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The SPEAKER (Hon. Tony Smith) took the chair at 09:30, made an acknowledgement of country and read prayers.

BILLS

Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Amendment (Ensuring Integrity No. 2) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Porter.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr PORTER (Pearce—Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Leader of the House) (09:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The government remains absolutely committed to ensuring the integrity of all registered organisations—employer groups and unions alike—for the benefit of workers, for the benefit of our national economy and for the broader public interest. This bill is not going away, because the problem is not going away, and maintaining the law on construction sites around Australia is not a principle to be applied in some circumstances and disregarded in others.

The SPEAKER: The Manager of Opposition Business on a point of order?

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker, it's not surprising, given the controversy surrounding this bill, that members present would like copies, as is required under the standing orders. The members are here. There's been a lot of publicity about this moment. It was a reasonable expectation that the government would have enough copies of the bill for members to be able to have a look at it during the second reading speech, and they haven't done so.

The SPEAKER: We've obviously had this sort of debate before, and it's well-established practice that 'sufficient' doesn't mean 151 copies at the table. But is the Manager of Opposition Business saying there are no copies?

Mr Burke: There are no further copies available at the table.

The SPEAKER: So you're confirming that copies have been provided at the table.

Opposition members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: I just need to know what the request of me is. I'm getting requests by interjection. Are you saying that both the bill and the explanatory memorandum have not been provided in the way they normally are?

Mr Fitzgibbon: No.

The SPEAKER: I didn't ask the member for Hunter. I really didn't.

Mr Burke: The normal provision is that there will be enough copies for the number of members who seek copies. I think it's a fair bet that government members aren't demanding right now that copies be available for them. There are members of the opposition who want copies in accordance with standing orders, and currently they are not available for them.
The SPEAKER: I just say to the Manager of Opposition Business that I understand the point he's making. But actually the normal practice is that there are a number of copies that are provided, and if more are provided they're provided during the course of the debate. That's what's occurred on many occasions. I just ask the clerks and the attendants if they can ensure that more copies continue to be made available.

Mr Burke: On the specific words of standing order 142:

If copies of the bill are available to Members, the Member presenting the bill may move immediately after the first reading, or at a later hour—

to move that the bill be read a second time. That has happened to a point that copies are no longer available to members.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps the Manager of Opposition Business does desire that I spend a long period of time debating this. Perhaps that's so. I can pull out the relevant section of practice if he wants me to do that. I can refer to all of the occasions where I've seen this raised in the 18 years I've been in this place, including when the Manager of Opposition Business was a minister, if he'd really like me to furnish all those rulings. It has never been the case that there needs to be 151 copies here. There are the standing orders and the Practice.

Mr Burke: Just a final time.

The SPEAKER: No. A final time sounds good—inviting!—but I'll just finish what I'm saying if that's okay. If he's really saying that is how he wants that interpreted, and he wants to ignore how it's been interpreted by governments of both political persuasions over a long period—

Mr Simmonds interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Ryan! As you can see, more copies are coming in. If he's really saying he wants that standing order to be interpreted so that if there is one copy fewer than the number of members seeking it, at any point on the clock, and therefore he wants me to interpret it that way, for me to give consideration to that would be for me to give consideration to enforcing every standing order, particularly those that would apply to the opposition, in the strictest possible sense. What I'm suggesting now is: you've made your point; there are more coming in, and more will continue to come in. I don't suspect this is the last procedural issue we'll confront today. I'm going to call the minister, and I'm going to hear him without interjection.

Mr PORTER: I'm sure the men and women being spat at and abused on construction sites appreciate that sort of stunt. That's what's happening. As we were noting, obeying the law on construction sites around Australia is not a principle to be observed in some circumstances and disregarded in others. It's incumbent upon all organisations, whether they be employee or employer organisations—

Opposition members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Can the minister just pause for a second. I'm going to try to give some helpful advice to those sitting behind the Manager of Opposition Business. When legislation is quite contested, it's understandable that members may have passion. But I remind them: standing order 94(a) does not just apply to question time; it applies to all proceedings. Disorderly conduct does not differ according to what the item of business is. Have no doubt, I
will exercise the power under 94(a) as I do in question time if the level of interjections continues.

**Mr PORTER:** It's incumbent upon all organisations, whether they be employer or employee organisations, unions, banks, other corporations—all of them—and their directors, their executives and their officers to comply with the law or to face appropriate consequences determined by this parliament.

This bill concerns registered organisations which, despite the claims of some, are not above the law. Multiple royal commissions and innumerable judgements of the courts have exposed the misconduct, the lawlessness and even the corruption at the heart of some parts of registered organisations, including, and specifically, a militant minority in the CFMMEU.

*Ms Kearney interjecting—*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Cooper is now warned.

**Mr PORTER:** To quote one of the very many similar passages from many judges of the Federal Court with respect to the CFMMEU:

> … the conduct of its officers and employees has consistently shown a total contempt … for the constraints imposed by the law …

And it has shown a:

> … cavalier disregard for the prior penalties imposed by this Court.

And this conduct is continuing. There have been over 30 contraventions of the law and close to $400,000 in court ordered penalties in the last few months alone. The Australian Building and Construction Commission filed a case just recently which alleges that CFMMEU officers threatened and intimidated workers of a crane company in New South Wales, including, as members opposite will no doubt be interested to hear, by spitting at them, calling them 'dogs' and 'scabs', photographing them and uploading the images on social media, where those hardworking men and women were then subjected to further abuse and intimidation.

*Ms Kearney interjecting—*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cooper, this is your final warning. I will eject you if you continue to interject at all for the rest of the day. You were warned yesterday and the day before.

**Mr PORTER:** I might just repeat that. The Australian Building and Construction Commission filed a case just recently. It alleges that CFMMEU officers threatened and intimidated workers of a crane company in New South Wales, hardworking men and women, including by spitting at them, calling them 'dogs' and 'scabs' and photographing them and uploading the images on social media, where those hardworking Australian men and women were further subjected to abuse and intimidation online.

Of course, it's not just repeated contraventions of workplace law. Just as we have seen New South Wales CFMMEU officers convicted this week of drug offences, a senior CFMMEU officer in Queensland is in court right now facing criminal charges for intimidating a state work health and safety inspector.

We have also seen examples of utterly horrendous conduct against women by officers of the CFMMEU, including intimidating female police officers, spitting at female building inspectors and making abhorrent violent threats about sexual violence to workplace
inspectors. Is it any wonder that data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that the number of women working in construction has fallen from 13 per cent 30 years ago to 11.8 per cent today?

So what should any reasonable government do in the face of organisations that engage in conduct such as this, that place themselves above the law on construction sites throughout Australia, that happily spend their members’ money on paying court imposed penalties while continuing to do what they like by way of breaking the law? Should a government make an exception? Should they admit defeat? Should they say employers and other unions must obey the law? It surely must be the latter. Organisations such as the CFMMEU are not above the law.

If existing sanctions are not working effectively to deter lawbreaking then a government needs to develop stronger sanctions. If penalties are not working, the courts need other options. It’s clearly the case when it comes to registered organisations.

Courts must be able to rationally and reasonably disqualify officers who keep breaking the law—removing them from office or alternatively suspending or taking from the organisation itself the enormous rights and privileges occasioned by virtue of registration. In essence, that is simply what this bill does.

