietnam Veterans Motorcycle Club, based in Bridgewater just across the road from the Derwent Tavern. It is a good facility and provides fantastic support for each other.

Also, the Westbury RSL sub-branch; replacement of the function room flooring of \$9000. There were some other ones which were from Wynyard and Zeehan, but overall, I thank the minister for excelling in his knowledge of the portfolio area and providing answers to the questions we asked.

[4.27 p.m.]

Ms DOW - Mr Deputy Chairman, I rise to speak this afternoon on the Estimates Committee held on Veterans Affairs. I wish to acknowledge on the record the day on which we met was the 75th anniversary of the D-Day landings in 1944. It is important to acknowledge that in my contribution this afternoon.

I enjoy the Veterans Affairs shadow portfolio, learning more about it and getting to know the communities and all of the local RSL clubs around the different regions of Tasmania. You do not realise until you walk through the doors of an RSL, the number of hours that go into volunteering to keep those organisations going in the community, and the valuable service, hospitality, friendship and all of those great things RSL clubs do not only for the veterans within our communities, but also our broader community. I thank our local RSLs for the work they do.

During the Estimates we heard predominantly that Veterans Affairs is a federal issue, but it is pleasing to note that in Tasmania there are a number of initiatives the Government is undertaking aimed at supporting our veterans, and the ongoing viability of our RSL clubs around the state.

There has been a reference group established by the minister, a great initiative and I look forward to learning more about that. I will go through in order some of the questions we asked. One was around the changes in funding across the forward Estimates and it was explained well by the minister and departmental staff. I understand those changes are predominantly reflected in changes to specific grants or pools of funding provided for a specific purpose over the Budget.

One of the programs I am really interested in is the Active Recreation Program, aimed at providing employment opportunities, skills and training and ultimately in adventure recreation and eco-tourism. That is a really solid initiative. I was disappointed to hear it has not developed much over the last 12 months.

I asked about how many people had benefited from that program and gained skills and training and perhaps even gained employment in recreation and eco-tourism, and that was not able to be provided. My understanding is there is commitment given by the Government to carry that funding over into subsequent years which is good. I look forward to next year learning more about the people who have benefited from that project.

The other thing that was important to note during our discussion was the THA skills program that was funded post the last state election. One of the components with this was around skills and training in hospitality for staff at our RSLs, and additional support for them around supporting their volunteers and for those who have paid employees as well. To date the minister has not been able

to provide me with a good update around that because, I understand, it is being administered through State Growth.

Mr Barnett - We have been able to answer you today on notice. I signed it off a few hours ago.

Ms DOW - I look forward to reading it. It has the potential to be a good program from the point of view of capacity building within local RSLs.

I wanted to touch on the Teddy Sheean Grants Program. A little while ago I was in the Rosebery RSL and they were asking me about that program. They were looking to put in an application. I do not know whether they followed through and did that. They were not on the list of recipients. The thing that struck me about that conversation was they were so happy about the grants program and the fact that it would offer them an opportunity to do an upgrade at the club. There is real value and a great sense of appreciation around that grants program. I wanted to feed that back to you.

I note those within my electorate who had benefited from that program. I was fortunate enough on Remembrance Day last year to attend the Circular Head service and the unveiling of the centenary poppy sculpture they had developed for the community. It is a beautiful piece of public art and takes pride of place at their Anzac Park.

I acknowledge the Burnie RSL refurbishment, \$10 000 to the kitchen, which I know they solidly appreciate. It has made a difference to their ability to serve meals and furnish funds from that as well.

The Waratah/Wynyard Council received some funding for the cenotaph precinct and the relocation of the Preolenna war memorial plaque. Just the other weekend Wynyard had the unveiling of the beautiful mosaic murals on the walls of the RSL. Through this grant program they were able to purchase a dishwasher. I know that the Zeehan RSL when I was there recently was appreciative of their refrigeration equipment that they had received through the grant program. It is a good grassroots funding program for local RSL clubs.

I spoke before about employment for veterans. We know there are significant issues around unemployment with veterans, mental health issues and the ongoing need for greater support in the community and homelessness, which has been a feature of discussion over many weeks now in the parliament. I asked the minister were there any specific initiatives within Tasmania. There may have been more details provided with the information that has been provided through questions on notice. I will have to look at that.

It is important that, despite it being predominately a federal responsibility, that we do take the time to think how we better support, through existing programs within this state, employment for veterans, transitioning them back into the workforce, better support around mental health services and, of course, homelessness support services as well for those who find themselves living on the streets or in shelters or the like.

I asked a question about the Time Out Workshop, which was also a specially funded project out of the last state election. The minister informed us that a coordinator was being employed there through the funding, which is positive. They have an association with the local Men's Shed.

There was some discussion about Legacy during the Estimates committee, which is also an important peak body and organisation in our community that do amazing work.

In relation to current employment programs I asked whether any consideration had been given to, or whether any veterans had benefited from, the partnership between TasCOSS and the TCCI through the Jobs Action Package. That information may be in the note provided from the minister.

I thank the minister for providing his information on the day. I always find it of great interest and I enjoy getting out and about in our communities, meeting with veterans and learning more about what services are provided. I look forward to Estimates next year.

[4.36 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT - Mr Deputy Chair, I thank colleagues for their observations, reflections and contributions to the budget Estimates committee hearings. In my responsibilities in this parliament and on behalf of the Hodgman Liberal Government, I treat this matter very seriously. It is a great honour to fulfil the role as minister and a real pleasure to advocate a vision for Tasmania and put in place policies that will achieve that vision.

They are critical areas for the economy in terms of energy, primary industry, water and Veteran's Affairs and what we are about is growing our economy, delivering more jobs, investing for growth and being in a position where we can reinvest in those essential services, whether they be health, education or, in particular, infrastructure.

The Budget is very much about maintaining the momentum and investing for growth, but we also want to protect the Tasmanian way of life, which is important. This morning I met with representatives of the Tasmanian Trail. They are into the Tasmanian way of life, which is something we want to support. Wherever possible, I will do that and try to balance that with the rights of farmers and others to enjoy their lifestyles as well. It is a balancing act.

The Budget is about delivering a strong economy. It is terrific that in the last week we have seen results confirming we are the strongest growing economy in Australia. We heard that from the Treasurer, and it did not happen by chance. It is not some fluke. It is clearly because we have had five years of solid management of our economy and budget, and we have been able to deliver and maintain that momentum. Yes, we are investing for growth, a huge investment in that regard, and the plan is working. We have seen 13 000 extra jobs delivered, which is terrific for the 13 000 Tasmanians with those new jobs and their families. We have plans for 10 000 new jobs in the years ahead.

Additionally, I want to indicate we have record funding for infrastructure and for health and education. We could not do that without a strong economy. Something I learned during the nearly nine and a half years I spent as a senator during the period of the Howard government is that you can reinvest funds in essential services such as new schools, hospitals, roads and bridges, and extra teachers, nurses, doctors, police officers and the like. In terms of agriculture it means irrigation, infrastructure dams and the like, which is intergenerational investment. This will increase our productivity and deliver for Tasmanians in the years ahead, for families well into the future, the next generation and the one after that.

Likewise in our energy infrastructure we are looking at long-term plans that will deliver for the next generation and the one after that. We heard about hydro industrialisation during the debate

this afternoon. I am proud of the former premiers and ministers for energy in this place who saw the vision and implemented it through hydro, and all those who supported that infrastructure.

I acknowledge Eric Reece and Robin Gray, and at times I feel, as the Minister for Energy, that I am standing on their shoulders, with the vision we are putting in place with our plans to make Tasmania the renewable energy powerhouse of Australia and the Battery of the Nation. It is very exciting and I will address some of those matters further.

Of course, we have received endorsement for our Budget. In one sense the Opposition in a funny backhanded way has endorsed the Budget - of course they asked questions and made some complaints - by not putting forward an alternative budget, and without a response from the Leader of the Opposition. I credit the Greens for putting up their alternative budget. I have said this on the record - credit to the Greens for delivering an alternative budget. Although I disagree with much of it, at least they delivered it. In summary, yes, it is disappointing to have no plans and no policies from the Labor Opposition. After four weeks in parliament and on the way to toward the backend of the parliamentary debate, there is still no alternative budget from Labor.

I put on record my sincere thanks to my ministerial staff for the support they provided to me. They have been efficient and relentless in their efforts, going beyond the call time and again, but with great integrity, both at a ministerial level and an electorate level. Likewise to the departments and their agency heads, in particular the Secretary of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, Dr John Whittington; the Department of State Growth energy secretary Kim Evans; and the Secretary of the Department of Communities, Ginna Webster. I thank you and your teams; I could not have done it without you. It is really appreciated.

I would now like to reflect on Estimates and respond to some of the queries and comments that were made. Then I will outline a little further some of the benefits of budget initiatives that will benefit Tasmania, not just during this 12 months or in the coming few years, but for the decades ahead. Many Opposition members during the Budget Estimates were seeking to uncover a sort of 'gotcha' moment when they asked their question. I can perhaps understand if individual members on the other side were trying to star in their roles and to be touted as a future leader -

Mr O'Byrne - Oh come on, don't be like that. That is not very fair. You need to leave Mr Bacon alone.

Mr BARNETT - I am not sure about that, but here we have an interjection from the member for Franklin, David O'Byrne. Isn't it interesting he interjected right at that very moment? I laid the bait, he took it hook, line and sinker, and here he is interjecting.

There was a difference in their serious interrogation of Government activity. Of course we should be held to account, but they were seeking tabloid sensationalism or had some shallow design for nothing more than an easy headline or a 24-hour news cycle hit. That is what they were after. Having nine and a half years in the Senate, my approach to Estimates is to try to be as cooperative, positive and helpful as possible because it is important to get information out there. It is part of due process to stand accountable, which is my approach.