Portraying this approach as an attack on unions, much less their hardworking members, is unreasonable—unless of course one views that these organisations are above the law and therefore somehow beyond reproach. But any such view, at best, is horribly misguided and, at worst, shows a genuine threat to the supremacy of the rule of law on construction sites throughout Australia.

The bill introduced into parliament today incorporates the sensible and constructive amendments, safeguards and further protections proposed to a previous iteration of the bill by both Centre Alliance and other crossbenchers. It also incorporates a provision requiring that the operation of the bill be reviewed in the near future, as suggested by the Greens and by the Jacqui Lambie Network.

The grounds for disqualification and cancellation of registration in the bill are set at an appropriately high level. They’ll only be met where courts have imposed penalties for serious or repeated contraventions of the law. Of course even where any such ground is met by way of application, only the independent regulator will be able to decide whether disqualification or cancellation should be sought and, even then, only the independent Federal Court is able to make these orders and, even then, the court can only do so where it would not be unjust, taking into consideration the gravity of the underlying conduct and all other relevant considerations.

To suggest that safeguards such as these and the multitude of other safeguards in the bill will lead to a person being disqualified or an organisation being deregistered for submitting paperwork a few days late, as those opposite have repeatedly and disingenuously claimed, is so far down the path to being legally fanciful. It evokes questions about precisely what sort of serious and unlawful conduct the allegations are designed to excuse.

Under the bill, only amalgamations of organisations with a serious and long track record of breaking the law will be required to satisfy a public interest test, administered by the Fair Work Commission. Members of organisations will continue to be able to vote on whether
their organisation should merge with another organisation. But where there is ongoing and serious contempt for laws on construction sites, the question needs to be asked: is it in the public interest for such an organisation to spread its culture of lawbreaking to other organisations?

It is vital to note that ultimately nothing in the bill prevents a registered organisation from exercising its rights under the law to represent workers, including investigating payment issues or acting on work health and safety concerns. The vast majority of unions and their employer groups manage to perform these functions perfectly well. They work hard for their members, but they do so inside the confines of the laws recognised by the Australian people. They recognise that they cannot in good conscience insist that employers pay workers their legal entitlements, bargain in good faith and comply with other legislative provisions if rogue elements of militant unions themselves perpetually ignore and disobey the law.

The bill simply deals with those registered organisations who have shown an absolutely unfettered disregard for the law, who break the law—civil, workplace and criminal—repetitiously and mistreat hardworking Australian men and women in workplaces, particularly in construction. Organisations that contribute positively to the industrial relations framework, work in their members' interests and obey the law—and thankfully that is of course the vast majority of the organisations in question—will not be impacted by the bill at all.

Respect for the law on construction sites goes not only to the absolute integrity and existence of registered organisations but also to the efficiency, the efficacy and the integrity of the entire industrial relations system itself. For all those reasons, I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (09:47):** I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

And I ask that a separate question be put on the resumption of debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Just for the interest of members, under the standing orders and under the Practice, the debate must be adjourned, and it must be adjourned without debate. I think the point that the Manager of Opposition Business is making is that he concedes that it must be adjourned. But, as to when it's adjourned to, he's essentially seeking to split the normal motion. So, you're moving that the debate be adjourned?

**Mr BURKE:** I've moved that the debate be adjourned, and I have asked that a separate question be put on resumption of the debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I think all I can do is just move that the debate be adjourned. Normally it would be to a later hour of this day. The question is that the debate be adjourned.

Question agreed to.

Debate adjourned.

**The SPEAKER:** The question now is that the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

**Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (09:49):** I move an amendment to that motion:

That the words "the next sitting" be deleted and, inserted in their place, the words "1 July 2022"
This amendment to this bill—the bill that the Senate rejected last week, but the stubborn members opposite don't want to acknowledge that they had a bill rejected by the Senate—what they want to present is effectively the 'ensuring double standards' bill. That's what's in front of us—a bill to ensure double standards, a bill that is part of this government's two-stage tactic: stage 1, attack the organisations that defend pay and conditions; stage 2, attack the pay and conditions themselves. We know what's coming from questions that were answered in the Senate last week. They're going to go after unfair dismissal laws. They're going to go after the better-off overall test. We know that the attack on pay and conditions is coming. We know that the attack on superannuation is on the way—

**The SPEAKER:** The Manager of Opposition Business will resume his seat.

**Mr Burke:** and I bet they want to shut the debate down. I bet they do.

**Mr Porter** (Pearce—Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Leader of the House) (09:50): The member's motion is shutting the debate down, and I'm shutting that motion down. I move:

That the question be now put.

**Mr Burke:** On a point of order: 'that the question be put' can be moved only at the end of the amendment. There's an obligation—

**The SPEAKER:** No, that's not right, and I can go to the section of Practice. This is what's colloquially called a steamroller motion. The amendment is not before the chair until it has been moved, seconded and then stated. At that point the amendment is before the chair; at this point, it's not. I'll hear the Manager of Opposition Business.

**Mr Burke:** That means the motion from the Leader of the House, guarantees, if carried, that there will not even be an opportunity for this amendment to be seconded. The debate is being shut down to that extent? We don't even get to have a seconder?

**The SPEAKER:** And that has been the case—

**Mr Burke:** No, I'm just asking: is that the impact of what the Leader of the House is doing?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes; procedurally, the Leader of the House can move 'that the question be put' at any time during the moving of the amendment, at any time during the seconding of the amendment—in fact at any time after the seconding of the amendment prior to my then stating, 'The question is that the amendment be agreed to.' Up until that point he can put that motion, and that has been the case on a number of occasions, so I'm happy to clarify that. What I will now do is put the question that is before me as moved by the Leader of the House. The question is that the question be put.

The House divided. [09:56]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 71
Noes ...................... 65
Majority .......................... 6
AYES

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KJ
Archer, BK
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Conaghan, PJ
Drum, DK (teller)
Entsch, WG
Falinski, JG
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Hammond, CM
Hawke, AG
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Katter, RC
Laming, A
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
Martin, NB
McCormack, MF
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O’Brien, T
Pearce, GB
Price, ML
Robert, SR
Simmonds, J
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Tudge, AE
Wallace, AB
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG
Zimmerman, T

NOES

Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Freelander, MR (teller)
Giles, AJ
Gosling, LJ
Hayes, CP

Allen, K
Andrews, KL
Bell, AM
Bachholz, S
Christensen, GR
Connelly, V
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hastie, AW
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Ley, SP
Liu, G
Martin, FB
McIntosh, MI
Morrison, SJ
O’Brien, LS
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sharma, DN
Stevens, J
Taylor, AJ
Thompson, P
van Manen, AJ
Webster, AE
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP

Young, T

Hill, JC
Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (10:01): The question now is that the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

The House divided. [10:02]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES</th>
<th>NOES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, JG</td>
<td>Jones, SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, KJ</td>
<td>Keogh, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer, BK</td>
<td>King, CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadbent, RE</td>
<td>Leigh, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, D</td>
<td>McBride, EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaghan, PJ</td>
<td>Mitchell, RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulton, M</td>
<td>Mulino, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton, PC</td>
<td>Neumann, SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, TM</td>
<td>O’Neill, CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, PW</td>
<td>Payne, AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frydenberg, JA</td>
<td>Piibersk, TJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie, DA</td>
<td>Rowland, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, CM</td>
<td>Smith, DPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawke, AG</td>
<td>Steggall, Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howarth, LR</td>
<td>Templeman, SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irons, SJ</td>
<td>Thwaites, KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, C</td>
<td>Watts, TG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landry, ML</td>
<td>Wilkie, AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley, SP</td>
<td>Zappia, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AYES

Allen, K                                      Andy, KL
Bell, AM                                       Andrew, KL
Buchholz, S                                   Andrews, KL
Christensen, GR                                Astley, K
Connelly, V                                   Connelly, V
Drum, DK (teller)                             Connelly, V
Entsch, WG                                    Connelly, V
Falinski, JG                                  Connelly, V
Flint, NJ                                     Connelly, V
Gee, AR                                       Connelly, V
Haines, H                                    Connelly, V
Hastie, AW                                    Connelly, V
Hogan, KJ                                     Connelly, V
Hunt, GA                                      Connelly, V
Joyce, BT                                     Connelly, V
Laming, A                                     Connelly, V
Leeser, J                                     Connelly, V
Littleproud, D                                Connelly, V
Marino, NB                                    Connelly, V

CHAMBER
### AYES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin, FB</td>
<td>McCormack, MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntosh, MI</td>
<td>McVeigh, JJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, SJ</td>
<td>Morton, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, LS</td>
<td>O'Brien, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasin, A</td>
<td>Pearce, GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, CC</td>
<td>Price, ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, RE (teller)</td>
<td>Robert, SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkie, RCC</td>
<td>Sharma, DN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmonds, J</td>
<td>Steggall, Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, J</td>
<td>Sukkar, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, AJ</td>
<td>Tehan, DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, P</td>
<td>Tudge, AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Manen, AJ</td>
<td>Wallace, AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster, AE</td>
<td>Wicks, LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, RJ</td>
<td>Wilson, TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, JP</td>
<td>Wyatt, KG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, T</td>
<td>Zimmerman, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanese, AN</td>
<td>Aly, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandt, AP</td>
<td>Bird, SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen, CE</td>
<td>Burke, AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burney, LJ</td>
<td>Burns, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, MC</td>
<td>Butler, TM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne, AM</td>
<td>Chalmers, JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare, JD</td>
<td>Coker, EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, JM</td>
<td>Conroy, PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick, MD</td>
<td>Dreyfus, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot, MJ</td>
<td>Fitzgibbon, JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelander, MR (teller)</td>
<td>Georganas, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles, AJ</td>
<td>Gorman, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosling, LJ</td>
<td>Hayes, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, JC</td>
<td>Husic, EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, SP</td>
<td>Katter, RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney, G</td>
<td>Keogh, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalil, P</td>
<td>King, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, MMH</td>
<td>Leigh, AK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marles, RD</td>
<td>McBride, EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, BK</td>
<td>Mitchell, RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulino, D</td>
<td>Murphy, PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neumann, SK</td>
<td>O'Connor, BPJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Neil, CE</td>
<td>Owens, JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne, AE</td>
<td>Perrett, GD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plibersek, TJ</td>
<td>Rishworth, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland, MA</td>
<td>Smith, DBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley, AM (teller)</td>
<td>Swanson, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeman, SR</td>
<td>Thistlethwaite, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thwaites, KL</td>
<td>Vamvakiniou, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watts, TG</td>
<td>Wells, AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, AD</td>
<td>Wilson, JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zappia, A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (10:04): Just briefly, for members who were present when the closure was moved and the Manager of Opposition Business raised a point of order of clarification which often gets raised, I wanted to point out the relevant part of Practice is on page 307. What the Leader of the House couldn't have done is move 'That the speaker be no further heard', but a member speaking to an amendment may be interrupted by a closure motion 'That the question be now put' and it may be moved while the member is moving an amendment. It's the same for the seconder; it goes onto the next page in explaining it. For the benefit of members, I thought I would point that out.

MOTIONS

Morrison Government

Mr ALBANESE (Grayndler—Leader of the Opposition) (10:05): I seek leave to move the following motion:

That the House:

(1) notes that:

(a) wages growth is at record lows under this seven-year-old Government;
(b) the Reserve Bank has declared that "lower wage rises have become the new normal";
(c) the Finance Minister has said that low wages is a "deliberate design feature" of the Government's economic policies;
(d) the Parliament rejected the Government's original bill attacking working Australians just days ago;
(e) the Government is continuing its attack on the very people that work to deliver wage rises for Australians;

(f) the Government has a tactic where it first seeks to attack the organisations that defend workers' pay and conditions, and secondly will then directly attack the pay and conditions of workers; and

(g) this is another example of the Prime Minister's arrogance and hubris; and

(2) therefore, calls on this Prime Minister to listen to the Parliament, stop being so stubborn and abandon his anti-worker legislation.

Leave not granted.

Mr ALBANESE: I move:

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the Leader of the Opposition from moving the following motion immediately:

That the House:

(1) notes that:

(a) wages growth is at record lows under this seven-year-old Government;
(b) the Reserve Bank has declared that "lower wage rises have become the new normal";
(c) the Finance Minister has said that low wages is a "deliberate design feature" of the Government's economic policies;
(d) the Parliament rejected the Government's original bill attacking working Australians just days ago;

(e) the Government is continuing its attack on the very people that work to deliver wage rises for Australians;
(f) the Government has a tactic where it first seeks to attack the organisations that defend workers' pay and conditions, and secondly will then directly attack the pay and conditions of workers; and

(g) this is another example of the Prime Minister's arrogance and hubris; and

(2) therefore, calls on this Prime Minister to listen to the Parliament, stop being so stubborn and abandon his anti-worker legislation.

This nasty legislation is about attacking the pay and—

Mr PORTER (Pearce—Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Leader of the House) (10:08): I move;

That the Member be no longer heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the Leader of the Opposition be no further heard.

The House divided. [10:12]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 71
Noes ...................... 66
Majority ............... 5

AYES

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KJ
Archer, BK
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Conaghan, PJ
Coulton, M
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hastie, AW
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
Marino, NB
McCormack, MF
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O'Brien, T
Pearce, GB
Price, ML
Robert, SR
Simmonds, J
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Tudge, AE
Wallace, AB
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR

Allen, K
Andrews, KL
Bell, AM
Buchholz, S
Christensen, GR
Connelly, V
Drum, DK (teller)
Entsch, WG
Falinski, JG
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Hammond, CM
Hawke, AG
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Ley, SP
Liu, G
Martin, FB
McIntosh, MI
Morrison, SJ
O'Brien, LS
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sharma, DN
Stevens, J
Taylor, AJ
Thompson, P
van Manen, AJ
Webster, AE
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Question agreed to.

**The SPEAKER** (10:13): Is the motion seconded?

**Mr BURKE** (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (10:13): Seconded. It's an attack on cleaners, on nurses, on shop assistants—

**The SPEAKER**: The Manager of Opposition Business will resume his seat. The Leader of the House.

**Mr PORTER** (Pearce—Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Leader of the House) (10:13): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.
The SPEAKER: The question is that the Manager of Opposition Business be no further heard.