Let me address some of the key issues. I should highlight that Dr Shane Broad asked some specific questions about the detector dogs, Tasmania's biosecurity system, and the importance of Tasmania being pest- and disease-free. We talked about the fruit fly incursion but, disappointingly he tried to politicise the role of our detector dogs. We have doubled the number of detector dogs

but there was some accusation that the Government is under-utilising the dogs on the TT-Line. For goodness sake, the experts from Biosecurity Tasmania had just explained that Biosecurity Tasmania's systems were evidence-based to manage risk. We know from Dr Broad's vast experience, and his resume, of the importance of evidence being science-based. He demonstrated that last night in the adjournment debate by reminding us of his interest in evidence and research. It was made clear during Estimates that we have doubled the number of detector dogs, and yes, they are focused on the flights into Launceston and Hobart airports as well as attending regional airports, ports and mail centres. But that has to be flexible, strategic and based on evidence and science. The dogs typically do not meet TT-Line *Spirit* ships at Devonport. The risk is managed offshore after a memorandum of understanding has introduced preventative biosecurity management strategy. I announced in parliament yesterday that we have stopped some 20 tonnes of biosecurity risk material annually before it reached Tasmania, so that is good news.

Efforts at cheap politics with biosecurity is not recommended. I did say to the member during Estimates that it is not appropriate; I thought it was irresponsible. What we have to do is stand together in support of Tasmania for our economy, for our agriculture, for tourism and for the Tasmanian brand. We have received endorsement from the TFGA and from Fruitgrowers Tasmania for our initiatives around biosecurity to up the ante. That third party support is well appreciated.

Likewise, during Estimates it was clear from Dr Woodruff, there was an attack on the salmon industry for failing in her words 'to listen to Tasmanians and failing to protect the environment'.

Dr Woodruff - It was an attack on you.

Mr BARNETT - We have to agree to disagree but that is not unusual.

I understand the concerns by some Tasmanians about salmon farming in our waterways but we have a sustainable industry growth plan. In accordance with our commitment prior to the election we have a 12-month review of the plan that we released. Yes, what we are about is continuing improvement. We want to seek best practice; that is the aim. That is our ambition and that is where we are headed. That is why in the last 12 months I have increased the levy on the salmon companies to allow the Government to increase monitoring and compliance in the industry and to achieve world's best practice.

That is what we are on about. I am somewhat intrigued by the Greens zealous critique of our industry that provides thousands of jobs with a turnover of more than \$800 million a year. It is the biggest part of our primary industry sector. I am proud of the salmon industry. It has a worldwide reputation. It is part of the Tasmanian brand and we will continue to do what we can to support it.

We have heard a little bit about red meat from Dr Shane Broad. In fact it took a couple of hours at Budget Estimates last week but it is a \$400 million part of our primary industry sector. It is a vital contributor to farm production and it is a key part of our plan to grow agriculture to \$10 billion farmgate value by 2050. We are on track with a 9 per cent increase over the last 12 months, just announced last week, which is terrific. Red meat is a very important part of that.

Dr Broad was up to quite a bit of political mischief over meat processing and raised a few questions in particular about the pig industry. Alan Broomby, key stakeholder in the pig industry, is on the meat industry working group. I made that clear during Budget Estimates and I will make it clear again today. Scottsdale Pork was referred to by Dr Broad during his observations a few moments ago. Scottsdale Pork was consulted by the meat industry working group and interviewed

as well. I think Meridian talked to them too. The bottom line is, the report was taken into account. The working group delivered findings, recommendations. The Government responded to that. We accepted all the findings and all the recommendations. I made that clear to Dr Broad on the day. It is on the public record; it has been released. We backed the group report and recommendation 100 per cent. We are backing in the industry. We are working shoulder to shoulder with the meat industry. Mr Chair, you would know how important it is with your agricultural and farming background.

There were questions about lambs and value adding. I have always said of this Government that we are into value adding. We support downstream processing wherever possible. We welcome the federal government investment of \$8 million at TQM at Cressy. I went to the lamb of Tasmania brand launch at TQM at Cressy a couple of weeks ago. Of course, we support the Tasmanian brand wherever possible. Agriculture is a key part of the Tasmania brand. We are proud of it, we are building it, we are growing it, and we are adding to it and creating jobs, wealth and opportunity for families in rural and regional Tasmania. It is delivering but we have much more to do and we now have a strategic plan we can work to.

We have reports and findings that we are working to. I say thank you again to the members of the Meat Industry Working Group. I say thank you to the TFGA for their support. What did they say about the Meat Industry Working Group and the Government's response? They say -

The Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association today welcomed the announcement ... that the Government will accept all 26 findings and recommendations of the Red Meat Working Group, including supporting Tasmanian based processing and ongoing investment in biosecurity and industry marketing and development. This is another positive step for the Red Meat industry in Tasmania and the acceptance of the working group's recommendations and commitment of the ministers and the broader Government is to be commended.

That is positive. That is looking forward. This is terrific. I am thankful for that from a key stakeholder in the agricultural sector. I say to Dr Broad, read third party support and endorsement. Get some feedback. This is the peak body from the agricultural sector and come on board, Dr Broad.

Let us now address energy. I will be able to respond to some of David O'Byrne's observations and reflections with respect to energy. First of all, I thank him for his observations in the early part of his contribution. As you say, it was not directly a pat on the back but it was one but then you raised a whole lot of concerns and questions, which is fair enough. That is what parliament is all about.

In terms of energy, you have asked questions about the interconnector - lack of clarity around that from your point of view, National Energy Market, and national energy policy. Let us just address some of those in particular. Right up front, there was a fair bit of politicking and nit-picking for the sake of criticism by the member to try to get a headline and manufacture a point of view and a point of difference. It was a little like *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*. I think you were caught in a time warp for at least for a while, a little step to the right, step to the left, caught in a time warp. What we are on about is plans for the future, not just for the next few years, but into the next decade and the generations to come. As I have indicated, like hydro industrialisation and the benefits to us now.

Ms O'Connor - What do you think atmospheric CO₂ levels will be like in a generation's time?

Mr BARNETT - I am glad you mentioned that through interjection. The Tassie First Energy Policy is delivering 100 per cent; fully self-sufficient, fully renewable by 2022. You should be applauding that and saying congratulations, well done you, the Hodgman Liberal Government's plans are delivering. We are on track to achieve that target.

We are trying hard to keep the downward pressure on electricity prices, ensuring energy security is locked in, ensuring opportunities for thousands of jobs in the years ahead. With respect to the questions about who is paying and what the beneficiary pays, let us see what Angus Taylor, the federal minister said. Mr Taylor said -

Projects like this aren't nice to have. They are necessary to have. We must have them. We stand ready to finance them.

That is the federal Minister for Energy regarding Marinus Link. The Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, and I say how good is Scomco?

Members interjecting.

Mr BARNETT - You do not like to hear that. You were handing out how to vote cards for higher taxes and the Labor brand did not go too well; a little over one third of the vote.

The Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, said -

We have got to get this second interconnector built. Tasmania will be charging up the rest of the nation and the one making the contribution to Australia. It means those that are benefiting will carry the financial cost.

There is the answer to the member's question. It talks about beneficiary pays. I made it very clear during Estimates that \$86 million is earmarked for the Marinus Link and Battery of the Nation plans for pumped hydro. Let us break that down. That is \$56 million for the next phase of the design and approval process for Marinus Link.

Time expired.

Estimates of the Minister for Primary Industries and Water, Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Minister for Energy agreed to.

Bills read the third time.

FIRST HOME OWNER GRANT AMENDMENT BILL 2019 (No. 24)

Second Reading

[4.58 p.m.]

Mr GUTWEIN (Bass - Treasurer - 2R) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the bill be now read the second time.

The Government is a strong supporter of Tasmania's building and construction industry and wants more Tasmanians to be in a position to own their own home. The First Home Owner Grant is one of several government policies that support this objective, alongside the duty concessions for first home buyers of established properties and pensioners who downsize, the Government's land tax exemptions, the Foreign Investor Duty Surcharge, and our significant investment into enabling infrastructure such as roads and transport links and increased investment into affordable housing. These policies form part of the Government's multi-pronged approach to address housing affordability in Tasmania.

The Government will extend the \$20 000 First Home Owner Grant for a further twelve months. Without the extension, the grant amount of \$20 000 would fall to \$10 000 on 1 July 2019. This bill therefore amends the First Home Owner Grant Act 2000 to extend the grant of \$20 000 for eligible first home buyers who enter an eligible transaction for the purchase of a newly constructed home or the construction of a new home from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 inclusive. The extension to the \$20 000 First Home Owner Grant will mean that Tasmania continues to have one of the most competitive home owner grants offered by any jurisdiction in Australia. This initiative will give Tasmanians a greater opportunity to build and own their own home and will add to housing supply, which will ease housing affordability pressures. This will have positive flow-on effects for Tasmania's building and construction industry, creating more work and more jobs.

Madam Speaker, I commend this bill to the House.

[4.59 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Madam Speaker, Labor supports the extension of the First Home Owner Grant until 30 June 2020. We understand that the First Home Owner Grant Amendment Bill is expected to support ongoing demand for newly constructed homes by first home buyers.

I will ask the Treasurer a few questions in seeking clarity. There has been a change in phraseology of the name of the grant. You are calling it the First Home Owner Grant. Previously, it was called the First Home Builder Boost, both of \$20 000. Why was the name changed? Does the scheme have the same governance? Are the terms of the conditions of the scheme unchanged from the originally named grant? What were the costs associated with the change to that name?