The House divided. [10:15]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ....................71
Noes .....................66
Majority ...............5

AYES

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KJ
Archer, BK
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Conaghan, PJ
Coulton, M
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hastie, AW
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
Marino, NB
McCormack, MF
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O’Brien, T
Pearce, GB
Price, ML
Robert, SR
Simmonds, J
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Tudge, AE
Wallace, AB
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG
Zimmerman, T

Allen, K
Andrews, KL
Bell, AM
Buchholz, S
Christensen, GR
Connelly, V
Drum, DK (teller)
Entsch, WG
Falinski, JG
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Hammond, CM
Hawke, AG
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Ley, SP
Liu, G
Martin, FB
McIntosh, MI
Morrison, SJ
O’Brien, LS
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sharma, DN
Stevens, J
Taylor, AJ
Thompson, P
van Manen, AJ
Webster, AE
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Young, T

NOES

Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC

Aly, A
Bird, SL
Burke, AS
Burns, J
Butler, TM
Question agreed to.

**Mr BRENDAN O’CONNOR** (Gorton) (10:16): This is an undemocratic assault on working people at a time with the lowest wages—

**Mr PORTER** (Pearce—Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Leader of the House) (10:16): I move:

That the question be now put.

The **SPEAKER**: The Leader of the House has moved that the question be put.

The House divided. [10:17]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes ..................... 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noes ..................... 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority .............. 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AYS E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alexander, JG</th>
<th>Allen, K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, KJ</td>
<td>Andrews, KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer, BK</td>
<td>Bell, AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadbent, RE</td>
<td>Buchholz, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, D</td>
<td>Christensen, GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaghan, PJ</td>
<td>Connelly, V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AYES

Coulton, M
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, IA
Gillespie, DA
Hastie, AW
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
Marino, NB
McCormack, MF
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O’Brien, T
Pearce, GB
Price, ML
Robert, SR
Simmonds, J
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Tudge, AE
Wallace, AB
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG
Zimmerman, T

Drum, DK (teller)
Entsch, WG
Falkin, JG
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Hammond, CM
Hawke, AG
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Ley, SP
Liu, G
Martin, FB
McIntosh, MI
Morrison, SJ
O’Brien, LS
Passin, A
Porter, CC
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sharma, DN
Stevens, J
Taylor, AJ
Thompson, P
van Manen, AJ
Webster, AE
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Young, T

NOES

Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Freelander, MR (teller)
Giles, AJ
Gosling, LJ
Hayes, CP
Husic, EN
Katter, RC
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Leigh, AK
McBride, EM

Aly, A
Bird, SL
Burke, AS
Burns, J
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Coker, EA
Conroy, PM
Dreyfus, MA
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georganas, S
Gorman, P
Haines, H
Hill, JC
Jones, SP
Kearney, G
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK

CHAMBER
Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (10:19): The question now is that the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition be agreed to.

The House divided. [10:19]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ..................... 63
Noes ..................... 73
Majority................... 10

AYES

Albanese, AN  Aly, A
Bandt, AP  Bird, SL
Bowen, CE  Burke, AS
Burney, LJ  Burns, J
Butler, MC  Butler, TM
Byrne, AM  Chalmers, JE
Clare, JD  Coker, EA
Collins, JM  Conroy, PM
Dick, MD  Dreyfus, MA
Elliot, MJ  Fitzgibbon, JA
Freelander, MR (teller)  Georganas, S
Giles, AJ  Gorman, P
Gosling, LJ  Hayes, CP
Hill, JC  Katter, RC
Jones, SP  Keogh, MJ
Kearney, G  King, CF
Khalil, P  Leigh, AK
King, MMH  McBride, EM
Marles, RD  Mitchell, RG
Mulino, D  Murphy, PJ
Neumann, SK  O'Connor, BPJ
O'Neil, CE  Owens, JA
Payne, AE  Perrett, GD
Plibersek, TJ  Rishworth, AL
Rowland, MA  Smith, DPB

NOES

Mitchell, RG  Mulino, D
Murphy, PJ  Neumann, SK
O'Connor, BPJ  O'Neil, CE
Owens, JA  Payne, AE
Perrett, GD  Plibersek, TJ
Rishworth, AL  Rowland, MA
Sharkie, RCC  Smith, DPB
Stanley, AM (teller)  Steggall, Z
Swanson, MJ  Templeman, SR
Thistlethwaite, MJ  Thwaites, KL
Vamvakinou, M  Watts, TG
Wells, AS  Wilkie, AD
Wilson, JH  Zappia, A
AYES

Stanley, AM (teller)  Swanson, MJ
Templeman, SR  Thistlethwaite, MJ
Thwaites, KL  Vamvakinou, M
Watts, TG  Wells, AS
Wilkie, AD  Wilson, JH
Zappia, A

NOES

Alexander, JG  Allen, K
Andrews, KJ  Andrews, KL
Archer, BK  Bell, AM
Broadbent, RE  Buchholz, S
Chester, D  Christensen, GR
Conaghan, PJ  Connelly, V
Coulton, M  Drum, DK (teller)
Dutton, PC  Entsch, WG
Evans, TM  Falinski, JG
Flint, NJ  Frydenberg, JA
Gee, AR  Gillespie, DA
Haines, H  Hammond, CM
Hastie, AW  Hawke, AG
Hogan, KJ  Howarth, LR
Hunt, GA  Irons, SJ
Joyce, BT  Kelly, C
Laming, A  Landry, ML
Leeson, J  Ley, SP
Littleproud, D  Liu, G
Marino, NB  Martin, FB
McCormack, MF  McIntosh, MI
McVeigh, JJ  Morrison, SJ
Morton, B  O’Brien, LS
O’Brien, T  Pasin, A
Pearce, GB  Porter, CC
Price, ML  Ramsey, RE (teller)
Robert, SR  Sharkie, RCC
Sharma, DN  Simmonds, J
Steggall, Z  Stevens, J
Sukkar, MS  Taylor, AJ
Tehan, DT  Thompson, P
Tudge, AE  van Manen, AJ
Wallace, AB  Webster, AE
Wicks, LE  Wilson, RJ
Wilson, TR  Wood, JP
Wyatt, KG  Young, T
Zimmerman, T

Question negativ ed.
BILLS

Student Identifiers Amendment (Higher Education) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Tehan.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr TEHAN (Wannon—Minister for Education) (10:25): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Student Identifiers Amendment (Higher Education) Bill 2019 gives effect to a key national education reform announced in the 2019-20 budget to extend the Unique Student Identifier, known as the USI, from vocational education and training (VET) to higher education.

The Australian government recognises the increasing need for individuals to access tertiary education to upskill and reskill throughout their life, in order to meet the evolving demands of the labour market.

To support this, the bill seeks to extend the Student Identifiers Act 2014 to higher education, providing a single government-issued student identifier in the tertiary education sector.

For the first time, all tertiary education students, across VET and higher education, will use one number throughout their education journey that stays with them for life.

It will reduce the administrative burden placed on students and providers when applying for studies and entitlement.

It will also help students engage with their learning and contribute to the lifelong learning ecosystem, encouraging Australians to upskill and reskill, building their careers to fulfil their goals and aspirations.

Starting in 2021, new higher education students can apply for a USI and, by 2023, all graduating higher education students will need a USI before they can receive their award, unless an exemption applies. It is estimated 300,000 USIs will be issued to higher education students in 2020-21; 1.4 million USIs in 2021-22; and around 500,000 each year thereafter.

A national USI will record a student's entire tertiary education journey, enabling students to have greater autonomy and control over their education.

This will also strengthen the integrity and richness of data available, helping us to gain a better understanding of student pathways across tertiary education.

This robust evidence base will help inform future policy development and program delivery, and, in doing so, further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the government's investment in tertiary education.