There is a significant reduction in the forward Estimates of nearly \$4 million. Does the Government not see the need to continue this grant into the future? Do you expect demand for the grant may reduce? Will there be a decline in the building and construction industry in future? I am keen to see evidence of the uptake of the scheme. How many people are using this scheme? How many have in the past, and what are your expectations of people taking up the scheme in future?

We are all for encouraging home ownership and creating pathways for Tasmanians to build their first homes and that is really positive. This needs to be part of a combination of many different strategies to create more options for affordable housing in Tasmania. The average time for people to save a deposit who are buying into the market or building their houses for the first time in Australia used to be five years. Now we are looking at a 10-year average for people to save the deposit, regardless of the grant. This is a long time and has doubled. We want to make sure we are not only looking after a certain echelon in our community; people who can afford their own houses. There are many people for which this will never be a dream or reality but we certainly support having the grant as long as there is a range of strategies and options available to combat problems we have with affordable housing in our state. Do you have any data to suggest whether the scheme has made any impact on making housing more affordable in our state?

We support the building of new properties to assist the building and construction industry in the light of creating employment opportunities and the creation of apprenticeships. It is important to make sure that young people in our community have apprenticeship options. That is all we need to seek information on.

I would like to know, if the Government is so committed to building affordable properties, why have you not built more to date? I would like to discuss that. The member for Clark, Ms O'Connor, Mr Tucker, a member for Lyons and I have recently been appointed to the committee on Housing Affordability in Tasmania. We will be meeting with a lot of different people from the industry to understand the problem with affordable housing and finding potential solutions. If this is part of that, that is a positive. We support the bill.

[5.04 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to make a contribution on what will be the last legislation debated before the winter break. It is particularly apt that we are debating a housing affordability bill in a week that has been dominated by questions of the Government and our society's response to housing and homelessness. I can indicate from the outset, as we did last year, we will support the extension to the First Home Owner Grant. It will make a difference to the lives of some homebuyers.

I would argue that in many ways this is window dressing that does not get to the substance of housing affordability and supply issues.

I want to tell a short story about a gentleman I met at Salamanca today. I will give him the name 'Peter'. Peter was sitting down at Salamanca in a high-vis vest and he had beside him a plastic bucket with coins in it. I had gone into the newsagent and I thought, well, I am going to take some money out in order to give this gentleman some money, but I could not because my card was on my phone. I felt compelled to talk to the man and apologise to him for not giving him money but to find out a bit about his story.

Peter, who is probably around 40 years old - although it is hard to tell the exact age sometimes when people have really hard lives and they are bitten by poverty - was an engaging person but clearly flattened by the state of his world. He said he had been homeless for six weeks. He lived out past the northern suburbs and he was reduced to asking for money because he receives a Newstart payment which leaves people well below the poverty line. It is a demoralisingly mean sum of money we are giving to people and expecting them to survive. I am absolutely certain that part of the reason we are seeing an increase in homelessness, housing insecurity and begging is because Newstart has not been lifted for 30 years, it has not kept up with the rate of inflation, and it is not enough money for any person to live on.

The reason I tell this story is because the legislation we are debating today is targeted at those first home buyers who have, as Ms Butler said, spent a long time saving up their deposit, but I do not think someone like Peter is ever going to own his own home. I asked him where he is going to sleep tonight and he did not know. I asked him if he had been to put his name on the Housing Connect list and he said that he did not think it worth it because he could not pay the rent, any rent. I said that Housing Tasmania is there for people who are living at the margins and you can get Commonwealth rent assistance. There are options here. He was in that state; he had given up.

We need to be mindful of these people when we debate this sort of legislation because at the end of a three-minute walk, and a slow walk at that, from the front door of this building, there is a

person who is reduced to begging, who does not know where he is sleeping tonight, and whose only warmth is a second coat he has with him. I have suggested that Peter come here and see me but I do not know if he will because I was standing there, talking to him in a nice suit and I think he found the idea of coming to this building intimidating.

When we next have an opportunity to talk about housing in this place, let us keep Peter at the front of our minds and let us make sure we deal with that statute that criminalises begging, which is section 8 of the Police Offences Act, that could see someone like Peter slapped with a \$900 fine or be put in jail for six months. The First Home Owner Grant Amendment Bill 2019 is so far from Peter's world, so far it is sad, and we have to make sure the law is looking after the impoverished.

I raise that because we have debated this before. In 2016, we brought through an amendment to the Police Offences Act that was not supported by Liberal members. It was supported by Labor members and then in October last year, we tabled a motion to decriminalise begging and to show support for the changes to the Police Offences Act. At that time, again, all Liberal members including, unfortunately, Ms Hickey, voted against that motion. The Police minister committed to undertaking a review of that provision in the Police Offences Act and reporting back to parliament in the first half of this year. Sorry, minister, I do not want to verbal you without the words in front of me. The parliament has to deal with this and, if the response from the minister for Police is not to strike out those provisions of the Police Offences Act that turn Peter into a criminal and potentially put him into Risdon Prison, we will give this parliament the opportunity to do just that. We will come back with the amendment bill to the Police Offences Act.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - I am not sure what the Chair should say but the minister did make comment about that very issue in his summing up yesterday if you would like to go to *Hansard*.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you. I did not watch that but I have been told that he made an update. That is why I said, when he brings that response back, which he has committed to do by 30 June. If the response is more window dressing and it does not go to the substance of how cruel that provision in the Police Offences Act is, the Greens will re-table our legislation and give this parliament another opportunity to do the right thing by Peter and the 1600 Tasmanians who, on any given night, have no place to call home.

Yes, we will support this legislation. The frustration for me, and I am sure Dr Woodruff feels the same way, is the short duration. Why are we only extending the first home owner grant for a single year? Will we back in this building again extending the \$20 000 First Home Owner Grant at the same time next year and the year after that? Will it only occur when we are on the eve of an election, or will this Government get serious about structural change that delivers real housing supply, true affordability and protects the rights of tenants?

The Residential Tenancy Act provides too little protection to tenants. It does not prevent landlords from exploiting the incredible housing distress that is making tenants feel afraid to speak to their landlord about the hot water cylinder springing a leak or the maintenance that needs to be undertaken on the house. They are afraid to do that. We know this because I hear it from constituents. I have also heard from the Tenants' Union of Tasmania that tenants are afraid to raise issues with their landlords because they are afraid they will be evicted into homelessness. There is insufficient protection in the Residential Tenancy Act for those tenants. There is nothing in the Residential Tenancy Act that prevents landlords from gouging their tenants and charging higher and higher rents. We know that rents are going through the roof, quite literally. Hobart is becoming the least affordable capital of any city in Australia. It is quite breathtaking. I can almost hear the

Treasurer's thought process then, which is: you beauty we've made the economy so strong that we have the least affordable capital in the country and that is a good thing. There is part of your brain that must have gone, 'It is the least affordable because we have changed everything'.

Mr Gutwein - No, in fact, what I was thinking was you actually opposed me for a number of years in terms of the planning reforms, which was all about increasing density ensuring that we could build closer to services.

Ms O'CONNOR - That is not what they were all about. We certainly support increased density.

Mr Gutwein - In large part they were.

Ms O'CONNOR - You said that by interjection and I apologise for misrepresenting your thought processes. We certainly support increased housing density and good planning but the planning reforms that you worked with the Property Council to develop were not about public participation or the public having a role in planning decisions. In fact, the ultimate objective is to minimise to the greatest extent possible the opportunities for consultation and public input. That is why we raised those concerns.

Back to my original point before I wind up. We need structural reform. I acknowledge that some changes have been made that will lead to increased density. We have to increase the density around our cities, but we need to reform the Residential Tenancy Act. We need to stop landlords from gouging the rents of their tenants and have a look at the model like the ACT where rent increases are capped at CPI, unless there is excellent cause for there to be an increase that falls outside of the CPI. We need to have an integrated approach to increasing the supply of good housing. Not just slap up housing so you can tick a box and say you have built this many houses, but good quality housing that is thermally and energy efficient in communities, that people are proud to live in, and are designed in a way to make people feel safe and secure in their homes.

The biggest obstacle to home ownership for our kids in this place is the federal policy settings, which give more financial reward for a person buying a seventh, eighth, ninth or tenth property than they do to a single person, couple or family buying their first property. Negative gearing and capital gains tax are structural obstacles to increasing the supply of affordable housing, making purchasing a home more affordable and renting a home more affordable. Hey, that is just a product of this 21st century culture where greed is God. Unfortunately, for people like Peter who have been left behind, there is nothing in this legislation for him. There is too little heart in Canberra for him from the federal government. At the moment the law in Tasmania treats Peter like a criminal and threatens to throw him in jail for six months.

[5.19 p.m.]

Mr GUTWEIN (Bass - Treasurer) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank members for their contributions and their support for the extension of the First Home Owner Grant. What we are dealing with here is the boost to the grant. The First Home Owner Grant was introduced on 1 July 2000 at \$10 000 and this is an additional \$10 000.

Ms Butler, you raised the terminology that is used. It has always been the First Home Owner Grant Act. Going back a number of years ago - and this might have been the time when Lara Giddings was premier - there was the First Home Builders Boost. That is what it was called. There was a shift to the grant only being used for new homes being built. We made the shift in 2014 to

where the grant was only available for new homes being built or new homes being delivered on a turnkey arrangement. That is the best way of describing it. That explains the first part.

We believe the grant of \$20 000 is about right at the moment. We review it each 12 months and make decisions then. It has been as high as \$30 000 in the past when there was a program to bring forward significant demand back in 2012.

Mr Bacon - What is the nature of the review that you are doing? You said you review it every 12 months.

Mr GUTWEIN - It is part of the Budget process.

Mr Bacon - You do not look at the results? It is a decision about whether you are going to raise it to \$20 000, or \$30 000 or leave it at \$10 000 effectively?

Mr GUTWEIN - That is basically the process. We look at what it has brought forward. It would be fair to say that when the grant was introduced to \$30 000 there was significant activity at that time. As a stimulus measure, Treasury would even agree, it is one of the few levers that Government has to bring forward demand and boost the economy. It certainly did at the time when it was first introduced.

What has been the take up? In the year to date for 2018-19, 587. For the full year, the year before, it was 589. That was to 31 May so with another month, I would expect there will be more delivered than the previous year. In 2016-17, it was 487. It has been quite successful and supports significant building occurring in this new home space.

In terms of the cost to the Budget, you pointed out that it falls away by about \$4 million in 2020-21. In fact in the 2019-20 budget papers it will be a cost of around \$12.7 million in the coming year, \$8.8 million the following year, and then it falls away to \$2.62 million. The reason it falls away is that it is the timing of the program. In this coming 12 months people will sign up to the grant. They have two years in which to build the property. There is always this timing issue that impacts.

You asked whether the program had been successful. Since inception of the First Home Owner Grant in July 2000, this Government and previous governments have provided in excess of \$433 million in grants to first home buyers, and assisted more than 45 000 first home buyers to enter the market.

The other measures - I make the point that in supporting people into other options, obviously this is one measure in terms of home ownership. We have the HomeShare program as well that allows the Director of Housing to take -

Ms O'Connor - Longstanding; very longstanding.

Mr GUTWEIN - It is. It is a very worthwhile program. The Director of Housing can take 30 per cent equity in a home up to around \$80 000-worth of equity. Obviously the homeowner will be responsible for the other 70 per cent. Along with this measure we also have the rebate on stamp duty for a first home purchase up to \$400 000 and the option of a further rebate for pensioners who want to downsize to properties below \$400 000.

I note Ms O'Connor raised a number of matters. I did not hear the Police minister and his contribution last night so I do not think I am in a position to comment on that at the moment, but I understand where the member is coming from.

The challenges we face - and I must say we raised the issues of a strong growing economy and rising rents - you took a leap of faith in terms of what I might be thinking, which was we need a multifaceted approach to finding a solution. Good planning is one - I agree with you on that and we probably have more common ground on that than you might suspect.

In terms of LUPAA, the statewide planning scheme and the local provision schedules councils will bring forward, we have not changed anything. If you think back, one of the issues that became a topic of discussion over the last four years was the opportunity to build units and engage in that process, which was a planning directive signed off by Mr Green. We have not changed that and in the current circumstances I would be reluctant to change it because it provides, hopefully, the opportunity for more homes sooner. My point is that while there has been a ferocious debate this week on a range of issues, and especially housing and homelessness, there is a lot of common ground.

Ms O'Connor - I am sure there is. You just need to put more money in.

Mr GUTWEIN - I looked at the last Budget you were involved in and while I understood we were investing significant amounts, it surprised me that this year's Budget was triple - around \$170 million - compared to the \$53 million over four years in your last budget when you were in government.

Ms O'Connor - Did you look at how many houses we built?

Mr GUTWEIN - I note that there was a massive, there was an inflow -

Ms O'Connor - More than 2000.

Mr GUTWEIN - The National Rental Affordability Scheme.

Ms O'Connor - Economic stimulus package which your federal colleagues railed against but which kept us out of recession.

Mr GUTWEIN - NRAS and a range of other things. There was a range of stimulus measures back then. Some of them worked, some of them did not, but again I make the point - and I am not looking to pick a fight and I do not think you are seeking one this afternoon either - that there is a lot of common ground. We all understand this is a challenge that needs to be addressed and we are doing the very best we can on this side to address those challenges, but obviously more discussion will occur tomorrow on that matter.

I thank members for their support of this bill and thank them for their support of the broader budget in the bills previously passed in this place as well.

Bill read the second time.

Bill read the third time.

SUPREME COURT CIVIL PROCEDURE AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 52)

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with amendment.

SUPREME COURT CIVIL PROCEDURE AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 52)

In Committee

Council amendment to clause 2 -

Ms ARCHER - Mr Deputy Chair, I move -

That the amendment of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

The proposed amendment to clause 2 of this Bill is -

After 'commences on', leave out 'the day on which this Act receives the Royal Assent.'

Insert instead 'a day to be proclaimed'.

I will try to be as brief as possible. To explain the reason for this amendment: after the bill was debated in this House, the Supreme Court advised the Office of Parliamentary Counsel that it needed to make consequential amendments relevant to the rules as a result of the changes to the act proposed in this bill. The OPC advised the bill needed to be amended to commence on proclamation to ensure it has the power to draft the requested amendments before the amending bill commences. It was due to commence on royal assent. All this amendment does is change the commencement date from royal assent to proclamation so that the rules and the act align in terms of commencement date.

I do not know whether members need any more explanation than that, but I am sure if they do, they will raise it in their contributions.

Dr WOODRUFF - Mr Deputy Chair, the Greens are happy to support that amendment. If the minister could provide any information she has about the length of time between royal assent and proclamation for this particular bill, that would be helpful.

Ms HADDAD - Mr Deputy Chair, likewise Labor will support this simple change as we did in the other place. We recognise this has been done at the behest of the Supreme Court and will align the commencement dates of those statutory rules and the change to legislation.

[5.33 p.m.]

Ms ARCHER - Mr Deputy Chair, I am attempting to get an answer to that question. I do not have advisers or departmental people with me. The Supreme Court is very keen, going on my recollection when we put the amendment bill through this Chamber. It will depend on OPC and the instructions given by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court had written that this amendment was required and they were keen to get this matter sorted out as soon as possible. Having gone

through this Chamber and the other place, and now with this amendment, the Supreme Court will act fairly swiftly in relation to those amendment rules.

I recently reappointed members to the Supreme Court Rule Committee. If this amendment is required to go through that committee, I expect that process to be done as quickly as possible by the Supreme Court, given it is their interests of the administration of the Supreme Court.

I am not expecting any significant delays -

Dr Woodruff - As soon as they have done their work, it can be proclaimed?

Ms ARCHER - Yes.

Council amendment agreed to.

Reported the Committee had resolved to agree to the Council amendment.

Resolution agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms ARCHER (Clark - Minister for Justice) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday 30 July.

Motion agreed.

Estimates Committee - Alleged Behaviour of Leader of the Greens

[5.35 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Clark - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to table my response to a letter that was tabled by the member for Braddon, Mrs Rylah, today and to place on the record that I refute, absolutely, the allegations made by Mrs Rylah in relation to last Thursday's Estimates committee hearing.

I admit, with regret, to using inappropriate language toward Mrs Rylah as Chair during the tea break. I also stated Mrs Rylah is a biased chair. Mr Deputy Speaker, I stand by that statement. However, I emphatically reject Mrs Rylah's version of events. I most certainly did not behave in the manner or use the offensive phrase that Mrs Rylah attributes to me. While I can use profanities from time to time, as many people in this place do, I simply do not speak to people like that, particularly the chair of a parliamentary committee. As my letter makes clear, which I will shortly formally seek leave to table, Mrs Rylah has either misheard or wilfully misrepresented what occurred during the tea break.

Mr Bacon - That would be unusual for the Government to do such a thing.

Ms O'CONNOR - Unusual, did you say, Mr Bacon?

Mr Bacon - I do not think that would be unusual for the Government.

Ms O'CONNOR - To mishear something?

Mr Bacon - No, to misrepresent it.

Ms O'CONNOR - To mispresent it, yes, particularly in the wake of what has been a disastrous budget session for this Government. It is convenient, to say the least, that this double-smear campaign is happening on the last sitting day.

What I find particularly offensive is the language that Mrs Rylah has used about my behaviour and that it was escalated straight to parliament when normal people in the outside world would talk to each other, which is what people would do if they felt aggrieved by something they thought someone else had said. Mrs Rylah chose not to do that.

I cannot apologise for something that I never said, nor did, so I will not be doing that. I only received the letter from the Speaker last night, which does not afford me natural justice as time frames go.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek the leave of the House to table my response to Mrs Rylah's complaint. It is a letter I have already delivered to Madam Speaker today.

Leave granted.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will also take the opportunity to point out, on the history, that Mrs Rylah does have a record of being prone to exaggeration and hysterical statements and statements that have hurt people. She has described protestors in the Tarkine who waved as she and Mr Barnett went by as 'violent protestors'. Mrs Rylah said in the debate about same sex marriage that she would be voting no because of her belief in freedom but she also likened the children of same sex parents to adopted children, donor-conceived children and the stolen generations who were removed and denied their genetic parents and family. As Mr Rodney Dillon said -

It is deeply offensive to Aboriginal people to try to compare that - they are two completely different things. There was genocide on our people in our country and what she is talking about is not genocide.

I ask the question: did Mrs Rylah ever apologise to Aboriginal Tasmanians for the statement she made to hurt them bearing mind, they are her own words in public? The conversation I had with Mrs Rylah, in which I admit to dropping the 'f'-bomb - I admit it but I did not use the phrase and the terminology that Mrs Rylah has put in her letter. The event was during the tea break, the committee was not sitting, and it was out of my frustration at the way the Greens were being treated at the table.

Here is another description of peaceful protesters as radical protesters. I have another description from Mrs Rylah, who accuses peaceful protesters of 'law-breaking attacks'. On Mrs Rylah's record, there is a tendency to hysteria and exaggeration and I believe that is what is happened in this instance. I regret using that word in Mrs Rylah's presence but I did not say the things she accuses me of nor behave in the manner she accuses me of. I hope my letter to Madam Speaker speaks for itself.

Peter Ridgeway - Tribute

[5.42 p.m.]