The USI will replace the existing Commonwealth Higher Education Student Support Number, also known as a CHESSN, reducing the number of student identifiers in tertiary education from two to one.
Since the turn of the century, the total number of students in higher education has grown dramatically—from 842,000 in 2001 to over 1.5 million in 2018.

We know that an investment in a post-school qualification is one of the best decisions an individual can make—whether it be through vocational education and training or higher education. Tertiary graduates enjoy consistently higher employment levels than those who complete secondary schooling.

The higher education sector has long supported the establishment of a USI.

In 2009, COAG recognised the importance of establishing a national USI to support a seamless transition between schooling, VET and higher education. Since that time, USIs were introduced to the VET system.

In 2018, the STEM Partnerships Forum, led by Chief Scientist, Dr Alan Finkel, recommended a lifelong unique student identifier be established and implemented across all education sectors by 2020. The forum summarised that the lack of a consistent national identifier was the largest barrier to understanding the impact of policy efforts to improve engagement in STEM education.

The final report of the Higher Education Standards Panel into improving retention, completion and success in higher education, released in 2018, included a recommendation to 'establish a common student identifier to better understand student pathways across tertiary education'.

With over 10 million VET USIs created and 6,000 students accessing the system every day, we are building on a system that works.

We have now reached the next phase of this evolution, as we introduce USIs to all higher education students.

Schedule 1 of the bill outlines amendments to reflect consistency between vocational education and training and the higher education sector. This will ensure that both sectors are able to provide students with the best services possible to enrich their tertiary education journey.

For the first time, all students studying at a tertiary level will have access to the same national system.

With almost all students in tertiary education using the USI, we will be able to monitor and collect unprecedented data to better inform education programs and policies. As with all information that is maintained by government, privacy is our No. 1 priority. USIs are kept in a secure environment, with all necessary steps taken to protect identifiers from misuse, interference, unauthorised access and modification.

Through the USI, students will be able to move between VET and higher education in a manner that supports lifelong learning, personal development and career aspiration.

The amendments in this bill were designed with innovation, fairness, and longevity at their core. They were informed by a collaborative approach between stakeholders and government agencies, with a focus on ensuring the students of today and tomorrow have access to the best quality tertiary education.

I commend the bill.

Debate adjourned.
(Quorum formed)

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Amendment (Prohibiting Academic Cheating Services) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Tehan.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr TEHAN (Wannon—Minister for Education) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Amendment (Prohibiting Academic Cheating Services) Bill 2019 implements recommendations of the Higher Education Standards Panel to deter third-party academic cheating services in higher education.

The growing availability and provision of academic cheating services poses a significant threat to the integrity and reputation of the higher education sector, both in Australia and internationally. Third-party cheating activity commonly involves the provision of bespoke academic material that is subsequently submitted by a student for assessment, or a third party impersonating a student in an exam or practical test.

Promotion of cheating services to students has become widespread in recent years through on-campus advertising, email and social media. Students are being inundated with targeted promotions for cheating services highlighting their ease of access, minimal cost and low risk of detection, while downplaying the ethical dishonesty involved.

While many aspects of these services and their use are already subject to criminal and civil penalties for various offences such as fraud or misrepresentation, these can be complex and difficult to pursue. They also provide little deterrence as there is no specific law that clearly and simply says the provision of cheating assistance is wrong. This makes it too easy for unscrupulous purveyors of these destructive harmful products to trick vulnerable students—particularly those under stress or having difficulty with their studies—that it is okay to buy an essay or have someone else take an exam for them; that no-one will find out or, if they do, that there will be no consequences.

We need to stop this.

The key features of the legislation are:

- The bill will make it an offence to provide, arrange or advertise academic cheating services to students studying with Australian higher education providers, whether the service is provided from within Australia or overseas.
- Criminal and civil penalties of up to two years jail and fines of up to 500 penalty units—around $100,000—will apply where the cheating service or advertising is for a commercial purpose.
- Civil penalties of up to 500 penalty units will apply where the cheating service is provided without remuneration.
The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) will have the ability to seek court injunctions to force internet service providers and search engines to block cheating websites.

Strict liability will apply to the criminal offence of providing an academic cheating service, in order to undermine services' tactics of disingenuous disclaimers regarding the purpose and use of their products.

TEQSA will be appointed to enforce the new law, with its powers to include monitoring, intelligence gathering, investigation and prosecution of identified offenders.

TEQSA will have additional power to collect and disseminate information about cheating websites and their users to help institutions combat cheating activity on campus; but with safeguards to protect the unwarranted sharing of personal information about those who purchase cheating materials.

This bill is aimed squarely at providers of cheating services, and not at students who might use such services. Students who cheat remain subject to their institutions' own academic integrity policies, processes and sanctions. Students who cheat are not subject to the penalties this bill creates; only those who help them cheat are at risk.

The maximum penalties outlined in this bill have deliberately been set high to create a strong deterrent to the provision and promotion of cheating services. Commercial cheating service providers could face up to two years imprisonment and fines of up to $100,000. Unpaid cheating services could be subject to similar maximum fines but will not be subject to jail time or a criminal record. While these maximum penalties are severe, they are consistent with those for comparable offences such as dealing in fraudulent identity information or knowingly providing false or misleading information or providing a false or misleading document to a Commonwealth entity.

The government has listened carefully to feedback from stakeholders on an exposure draft of the bill that was released for comment in April this year. Overall, stakeholders were highly supportive of the need for legislative action to deter this cheating activity. A number of issues were raised that the government has responded to in the bill now before the House.

Criminal penalties have been limited to situations where the cheating service or advertising is done for a commercial purpose.

The maximum civil financial penalty has been halved to the same level as for criminal offences.

The scope of cheating assistance that is prohibited by the bill has been more tightly defined to where 'a substantial part' of an assessment task is undertaken by a third party, not 'any part' as in the earlier draft.

Because of this new approach, there was no longer a need to define exemptions to the prohibition—which sought to achieve the same outcomes in the earlier draft.

I recognise that some have questioned why this bill seeks to prohibit unpaid cheating assistance. Australian research has shown that a large proportion of third-party cheating occurs on an unpaid basis, by friends, family or others in the community. This type of cheating not only is a threat to the integrity of student assessments and of qualifications earned but in some fields of study—for example, in engineering or the health professions—
could lead to dangerous or even life-threatening situations if students are assumed to have knowledge and skills that they do not possess. It is appropriate to deter this type of cheating.

It is not anticipated that many such cases would reach the courts, except in the most serious cases of repeated, deliberate and extensive infractions. The clear intention with this bill is to deter cheating assistance rather than to prosecute friends and family members. And universities' clear preference is to take an educative approach in the first instance where this type of cheating is detected. But it is important that we send a clear signal that cheating in higher education is not just immoral but also illegal.

International education is one of Australia's biggest export industries and this bill demonstrates to potential students, their parents, their governments and also to overseas employers that Australia takes the quality and integrity of its higher education system and graduates very seriously.

The measures in this bill will help to undermine the business model of commercial cheating service providers, many of which operate as organised criminal enterprises, drawing unsuspecting users in and in some cases exploiting these victims further with threats of blackmail and exposure to their university, their employer or their family.

The penalties in this bill will significantly change the incentives for commercial operations. The capacity to block cheating websites will make it harder for students in Australia to access these services. We will change not just the conversation about cheating but the incentives to get involved as either a provider or promoter of cheating material.