Mr BACON (Clark) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to note a great Tasmanian, Mr Peter Ridgeway. Peter Ridgeway is 76 years old. He finished school at 14 years of age before taking up a carpentry apprenticeship. When he finished his apprenticeship he moved to the west coast of Tasmania and started working underground in Queenstown before moving to the Savage River and Rosebery mines. Working in the mines shaped Peter's affiliation with his colleagues and lifelong dedication to the union movement, becoming a delegate for the CFMEU when he moved back to Hobart and took up carpentry work again. Peter tells me that his proudest moment was working in his role as a delegate on the Basslink project in George Town, which was the biggest construction project in Australia at the time. As Peter said to me -

I look after the blokes, made sure the site was safe and I was in charge of first aid. It was the experience of my life. I never dreamed a bloke who left school at 14 would end up doing a job like that.

Peter helped to shape Tasmania's mining and construction history. It is through workers like Peter that Tasmania's future was created for our benefit and for generations to come. Peter told me about his youth when he met with me a couple of weeks ago to raise his concerns with Tasmania's health system. He felt so strongly about the way he was treated that he has asked me to talk about his experience this evening.

In 2014, Peter noticed his muscle strength had started to deteriorate. Besides this, he was in very good health. When he did seek medical intervention, his condition was misdiagnosed. His doctor proceeded to treat him for this misdiagnosis with an immunosuppressant and for a short period of time Peter experienced some improvement before his health continued to decline over a six-month period. Peter eventually developed septicaemia and was incredibly unwell. After some time, he was correctly diagnosed with an extremely rare and unusual form of parasitic myositis, which doctors said was from eating bush meat. The offending nematode had never been recognised before and it is thought to represent the first known case in the world. As part of his treatment, Peter was admitted to the Roy Fagan Centre. At Roy Fagan, Peter was hallucinating and unable to lift a cup of tea to his mouth. He was left frail and now walks with a walking stick. He was diagnosed with vascular dementia. His car licence was taken away from him and the day he left Roy Fagan, his wife was admitted to hospital with a terminal brain tumour.

Peter accepts the unusual nature of his illness. However, what he does not accept is how long it took for the doctor to recognise the deterioration in his health when he was receiving the immunosuppressant treatment for the misdiagnosis.

Peter believes he should have received a second biopsy earlier when the doctor first realised his health was not improving with the treatment. This matter has plagued Peter for the past five years. It has changed his life at a time when he should be enjoying his retirement. Throughout all of this Peter has continued to fight. He raised his concerns with the Royal Hobart Hospital, the Roy Fagan Centre and with the Health Complaints Commission. Peter eventually regained his car licence at great financial expense to him as he is living on an aged pension.

The health system and the Health Complaints Commission both maintain that Peter received the best care under the circumstances. Peter has asked me to put his experience with the health system on the record as he has exhausted all avenues of appeal.

The misdiagnosis has left Peter with a lasting legacy and loss that he will carry for the rest of his life. As a person who has stood up for so many people, it is disappointing that at this stage of his life Peter has been forced to fight so hard under such difficult circumstances. Peter Ridgeway is a great Tasmanian. I wish him all the best for the future, particularly with his health concerns.

Philippines Australia Community of Tasmania - Independence Day Dinner

[5.46 p.m.]

Ms HADDAD (Clark) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise tonight to mention and pay thanks to the Philippines Australia Community of Tasmania for inviting me recently to their Independence Day dinner. It was last weekend, but I recognised that Independence Day for the Philippines was celebrated yesterday on 12 June. I attended the dinner along with a lot of other MPs, including the member for Elwick, Josh Willie, the member for Hobart, Rob Valentine, and my fellow member for Clark, Elise Archer. I am sure all would agree it was a beautiful night, full of song and dance and beautiful Filipino food and Filipino culture.

Ms Archer - I thought you were going to talk about my inspirational speech.

Ms HADDAD - It was an inspirational speech. That is how the Attorney-General was introduced - to give the group an inspirational speech and you did give a lovely speech.

There were a number of highlights but the MC who travelled from Sydney, Michael Pio Catubay - I probably said his name wrong - gave a quite moving speech about the history of the Philippines. For a country that has been under colonisation from a number of colonisers over several hundreds of years, I thought it was a really positive speech. He found something unique and special to say about the Philippines with regards to each of those colonisers over many years, the Spanish, the Japanese and the Americans. I felt that was a positive way to reflect Filipino culture and Filipino history.

There were more than 200 people at the dinner. At some stage pretty much everybody was up on stage singing or performing or on the dance floor afterwards. The night really did kick on. One of the most beautiful things was the Mr and Mrs Independence Day Best Dressed competition. That was Bren Felisilda and Weng Mansbridge who won respectively the male and female category of best dressed on the night. I have to say there was amazing competition from both the men and the women. I wished I had dressed up a little more; I will next year. There were the most stunning dresses on the women all around the event that night, but Weng Mansbridge really did steal the show. She wore a most beautiful yellow gown with a matching crown and she was undeniably the winner of the best-dressed competition for the women. They were announced Mr and Mrs Independence Day for 2019. They will have the honour of passing that on to the winners at next year's dinner.

In particular, I wanted to thank Dona Taguinod, the new President of the Philippines Australia Community of Tasmania for inviting me and I pay respect also to Victor Folloso who is the outgoing president and has been the president for 10 years all up, although in different stints. I congratulate the rest of the committee for organising what was a beautiful night.

***Singin' in the Rain* - Hobart College Performing Arts Unit**

[5.49 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on adjournment to inform the House of the magnificent performance by the Hobart College Performing Arts Unit of *Singin' in the Rain* at Hobart College. I was invited to the opening night and it was a cracking evening of entertainment and showcase of what Hobart College and the work that they are doing in the performing arts. It was a cracking evening. I think it is important that in this place we acknowledge the work of our schools, our educators and all of those people who work to provide a wonderful enriching environment for young budding actors within our community.

Leadership starts from the top and Tracy Siedler who is the principal, is proud of the work that is being done up at Mount Nelson at Hobart College and very proud of the performance on the night. I would like to acknowledge the director, Jeff Michel, who was also the set designer. He spoke passionately before the performance about the commitment of all of those who came together to produce what was a wonderful outcome on the night and also to acknowledge the commitment young students have given to put on such a performance with all of the challenges of life, part-time work and getting to and from school, the commitment that was given by those young students to do all the rehearsals and get it ready and get it to a point where they could be enormously proud of their performance.

I will acknowledge a number of people: the musical director, Simon Cawthorn; choreographers Angela Barnard and Charlea Edwards; production manager, Sue Le Messurier; the AST performing arts, Rosalie Kinstler; the technical director and audio designer, Lyndon Bounday; the assistant director, Lucinda Wagner; co-assistant choreographer, Archie Stevenson; co-assistant choreographer and assistant vocal coach, Emma Webb; the assistant production manager, Alex Rivas; stage manager, Alisha Herrington; the assistant stage manager and fly operator, Karl Sanger; the vocal coach, Amanda Hodder, and a whole range of people across set construction, painting, the lighting, and the audio. It was amazing work by all of the team.

It is important that I acknowledge the actors on the night. For a couple of the lead roles a number of actors move in and out of those roles. I will acknowledge the young actors that portrayed the roles on opening night. Dora Bailey and the maid was played by Savannah Andresen-Tuivasa; Zelda Zanders was played by Lilith Cole; R. F. Simpson - Sara Webb; Mr Simpson - Jack Shirley; Roscoe Dexter by Tom Cross; Cosmo Brown by Hugh Gable, and he put in a cracking performance; Lina Lamont was played by Cleo Dudgeon; Don Lockwood played by Finlay Underwood; Young Don by Clancy Smith; Young Cosmo and Rod played by Gianni Puli; and Kathy Selden by Gabriella Vavoulas, who was a fantastic lead and her singing was magnificent. All of the actors did a tremendous job. The Person on Film was Lydia Bashford; assistant directors were Lachlan Portlock, Lawrence Ellis and Angel Wong. Other performers were Meg Bradshaw; Nikhita Sharma; Clancy Smith; Maeghan Jernigan; Monica Robbie; Harriet Langman; and Amy Rahmanovic. All the ensemble cast and orchestra were magnificent.

I acknowledge the partnership the school has created with the University of Tasmania and the Conservatorium of Music to support musical theatre. It was a fantastic performance and partnership between the two. The final song with all the raincoats and the umbrellas was magnificent. Well done to Hobart College, *Singin' in the Rain*.

Ms Robyn Coulson - Lack of Response from Government

Geoff Leitch - Tribute

Comments made by Mrs Petrusma - Women in the Labor Party

[5.53 p.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I have three matters to bring before the House today. The first goes to the tabling of a petition that I tabled on 9 April. It was a petition out of order. I appreciated the Government allowing that petition to be tabled. It was in relation to Ms Robyn Coulson and the loss of her son and the manslaughter legislation around that. Ms Coulson lost her son and, she said -

At the age 24 my wonderful son David was killed in a workplace accident in Tasmania, an accident that should never have happened.

I went through this at the time. Because the petition was out of order the Government is not required to make a formal response. However, whilst the petition in its current form does not compel the Government to respond because it is not a formal petition, Mr Ferguson undertook across the Chamber that he would seek to have that response provided. I requested that and I pleaded with the Government to give Ms Coulson the courtesy of a response to this. To date Ms Coulson has not had not had one. I want to draw the House's attention in the hope that Mr Ferguson could follow through with that, or the Premier if he is listening, and take the opportunity to respond to Mrs Coulson.