This bill will ultimately help to protect the integrity of Australian higher education.

I commend the bill.

Debate adjourned.

Export Control Bill 2019
First Reading
Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Littleproud.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (10:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Agriculture, fisheries and forestry exports are an economic powerhouse for Australia and are expected to be worth around $51 billion in 2019-20.

We are one of the top 10 agricultural exporting countries in the world, exporting around two-thirds of our agricultural production each year.

Strengthening the competitiveness and productivity of Australia's agriculture sector is a key commitment of this government.

We want our industries to be able to capitalise on the opportunities that flow from growth in our region and globally, and grow Australian agriculture to $100 billion by 2030.
To help us achieve this, we need export legislation that is easier for our exporters and others along the agricultural production chains to understand.

We need legislation that supports the uptake of innovation, particularly new technologies.

And finally, we need legislation that provides options for our exporters to reduce the cost of compliance, such as streamlined processes for exporters to engage non-government people to undertake regulatory activities, where agreed upon by importing countries.

This bill and its supporting legislation does all of this and more.

It builds on reforms introduced into the 45th Parliament in December 2017 as part of the Export Control Bill 2017, which lapsed on the dissolution of the parliament.

The bill meets the needs of those who use the system and is the result of extensive consultation.

Since the Export Control Act 1982 commenced, the legislation governing agricultural exports has grown into a complex web of regulation.

The Export Control Bill 2019 streamlines and consolidates existing export certification legislation. It reduces complexity, duplication and ambiguity, and provides the confidence for existing and potential exporters to pursue lucrative export opportunities, particularly for those involved with new and emerging industries.

The rules that are being developed to support the bill will replace the existing orders. They will also be simpler and easier for exporters to understand and comply with.

The bill recognises alternative regulatory arrangements, and so provides opportunities for Australian exporters to innovate and take up technologies.

The bill allows the government to certify a greater range of agricultural goods for export. This demonstrates the importance of trade for government and our commitment to its growth, by responding to calls for certification of more agricultural goods.

And, of course, it is critical that our trading partners continue to have confidence in the safety of Australian produce, and continue to be confident that they are receiving what they purchased.

Market access is becoming increasingly complex and challenging as importing countries' requirements become more sophisticated and we compete with other countries for lucrative overseas markets.

The bill assists in providing a competitive edge for our exports.

It provides clearer regulation that supports innovation and the export of a broader range of goods, but, at the same time, it ensures that regulatory settings maintain the standards that our trading partners expect. The government has worked hard with importing countries to provide assurances that our level of regulatory oversight remains the same. It will ensure that we can protect the welfare of live animals exported from Australia, especially livestock.

We need to ensure Australia is a reliable source of clean and green agricultural products and ensure the welfare of live animal exports. The bill protects our valuable export markets by introducing a larger range of monitoring, investigation and enforcement powers, so that greater assurance can be given about compliance. It includes a clearer basis for the performance of verification activities across the supply chain.
The bill provides for increased criminal penalties and sanctions and will introduce new criminal offences and civil penalties for unacceptable exporter behaviour.

It will therefore act as a strong deterrent for that small minority whose conduct would otherwise undermine the integrity of the system and, in doing so, damage Australia's trading reputation.

The bill will provide a graduated set of punishments that can be better matched to offences, should exporters choose to disregard their legislative responsibilities.

The bill includes a range of new enforcement tools including injunctions, enforceable undertakings and infringement notices.

The bill protects the businesses of our exporters who are committed to doing the right thing and is yet another step in the right direction for Australian agriculture.

It demonstrates the government's commitment to increased access to high-value premium markets for Australia's agricultural sector.

For Australian farmers, reliable access to overseas markets means increased profitability and certainty for further investment in their properties and people.

For the Australian community, it means stronger regional communities and a more prosperous and productive Australia.

For the Australian economy, it means more jobs, more exports, and higher incomes in a competitive and profitable agricultural sector.

The export legislation reforms are just one of the initiatives that the government is progressing to modernise the systems that underpin our very valuable agricultural exports, which will be crucial to growing Australian agricultural exports to $100 billion by 2030.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

(Quorum formed)

Export Control (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Littleproud.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (10:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.


This bill will repeal 17 acts which are redundant, or which will become redundant, with the enactment of the Export Control Bill 2019.

It will deliver a simpler and easier way to understand legislative framework.

It will also make minor consequential amendments to seven Commonwealth acts that refer to the Export Control Act 1982, as well as remove provisions that will be incorporated in the Export Control Bill 2019.

Importantly, this bill will support a smooth transition from the existing legislation to the new regulatory framework.

The bill will do this by ensuring that arrangements to manage the export of goods are transitioned appropriately, without disruption to exporters, to industry or to trade.

For example: an accredited property or a registered establishment under the existing legislation will transition to be recognised as an accredited property or a registered establishment under the new legislation.

Any outstanding applications made under the existing export law that are not dealt with before the Export Control Bill 2019 commences will be transitioned in this bill so that they can be dealt with under the new export legislation framework.

The compliance and enforcement measures in the Export Control Bill 2019 will apply for the purposes of monitoring and investigating compliance with the repealed laws. In addition, the monitoring and compliance powers under the existing legislation will continue to apply in relation to notices and directions given under a repealed law. This will ensure that compliance and enforcement activities can continue to protect the integrity of Australia's exports.

This bill will also preserve rights (such as the right to seek review of decisions) and liabilities (such as the requirement to pay fees) that exist under the repealed legislation. This will help to ensure there is no impact on the export industry.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Export Charges (Imposition—Customs) Amendment Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill—by leave—and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Littleproud.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (10:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Export Charges (Imposition—Customs) Amendment Bill 2019 is the third of three bills which will amend the current charging legislation relating to export, as part of the Export Control Bill 2019 package.

This bill will amend the Export Charges (Imposition—Customs) Act 2015, which deals with charges that are considered a duty of customs within the meaning of section 55 of the Constitution.
This bill will continue to provide that these charges will be set out in regulations and will reflect the Commonwealth's likely costs in regulating exports.

Together, the three charging bills will ensure that charges for export activities continue to be supported by legislation and that these charges reflect the Commonwealth's likely costs relating to the administration of Australia’s export control system.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Export Charges (Imposition—Excise) Amendment Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Littleproud.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (10:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Export Charges (Imposition—Excise) Amendment Bill 2019 is the second of three bills which will amend the current charging legislation relating to export, as part of the Export Control Bill 2019 package.

This bill will amend the Export Charges (Imposition—Excise) Act 2015, which deals with charges that are considered a duty of excise within the meaning of section 55 of the Constitution.

This bill will continue to provide that these charges will be set out in regulations and will reflect the Commonwealth's likely costs in regulating exports.

Together, the three charging bills will ensure that charges for export activities continue to be supported by legislation and that these charges reflect the Commonwealth's likely costs relating to the administration of Australia’s export control system. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Export Charges (Imposition—General) Amendment Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Littleproud.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (10:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Export Charges (Imposition—General) Amendment Bill 2019 is the first of three bills which will amend the current charging legislation relating to export.

The Export Charges (Imposition—General) Amendment Bill 2019 will amend the Export Charges (Imposition—General) Act 2015, which deals with charges that are not a duty of customs or excise within the meaning of section 55 of the Constitution.

This will allow the Commonwealth to continue to impose charges that appropriately reflect the cost of administering the export control system, both now and into the future.