I have donated a copy of a book written by Geoff Leitch and friends to the library today. Geoff Leitch served in the Royal Australian Navy from 1969 to 1989, attained the rank of Warrant Officer in the Gunnery Branch, specialising in gunnery fire control. He attended the Frank MacDonald Memorial Prize in 2012 and, from that, he has produced a book. I am gifting a copy to the library as a memorial of the work and the artistry that came from that significant trip. I place on record the House's appreciation of Mr Leitch's contribution on that trip, his role in the RSL and the work he has undertaken to produce this publication.

Mrs Petrusma made some rather disparaging comments today about how women are elected in the Labor Party. Mrs Petrusma's main principles seem to be that women should not attack women. I am firmly on the record of being a member of organisations that support women. However, that does not preclude us from raising concerns when the Minister for Women does not pay appropriate attention to her portfolio to be able to answer questions impacting women across all portfolios in Tasmania. The more women in parliament, the better the place and the more representative we are, but that does not mean that we will not call Mrs Petrusma to account when she fails to do her job.

St Helens School Fair

[5.56 p.m.]

Mr TUCKER (Lyons) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the St Helens School Fair, taking place on Sunday 9 June. The community braved crisp weather to rally behind the event. The fair coincided with the Bay of Fires winter arts festival and the school was hoping to give the region's visitors another great place to visit. Amanda Lovell, the Administration Clerk at St Helens District High School, said the idea behind this year's fair was to make a celebration of the school and its relationship with the community. It had been 14 years since the school fair had been held

at the St Helens District High School and the students were ready to host it. The first school fair in more than a decade was a massive success.

St Helens District High School Association Secretary, Amanda Lovell, said it was a great day for the school and community and despite it being a while since the last fair, it was heartening to see so many people come out in support. All the student's stalls sold out and they had fabulous support for all their craft activities. Students performed in choirs and the highlight was an up-cycled fashion show and the crowning of the winter king and winter queen, snow teen and snow child. The atmosphere was superb. Everyone relaxed and enjoyed themselves. Students had the chance to share their school with family, friends and the wider community. There were plenty of visitors from outside the region, which was fantastic. The fair boasted classics such as bake sale, arts and crafts, trash and treasure and face painting, to name a few, but some exciting additions included a wellness centre, a community showcase featuring the St Helens Marine Rescue, Tasmanian Fire Service and Tasmania Police, and a creative hub with workshops and hands-on activities.

For the school, it was about more than fund-raising or making money. It was about bringing everyone together and showcasing talents and the wonderful things that the students do. Many of the students have never experienced a fair before and the involvement ran right across the school with the Year 9 and 10 business enterprise pupils designing the logo and poster for the event. All primary pupils were involved with the stalls and creating items, volunteering on the day and performing and showcasing their work. There was entertainment in the gym, with science experiments, a juggling workshop and a paper plane competition. The stage area came to life with a taster from the school's production, the primary school choir and the up-cycled fashion parade.

Burnie Surf Club Redevelopment

Wynyard RSL Club - Unveiling of Murals

[5.59 p.m.]

Ms DOW (Braddon) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to share with the House a couple of events I attended recently in my electorate. Last Friday night, my family and I attended the opening of the Burnie Surf Club redevelopment. It was a very well attended event with past and present members, life members and representatives from the Burnie City Council and community present. It was great to have the opportunity to have a tour of the new facilities and whilst I acknowledge that the circumstances which brought about the changes to the club's facilities was a difficult time for the club, community and council, it was great to see the project completed and being used once again by the club.

I thank the Burnie Surf Lifesaving Club for the work they do in our community, on our beaches during the summer, with our young people, through the nippers program, instilling valuable life skills and fostering personal development, and for their broader community development activities. I was not able to attend their annual dinner this year because I was at another event but I would like to congratulate them again on a wonderful season.

The second event I would like to speak about tonight was held a couple of weekends ago. It was a ceremony that I attended to commemorate the unveiling of 10 mosaic murals on the exterior wall at the Wynyard RSL Club. It was a great afternoon, with the sounds of the Australian Army Band's rendition of Waltzing Mathilda echoing in the streets of Wynyard during a vibrant parade. It was a moving and beautiful display of Tasmanian faces of war, local people and landscapes,

soldiers, personnel and nurses. My parliamentary colleagues, Mr Barnett and Mrs Rylah were present, as was Ruth Forrest MLC and many members of the Wynyard community. I commend the work of the executive of the RSL on this project and the colour and expression and opportunity for reflection it will bring to Wynyard.

The artist, Jenny Archer, has done an amazing job and I thank those featured in the mosaic for their contribution to their state and country, for their service and their sacrifice. After the ceremony, we enjoyed a lovely afternoon tea at the RSL prepared by the fantastic ladies' auxiliary. I cannot let the moment pass to put on the record that the cream puff I had was possibly the best I have ever tasted. Congratulations go to the ladies of the auxiliary and thank you, too, for your important contribution, bringing the community together over a cup of tea, with the outstanding hospitality at this event and others I have experienced. The 10 mosaics now have pride of place on the walls of the exterior of the RSL Club and I encourage you to take a drive to the picturesque town of Wynyard and enjoy these beautiful murals.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management - Answers to Questions

[6.02 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on the adjournment to speak in relation to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management. It is my belief that I have been misrepresented by the minister here in the House. In my response to the divisions 5, 8 and 9, in our Estimates committees, I asked why 39 questions I had submitted on notice last August, 2018, had not been answered by the minister. They were questions around spending scrutiny and they are a collection of over 300 questions in total that I have asked the Government, all to do with government spending, and I have had no responses.

I note that Mr Guy Barnett, during questioning in his Estimates committee meeting, did provide me with some answers at that committee, which was really helpful and I thank him for that. I have a lot more answers to find. Those questions were prorogued in February 2018 and I resubmitted those questions so it is coming up to nearly 12 months. I spoke about this for quite some time in my Estimates response to the minister. In the Estimates response, when the minister was summing up, he said, 'I went to significant lengths to answer questions and I stand by that'. He goes on to say -

To those people who claim otherwise, I encourage you to check in with your committee secretary. It is a shame these things get said. I went to significant efforts to honestly and factually respond to fact-based questions. Questions that were seeking a fact-based response have been answered.

None of my questions had been answered. The only questions that were answered were submitted to us after the minister was answering questions in the Estimates committee. It is really manipulative and it is really deceitful and dishonest. Using a mismatch of language is really deceitful. I think I have been misrepresented because have not received responses to my questions. I feel that I certainly have been misrepresented in the House.

I am more than happy to read these all 39 of these questions again. They are important questions and they need answering. They are all to do with spending in ministerial offices. I am the Chair of our spending scrutiny committee. I have an obligation in that role and also my role as a local member to ask those questions. It is really important that we know what the Government

spends on in their ministerial offices on travel, on credit cards, on entertainment. These are questions which we have the right to have answers to.

The minister has not answered my questions. I would really appreciate him correcting the record. I will not be misrepresented in this House. I will not have another member of Parliament infer that I am dishonest. I certainly have not had a response to my questions and I would like the minister to correct the record.

Estimates Committee - Answers to Questions

[6.06 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I just received, a week late, the responses to Estimates Committee B from the Minister for Primary Industries, Water, Energy and Veterans' Affairs Minister, Mr Barnett. It has long been the practice of governments to provide the answers that are asked during Estimates scrutiny during that week or by the end of that week. This Government just does not care. It does not care for the practice or for accountability or transparency in any form whatsoever.

I must say I was surprised that Mr Barnett comfortably agreed to provide answers on notice to some questions that I asked specifically in relation to marine resources. I asked questions in relation to marine farming leases, in relation to seal control in particular and Mr Barnett agreed to provide information that ought to be on the public record anyway.

All I am seeking in these questions is to have access to information that should be there by right. This is not like Cabinet-in-confidence documents. This is bog standard information that is the bread and butter of the work of the department and is basic information. I asked in relation to marine farming leases what the number of marine farming leases in Tasmanian waters is. The answer provided was that there is a total of 200 marine farming leases with an existing lease agreement for which a lease area rental is charged.

The question that was most important that I was seeking the answer for is: what are the names of the companies or persons that own each lease by individual lease site? The answer to that was an outrage. The answer is that 'the names of lessees are not publicly available'. I know that which is why I asked the question in the first place. I would not waste my time or the department's time asking for information that is already publicly available. The minister goes on to say, 'However the location of marine farming leases is publicly available via the list map'. Well, no it is not. That is a complete falsehood. That is a false statement. It is wrong to suggest that information about the ownership of marine farming leases on publicly owned waterways around the coastline of Tasmania is available and that it can be available on the list map. The Greens have tried to find out who owns those zombie leases because the community wants to know.

Just to put this in context, if you own a block of land in Tasmania, that block of land will appear on a digital database called The List. That list contains the names of every single landowner in Tasmania - the names, the block, the title, the name of the person, the name of the company - available for free for members of parliament, and for a fee for anybody in the Tasmanian community.

When it comes to who owns publicly owned waterways, which companies have bought it up and are sitting there waiting to expand, or to change the purpose of that lease, or to do something

with that without the community having any recourse to accessing that, that information is not available, will not be available. The minister told a complete mistruth when he said he was going to provide that information, because he has not.

The second question I asked was in relation to seal controls. I sought to have follow-up information on information that became available through the Right to Information Act only because the department has refused to release that information about the amount of seal control units and crackers that have been used in the last financial year. With sneering disregard, the minister responds with information from the previous financial year, which is already available because it was sought by a journalist, a Mr Schwartz, through the Right to Information Act. It is a disgrace that he dares to recirculate information that came through a Right to Information Act request. I specifically asked for this financial year, current financial year, and he has given me last financial year and he knows it, and it is disgusting abuse of this Government's treatment of Estimates.