The bill does not set the amount of the charges and does not apply any financial impacts on business. This is because the specific charges will be set out in regulations, as they are now.

The bill continues to provide that, before making these regulations, the Minister for Agriculture must be satisfied that the amount charged will not be more than the likely costs in connection with the export of goods.

This will provide business with confidence that the government will not charge more than is necessary to recover the costs of its export services.

Together, the three charging bills will ensure that charges for export activities continue to be supported by legislation and that these charges reflect the Commonwealth's likely costs relating to the administration of Australia's export control system. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Commonwealth Registers Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum to this bill, and to the Treasury Laws Amendment (Registries Modernisation and Other Measures) Bill 2019, Business Names Registration (Fees) Amendment (Registries Modernisation) Bill 2019, Corporations (Fees) Amendment (Registries Modernisation) Bill 2019 and the National Consumer Credit Protection (Fees) Amendment (Registries Modernisation) Bill 2019 presented by Mr Sukkar.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr SUKKAR (Deakin—Assistant Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (10:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.


The core provisions have been mirrored in almost their entirety in the Treasury Laws Amendment (Registries Modernisation and Other Measures) Bill 2019.

Full details of the measure are contained in the explanatory memorandum.

Debate adjourned.
Treasury Laws Amendment (Registries Modernisation and Other Measures) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill presented by Mr Sukkar.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr SUKKAR (Deakin—Assistant Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (11:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will amend the Treasury Laws Amendment (Registries Modernisation and Other Measures) Bill 2019 to introduce a single business register that will fundamentally improve and streamline how businesses engage with government.

The government announced the Modernising Business Registers (MBR) program in the 2018-19 budget, which includes the introduction of a director identification number, more colloquially known as a DIN.

This flexible legislative framework will modernise the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) business registers and the Australian Business Register (ABR) and will integrate the 32 existing business registers onto one platform to be administered by the Australian Business Registrar.

To facilitate the implementation of a modernised registry system, new legislation has been drafted that is technology neutral and governance neutral.

The legislation allows for the minister of the day to appoint a Commonwealth body to be registrar. Rather than having administrative requirements prescribed in primary legislation, the ’registrar’ is able to create data standards and disclosure frameworks via legislative instruments to assist them in carrying out their registry functions and powers.

The data standards will allow the registrar to determine what and how information is collected and the manner in which it is maintained. The disclosure frameworks will be used to determine under what circumstances information is disclosed.

This bill also provides, as I said, a legal framework for the introduction of DINs.

The DIN is a unique identifier that a director will keep forever, meaning it will provide traceability of a director’s profile and relationships across companies and over time. This will provide greater insights to regulators, businesses and individuals on the identity and affiliations of directors and prevent the use of fictitious identities.

DINs are being appropriately progressed as part of the MBR program to ensure that they are integrated with other important registry information. This enables critical data to be linked on the platform, which is key to the success of the DIN.

Full details of the measure are contained in the explanatory memorandum.

Debate adjourned.
Business Names Registration (Fees) Amendment (Registries Modernisation) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill presented by Mr Sukkar.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr SUKKAR (Deakin—Assistant Treasurer and Minister for Housing ) (11:03): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.
This bill supports the Treasury Laws Amendment (Registries Modernisation and Other Measures) Bill 2019 by allowing the registrar to collect fees for registry services.
Full details of the measure are contained in the explanatory memorandum.
Debate adjourned.

Corporations (Fees) Amendment (Registries Modernisation) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill presented by Mr Sukkar.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr SUKKAR (Deakin—Assistant Treasurer and Minister for Housing ) (11:05): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.
This bill supports the Treasury Laws Amendment (Registries Modernisation and Other Measures) Bill 2019 by allowing the registrar to collect fees for registry services. Full details of the measure are contained in the explanatory memorandum.
Debate adjourned.

National Consumer Credit Protection (Fees) Amendment (Registries Modernisation) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill presented by Mr Sukkar.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr SUKKAR (Deakin—Assistant Treasurer and Minister for Housing ) (11:05): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.
This bill supports the Treasury Laws Amendment (Registries Modernisation and Other Measures) Bill 2019 by allowing the registrar to collect fees for registry services. Full details of the measure are contained in the explanatory memorandum.
Debate adjourned.
Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment (Cross-boundary Greenhouse Gas Titles and Other Measures) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum to this bill, and to the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Regulatory Levies) Amendment (Miscellaneous Measures) Bill 2019, presented by Mrs Marino, for Mr Taylor.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mrs MARINO (Forrest—Assistant Minister for Regional Development and Territories) (11:07): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment (Cross-boundary Greenhouse Gas Titles and Other Measures) Bill 2019 amends the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Act 2006 (the OPGGS Act) to enable title administration and regulation of a greenhouse gas storage formation that straddles the boundary between state and Northern Territory coastal waters and Commonwealth waters, as well as to enhance the National Offshore Petroleum Safety Environmental Management Authority's (NOPSEMA's) ability to respond fully during an oil spill emergency.

The recently announced National Hydrogen Strategy highlights the economic opportunity the hydrogen export industry has for Australia.

Australia's abundant natural resources mean it could be one of the first countries to create a hydrogen export industry, helping to generate a significant number of Australian jobs and lay the foundations for a new hydrogen industry. This bill aims to help realise this opportunity for Australia. The Hydrogen Energy Supply Chain project relies on suitable carbon capture and storage that the CarbonNet Project will provide. This is the cheapest way to produce clean hydrogen.

The CarbonNet Project is investigating the feasibility for a commercial-scale, multi-user carbon capture and storage network in Gippsland, Victoria. The proposed storage site under the CarbonNet Project is one such site that straddles the boundary between Commonwealth waters and state and Northern Territory coastal waters. The Australian government has invested heavily in both the CarbonNet and Hydrogen Energy Supply Chain projects, providing total funding of almost $150 million. The two projects are highly interdependent.

To kickstart our new hydrogen industry, the bill will improve the current regulatory framework by amending the OPGGS Act to provide for single greenhouse gas titles that are partially located in Commonwealth waters and partially located in state and Northern Territory coastal waters. These amendments will further realise the benefits of Australia's resources sector and unlock the development of future resource projects that identify potential storage formations which straddle the jurisdictional boundary.

Once these amendments have passed, together with supporting state or Northern Territory legislation, a cross-boundary regulatory regime will be ready to be triggered. This regulatory regime starts with the creation of a Cross-boundary Authority, consisting of the responsible Commonwealth minister and the relevant state or Northern Territory resources minister. This
is similar to current joint authority arrangements for petroleum titles in Commonwealth waters. The Cross-boundary Authority will make decisions by consensus about the granting of cross-boundary greenhouse gas titles.

Upon the grant of the cross-boundary title, the title area becomes Commonwealth waters for all purposes of the OPGGS Act. The title area will be regulated under the OPGGS Act in the same way as other greenhouse gas titles located in Commonwealth waters. NOPSEMA will have regulatory responsibility for environmental management, safety and well integrity. Titles administration will be undertaken by the National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator.

The existing protections for precommencement petroleum titles and existing petroleum production licences, both in Commonwealth and state and Northern Territory waters, will be maintained. The amendments will also enable the unification of adjacent Commonwealth greenhouse gas titles where a titleholder has reasonable grounds to suspect that there is a geological formation that straddles the two title areas.