It ought to be the matter of an investigation the way this Government continues to abuse the processes of parliament, to abuse the processes of the Estimates scrutiny mechanism. If you go back and read the *Hansard* of previous years, it is like night and day. People ask questions, interrogation happens, they are treated respectfully, they are not constantly shut down and there is not this ridiculous joke of adding up questions. It is all about spin.

During the whole Estimates process Ms O'Connor and I were shunted from minister to minister, from Crown Lands to Planning to Local Government if we wanted to talk about Lake Malbena. Or from Environment to DPIPWE to Resources if we wanted to talk about threatened species in our forestry area. It is disgusting.

What does it take to have the confidence of your convictions? If you are doing stuff because you think it is the right thing to do, why don't you tell Tasmanians what you are doing? Suffer it. Suffer people's criticism. Be honest. It is really hard to believe that Mr Barnett, the Minister for Energy and the department of Primary Industries can be so deceptive to have said that he would provide information and he has withheld it.

Time expired.

Risdon Vale Medical Centre - Closure

[6.13 p.m.]

Ms STANDEN (Franklin) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise this evening on adjournment to express my outrage on behalf of the people of Risdon Vale. The minister, Michael Ferguson, has failed the individuals, the families, small businesses and the entire community of Risdon Vale. He has ignored their fears and frustrations and he has left them in the dark. He has failed to provide information to the community after the private provider announced their intention to close the Risdon Vale Medical Centre at the end of this month. He has failed to provide information to the community about what action he has taken and intended to take to ensure the continuity of the GP practice at Risdon Vale.

He has failed to respond to my letter of 2 May. He has failed to attend, or even to RSVP to attend, a community meeting in Risdon Vale on 26 May attended by over 100 local people, service providers, HR Plus, GP Recruitment Group, and at least two GP practices that had been invited of

the many across the eastern shore and some in the greater Hobart area that attended that meeting. He failed even to RSVP to the invitation to attend.

Members of the community expressed their anger and disappointment at the meeting that he failed to attend and he did not even have the courtesy to RSVP.

He failed to respond to my further letter, together with local members David O'Byrne and Sarah Lovell, of 28 May. He has failed to respond when I raised this matter in this place this week. I first raised this matter - in fact, former member for Franklin, Lara Giddings through her office, raised this matter in late 2017. We have written. Since being elected to this place I wrote last year to the minister. I lodged a petition on behalf of the local community late last year with 177 signatures. He failed to respond to that petition. I know he has failed to respond to correspondence from the Risdon Vale Pharmacy, and he has failed to provide information even to the GPs operating still within the Risdon Vale Medical Centre regarding his expression of interest process that he announced shortly after the announcement of closure.

It has now been six weeks since the first letter was sent to the minister and the closure of the Risdon Vale Medical Centre was announced. It is one thing to be discourteous and rude to members of parliament. It is another to be so heartless as to keep members of the community of Risdon Vale, some of our most vulnerable people in this community, in the dark.

What will it take to get a response from this minister? People are transferring their records and have been over the course of the month and saying goodbye to that practice. People with transport, in particular, and those who are in employment and so have some discretionary money, have been first to leave the practice. The people remaining are some of the most disadvantaged in that community. This minister has contributed to further running down this practice and its viability. Almost 100 per cent of health care cardholders and a disproportionate number of people with chronic and complex issues and needs remain within the practice. I have been doing the job of the Health minister, talking with a number of local GPs and those within my social networks. I have been talking with HR Plus. I have been talking with the service providers at the Risdon Vale Medical Centre, local businesses like the pharmacy, but also the neighbourhood centre and others within the community about the impact to the community.

The long-term costs of the closure of this medical centre will be enormous: the cost to ambulance services, to emergency department presentations, for people failing to present for care because they know that care is not readily available in their community when they need it. People will be sicker. They will fail to present. They will be more unwell when eventually they do attend our acute care services. There is no doubt that there will be poorer health outcomes in the community of Risdon Vale.

Will the minister act now? Will he provide the information, not just to members of parliament, the people in this place, but most of to the people of Risdon Vale who have been demanding answers now for some six weeks as to what he will do to maintain this vital service to the community of Risdon Vale?

The House adjourned at 6.18 p.m.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

The following answer was given to questions upon notice numbers 2 to 68:

2. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - PREMIER

Did the Premier host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including employees of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, members of the Premier's family or ministerial staff from the Premier's office;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

3. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

Ms BUTLER asked the Leader of the House -

Did the Department of Premier and Cabinet host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including employees of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, members of the Premier's family or ministerial staff from the Premier's office;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

4. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, or the offices of any deputy secretaries of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

5. FACILITIES UPGRADES - DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

With respect to facilities upgrades:

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of Premier and Cabinet upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?
- (2) And if so -
 - (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
 - (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

6. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

With respect to staff travel -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of Premier and Cabinet undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?
- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the Premier's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

7. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

With respect to the Department of Premier and Cabinet -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what was the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?

- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

8. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - PREMIER

Did the Premier have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any:

- (a) Flights for the Premier and any accompanying members of the Premier's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Premier and Cabinet, and identify the airline and class of travel;
- (b) Ground transport for the Premier and any accompanying members of the Premier's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Premier and Cabinet;
- (c) Accommodation for the Premier and any accompanying members of the Premier's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Premier and Cabinet, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Premier and any accompanying members of the Premier's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Premier and Cabinet supported by any available receipts for meals?

9. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of Premier and Cabinet and ministerial staff in the Premier's office, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so -
 - (a) how many purchases?

- (b) what was the total value of those purchases?
 - (c) were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and, if so, what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) what was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? Was that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (8) Does the Department of Premier and Cabinet have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

10. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - TREASURER

Did the Treasurer host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Treasury and Finance and members of the Treasurer's family or the Treasurer's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Were any wines or champagnes served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

11. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE

Did the Department of Treasury and Finance host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Treasury and Finance and members of the Treasurer's family or the Treasurer's staff;

- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, and if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

12. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of Treasury and Finance, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries of the Department of Treasury and Finance, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

13. FACILITIES UPGRADES - DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE

With respect to facilities upgrades -

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of Treasury and Finance upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?
- (2) And if so -
 - (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
 - (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

14. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE

With respect to staff travel -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of Treasury and Finance undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?
- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the Treasurer's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

15. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE

With respect to the Department of Treasury and Finance -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what was the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?
- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

16. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - TREASURER

Did the Treasurer have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any:

- (a) Flights for the Treasurer and any accompanying members of the Treasurer's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Treasury and Finance, and identify the airline and class of travel;
- (b) Ground transport for the Treasurer and any accompanying members of the Treasurer's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Treasury and Finance;
- (c) Accommodation for the Treasurer and any accompanying members of the Treasurer's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Treasury and Finance, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Treasurer and any accompanying members of the Treasurer's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Treasury and Finance supported by any available receipts for meals?

17. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of Treasury and Finance and ministerial staff from the Treasurer's office, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?

- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so -
 - (a) how many purchases?
 - (b) what was the total value of those purchases?
 - (c) were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and if so what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) what was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? Was that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (8) Does the Department of Treasury and Finance have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

18. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Did the Minister for Education and Training host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Education and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and

- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

19. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Did the Department of Education host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Education and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

20. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of Education, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries of the Department of Education, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

21. FACILITIES UPGRADES - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

With respect to facilities upgrades -

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of Education upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?
- (2) And if so -
 - (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
 - (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

22. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

With respect to staff travel -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of Education undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?
- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the Minister for Education and Training's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

23. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

With respect to the Department of Education -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what was the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?
- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

24. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Did the Minister for Education and Training have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any -

- (a) Flights for the Minister for Education and Training, any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Education, and identify the airline and class of travel;
- (b) Ground transport for the Minister for Education and Training, any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Education;
- (c) Accommodation for the Minister for Education and Training, and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Education, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Minister for Education and Training, and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Education supported by any available receipts for meals?

25. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of Education or the minister's staff, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so:
 - (a) how many purchases?
 - (b) what was the total value of those purchases?
 - (c) were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and if so what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) what was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? Was that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (8) Does the Department of Education have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

26. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Did the Minister for Health host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Health and Human Services and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;

- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

27. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Did the Department of Health and Human Services host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Health and Human Services and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

28. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, or the offices of any deputy secretaries of the Department of Health and Human Services, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

29. FACILITIES UPGRADES - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

With respect to facilities upgrades -

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of Health and Human Services upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen

refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?

(2) And if so -

- (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
- (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

30. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

With respect to staff travel during 2017-18 -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of Health and Human Services undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?
- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the Minister for Health's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

31. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

With respect to the Department of Health and Human Services during 2017-18 -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what was the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?
- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

32. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Did the Minister for Health have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any -

- (a) Flights for the Minister for Health and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services, and identify the airline and class of travel;

- (b) Ground transport for the Minister for Health and any accompanying members of the Minister for Health's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services;
- (c) Accommodation for the Minister for Health and any accompanying members of the Minister for Health's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Minister for Health and any accompanying members of the Minister for Health's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services supported by any available receipts for meals?

33. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of Health or the minister's staff, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so -
 - (a) how many purchases?
 - (b) what was the total value of those purchases?
 - (c) were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and if so what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) what was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? Was that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?

- (8) Does the Department of Health have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

34. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - MINISTER FOR JUSTICE

Did the Minister for Justice host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Justice and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

35. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Did the Department of Justice host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Justice and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held?
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

36. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of Justice, or the offices of any deputy secretaries of the Department of Justice, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

37. FACILITIES UPGRADES - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

With respect to facilities upgrades -

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of Justice upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?
- (2) And if so -
 - (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
 - (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

38. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

With respect to staff travel -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of Justice undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?
- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the Minister for Justice's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

39. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

With respect to the Department of Justice -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what was the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?
- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

40. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - MINISTER FOR JUSTICE

Did the Minister for Justice have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any -

- (a) Flights for the Minister for Justice and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Justice, and identify the airline and class of travel;
- (b) Ground transport for the Minister for Justice and any accompanying members of the Minister for Justice's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Justice;
- (c) Accommodation for the minister for Justice and any accompanying members of the Minister for Justice's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials of the Department of Justice, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Minister for Justice and any accompanying members of the Minister for Justice's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Justice supported by any available receipts for meals?

41. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of Justice or the minister's staff, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so -
 - (a) how many purchases?
 - (b) what was the total value of those purchases?

- (c) Were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and if so what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) What was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? Was that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (8) Does the Department of Justice have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

42. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES

Did the minister host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Health and Human Services and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

43. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES

Did the Minister for Human Services have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any:

- (a) Flights for the Minister for Human Services and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services, and identify the airline and class of travel;

- (b) Ground transport for the Minister for Human Services and any accompanying members of the Minister for Human Services personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services;
- (c) Accommodation for the Minister for Human Services and any accompanying members of the Minister for Human Services personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Minister for Human Services and any accompanying members of the Minister for Human Services personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Health and Human Services supported by any available receipts for meals?

44. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITIES

Are there any credit cards currently on issue for employees of the Department of Communities or the minister's staff, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card issued to the minister's staff in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards issued to the minister's staff in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards issued to the minister's staff during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card issued to the minister's staff at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (7) Does the Department of Communities have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

45. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - MINISTER FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Did the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;

- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

46. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Did the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management and members of the minister's family or the minister's staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

47. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management, or the offices of any deputy secretaries of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

48. FACILITIES UPGRADES - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

With respect to facilities upgrades -

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?
- (2) And if so -
 - (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
 - (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

49. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

With respect to staff travel -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?
- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

50. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

With respect to the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what was the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?
- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

51. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - MINISTER FOR POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Did the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any -

- (a) Flights for the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management, and identify the airline and class of travel;
- (b) Ground transport for the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management and any accompanying members of the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management;
- (c) Accommodation for the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management and any accompanying members of the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials of the Department of Emergency Management, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management and any accompanying members of the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management supported by any available receipts for meals?

52. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, FIRE AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management and the minister's staff, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so -

- (a) how many purchases?
 - (b) what was the total value of those purchases?
 - (c) were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and if so what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) what was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? Was that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (8) Does the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

53. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND WATER

Did the Minister for Primary Industries and Water host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment and members of the minister's family or ministerial staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

54. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

Did the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;

- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment and members of the minister's family or ministerial staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

55. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, or the offices of any deputy secretaries of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

56. FACILITIES UPGRADE - DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

With respect to facilities upgrades -

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?
- (2) And if so -
 - (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
 - (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

57. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

With respect to staff travel -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the minister's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

58. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

With respect to the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what are the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?
- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

59. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

Did the minister have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any:

- (a) Flights for the minister and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment, and identify the airline and class of travel;
- (b) Ground transport for the minister and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment;
- (c) Accommodation for the minister and any accompanying members of the personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials or the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and
- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the minister and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment supported by any available receipts for meals?

60. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment or the minister's staff, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so -
 - (a) how many purchases?
 - (b) what was the total value of those purchases?
 - (c) were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and if so what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) what was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? What that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (8) Does the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

61. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - MINISTER FOR STATE GROWTH

Did the Minister for State Growth host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials from the Department of State Growth and members of the minister's family or ministerial staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);

- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage;
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it; and
- (h) Was any petty cash spent?

62. OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS - DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH

Did the Department of State Growth host any functions or official receptions during the financial year 2017-18, and if so -

- (a) What were the functions for;
- (b) Who attended each function, including officials of the Department of State Growth and members of the minister's family or ministerial staff;
- (c) Where were the functions held;
- (d) What were the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);
- (e) What food, if any, was served;
- (f) Was any wine or champagne served, if so, please provide details including brand and vintage; and
- (g) Was any entertainment provided, if so, what was it?

63. OFFICE FIXTURES AND FITTINGS - DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH

Was the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the office of the Secretary of the Department of State Growth, or the offices of any deputy secretaries of the Department of State Growth, upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?

64. FACILITIES UPGRADES - DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH

With respect to facilities upgrades -

- (1) Were the facilities of any of the premises of the Department of State Growth upgraded during the financial year 2017-18, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment?
- (2) And if so -

- (a) what were the details of each upgrade and what was the itemised list of costs (GST inclusive)?
- (b) can any photographs of the upgraded facilities please be provided?

65. STAFF TRAVEL - DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH

With respect to staff travel -

- (1) Did any employees of the Department of State Growth undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?
- (2) Did any ministerial staff of the Minister for State Growth's office undertake travel during the financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total cost of this staff travel?

66. MEDIA MONITORING, ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISE - DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH

With respect to the Department of State Growth -

- (1) Did the department have any expenditure on media monitoring in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure?
- (2) Did the department have any expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and what was the itemised list of the costs of each campaign?
- (3) Did the department have any expenditure on promotional merchandise in financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the itemised list of the costs of all promotional merchandise?

67. INTERNATIONAL AND INTERSTATE TRAVEL - MINISTER FOR STATE GROWTH

Did the Minister for State Growth have any expenditure on international or interstate travel during financial year 2017-18, and if so, what was the total expenditure and the itemised list of costs, including details of any:

- (a) Flights for the Minister for State Growth and any accompanying members of the minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of State Growth, and identify the airline and class of travel;
- (b) Ground transport for the Minister for State Growth and any accompanying members of the Minister for State Growth's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of State Growth;
- (c) Accommodation for the Minister for State Growth and any accompanying members of the Minister for State Growth's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying

officials from the Department of State Growth, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; and

- (d) Meals or other incidentals for the Minister for State Growth and any accompanying members of the Minister for State Growth's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying officials from the Department of State Growth supported by any available receipts for meals?

68. CREDIT CARDS - DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH

Are there any credit cards currently on issue to employees of the Department of State Growth or the minister's staff, and if so -

- (1) What is the total amount expended on these cards?
- (2) What was the value of the largest reported purchase on any credit card in financial year 2017-18 and what was it for?
- (3) Was any interest paid on amounts outstanding from credit cards in financial year 2017-18?
- (4) Were there any late fees on amounts outstanding from credit cards during the financial year 2017-18? If so, what was the total?
- (5) What was the largest amount outstanding on a single card at the end of a payment period in financial year 2017-18?
- (6) Were any credit card purchases deemed to be illegitimate or contrary to departmental policy during the financial year 2017-18? If so -
 - (a) how many purchases?
 - (b) what was the total value of those purchases?
 - (c) were any purchases asked to be repaid on that basis in financial year 2017-18 and if so what was the total value thereof and were those amounts repaid? If no, how many were not repaid, and what was the total value thereof?
 - (d) what was the largest purchase that was deemed illegitimate or contrary to agency policy and asked to be repaid in financial year 2017-18? What that amount actually repaid, in full? If no, what amount was left unpaid?
- (7) Are any credit cards currently on issue connected to any rewards schemes? And if so do any staff receive any personal benefit as a result of those reward schemes?
- (8) Does the Department of State Growth have a staff credit card policy? And if so, can you provide a copy of the policy?

Mr FERGUSON replied -

The questions are addressed to nine members - the Premier, the Treasurer, the Minister for Education and Training, the Minister for Health, the Minister for Justice, the Minister for Human

Services, the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management, the Minister for Primary Industries and Water, and the Minister for State Growth.

The majority of questions request very detailed information regarding ministers and departments hosting functions and official receptions; departmental furniture, fixtures and fittings; the upgrade of departmental facilities; ministerial office and departmental staff travel; ministerial international and interstate travel; departmental media monitoring, advertising and promotional merchandise; and ministerial offices and departmental credit cards. Much of the information has been requested for the period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018.

The amount of work involved in responding to the 67 Questions on Notice would place a significant impost on the government resources. A conservative estimate is that it would be at least a week's work for each portfolio given the level of detail requested. Across the nine portfolios this would equate to a minimum of 350 hours work. The amount of work involved and the inherent associated cost is not an appropriate use of constrained government resources given that other mechanisms already exist for providing information, particularly the Budget Estimates process and the routine disclosure of information.

The parliamentary budget debate and Estimates committee review process provides an opportunity for detailed parliamentary scrutiny of, and debate on, the state's economic and financial position and the Government's overall objectives.

Additionally, departmental annual reports, the audits undertaken by the Auditor-General and the work of parliamentary committees provides other mechanisms for obtaining information and scrutinising government activities.

In relation to routine disclosure of information, the Government is committed to the routine disclosure of ministerial and parliamentary support - MPS - information as well as departmental information. The MPS information includes details on:

- ministerial office employees and salaries;
- government card expenses
- fleet cars and taxi services; and
- travel and ministerial office refurbishment expenses.

Departmental information includes information such as:

- organisational structure and functions;
- departmental governance policies;
- major policy programs;
- employment statistics and Senior Executive Service details;
- expenditure on telecommunications;
- gifts and hospitality; and
- contracts and consultancies awarded with a value greater than \$50 000.

On 25 June 2018, the Government further committed to increasing transparency and accountability by enhancing and extending the routine disclosure of information across all government departments. From the end of June this year, 37 new routine data releases were published online, including information about government procurement, property data, industrial hemp and poppy active licences, and taxi licences and the taxi subsidy program. In October 2018,

a further suite of routine disclosure items was published online ensuring even greater access to up-to-date information on the activities of government. This information can be found on the Government Information Gateway at www.dpac.tas.gov.au/government_information_gateway.