Through its other key measure, the bill will also strengthen and clarify the monitoring, inspection and enforcement powers of NOPSEMA within state and Northern Territory jurisdictions during an oil pollution emergency originating in Commonwealth waters.

The OPGGS Act currently does not provide adequate monitoring, inspection and enforcement powers, within state and Northern Territory jurisdictions, for NOPSEMA to ensure compliance by a titleholder within its environmental management obligations. The extension of NOPSEMA's powers in the bill is confined to the event of an oil pollution emergency originating from operations in Commonwealth waters.

The bill will amend the OPGGS Act to enable NOPSEMA inspectors to enter premises used for the implementation of oil spill response obligations without a warrant in the event of an oil pollution emergency arising from operations in Commonwealth waters. Premises also include an aircraft or vessel. NOPSEMA will be able to enter premises whether they are located in Commonwealth, state or Northern Territory jurisdictions. The delay caused by obtaining a warrant or consent can significantly impede compliance monitoring in such emergency circumstances and situations. During an offshore incident, NOPSEMA inspectors need real-time regulatory intelligence in dynamic situations, including monitoring and enforcing compliance across premises.

The warrant-free oil pollution environmental inspection powers will only be exercisable if the CEO of NOPSEMA is satisfied that there is an emergency that has resulted in, or may result, in oil pollution and declares an oil pollution emergency. NOPSEMA must publish a copy of the declaration on its website as soon as is practicable after the declaration is made, and must give a copy to the relevant titleholder.

When the CEO of NOPSEMA is satisfied that the emergency no longer exists, the CEO must revoke the declaration and publish a copy of the instrument of revocation on NOPSEMA's website as soon as possible after making. A copy of the revocation will also be provided to the relevant titleholder.

The amendments will enable NOPSEMA to monitor whether a titleholder is in compliance with its oil spill response obligations and take enforcement action in the event of noncompliance. The bill will also amend the OPGGS Act to extend the operation of polluter-
pays obligations and the application of significant incident directions that may be given by NOPSEMA to areas of state and Northern Territory jurisdiction.

Finally, the bill makes minor technical amendments to improve the operation of the OPGGS Act.

Overall, the bill underscores this government’s ongoing commitment to the maintenance and continuous improvement of a strong and effective regulatory framework for offshore petroleum and greenhouse gas storage. Further, the bill ensures the regulatory framework’s alignment with international best practice and aims to attract investment in new technologies and industries for Australia.

I commend this bill to the chamber.

Debate adjourned.

Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Regulatory Levies) Amendment (Miscellaneous Measures) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill presented by Mrs Marino.

Second Reading

Mrs MARINO (Forrest—Assistant Minister for Regional Development and Territories) (11:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Regulatory Levies) Amendment (Miscellaneous Measures) Bill 2019 amends the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage (Regulatory Levies) Act 2003 (the levies act) to clarify the application of levies in relation to cross-boundary greenhouse gas titles, as well as to the Crown in right of the states and the Northern Territory.

Amendments to the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Act 2006 (the OPGGS Act) included in the Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment (Cross-boundary Greenhouse Gas Titles and Other Measures) Bill 2019 (the cross-boundary titles bill) provide for the grant of cross-boundary greenhouse gas titles over an area that includes both Commonwealth waters and state or Northern Territory coastal waters.

Amendments to the OPGGS Act included in the cross-boundary titles bill also provide that greenhouse gas related provisions of the OPGGS Act and the regulations apply, and are taken to always have applied, to the states and the Northern Territory. These amendments are intended to remove any doubt about the validity of greenhouse gas assessment permits that have been granted to the Crown in right of Victoria.

The National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA) and the National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator both operate on a cost-recovery basis. This bill removes any doubt that levies imposed by the levies act are effectively imposed on cross-boundary greenhouse gas titles, including the part of a title that is in state or Northern Territory coastal waters, and that the levies act applies to the Crown in right of each of the states and the Northern Territory. In effect, this means that levies are
imposed in relation to regulatory activities undertaken in respect of greenhouse gas titles held by a state or the Northern Territory.

The amendments included in this bill will not change the substance or practical effect of the levies act. The purpose of retrospective application is to validate past payments of annual titles administration levy by the Crown in right of Victoria under the levies act. No person will be disadvantaged as a result of retrospectivity.

I commend this bill to the chamber.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEES
Regional Australia Select Committee
Membership

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Andrews) (11:19): The Speaker has received advice from the Chief Opposition Whip that he has nominated Mr Zappia to be a member of the Select Committee on Regional Australia in place of Ms LM Chesters.

Mrs MARINO (Forrest—Assistant Minister for Regional Development and Territories) (11:19): by leave—I move:

That Ms L. M. Chesters be discharged from the Select Committee on Regional Australia and that, in her place, Mr Zappia be appointed a member of the committee.

Question agreed to.

Intelligence and Security Joint Committee
Report

Mr HASTIE (Canning) (11:20): On behalf of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security, I present the following reports: Annual report of committee activities 2018-2019 and Review of the renunciation by conduct and cessation provisions in the Australian Citizenship Act 2007.

Reports made parliamentary papers in accordance with standing order 39(e).

Mr HASTIE: by leave—Firstly, I will speak to the annual report. Each year the committee provides the Australian parliament with an annual report describing activities undertaken during the financial year in recognition of the importance of operating as transparently as possible.

The 2018-19 financial year was a very demanding one for the committee. Aside from undertaking our annual oversight of the national intelligence community, the committee reviewed several important national security bills as they passed through the Australian parliament.

This included:

• transforming and modernising the Office of National Assessments into the Office of National Intelligence and mandating that agency to provide leadership, coordination and guidance to the broader intelligence community;
• expanding the powers available to officers of the Australian Secret Intelligence Service and agents to use weapons, self-defence techniques and reasonable force to protect themselves; and

• strengthening the ability of Australia's law enforcement and national security agencies to deal with the challenges of encrypted communications.

These reviews provided a classified and collaborative opportunity for members from both sides of the chamber to examine draft national security legislation in a detailed manner. My colleagues and I worked cooperatively to ensure that these bills struck the right balance between protecting civil liberties and empowering intelligence and enforcement agencies to keep Australians safe. I thank members for their diligence throughout the year on what was a demanding work program.

The 2018-19 financial year also encompassed the 30th anniversary of the committee's operation. Our annual report reflects on the evolution of the committee and looks forward to possible future developments.

The committee's role and place within the national security architecture has changed considerably since the first Parliamentary Joint Committee on the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation was appointed in 1988 to provide oversight of ASIO.

Since then the committee's oversight responsibilities have expanded across the Australian intelligence community.

We now examine the administration and expenditure of intelligence agencies annually. These reviews provide an important transparency mechanism; ensuring that agencies remain accountable to the Australian parliament.

We have also developed substantial responsibilities in refining national security legislation to build bipartisan consensus in the Australian national interest.

The committee anticipates further evolution of its role and responsibilities over the coming parliaments as the recommendations of the Independent Intelligence Review and the Richardson Review of the Legal Framework Governing the National Intelligence Community are implemented.


In 2015, the coalition government introduced amendments to the Citizenship Act via the Australian Citizenship Amendment (Allegiance to Australia) Bill 2015. The legislative changes broadened the powers of the minister relating to the cessation of Australian citizenship for individuals engaging in terrorism and for those who are a serious threat to Australia and Australian interests.

The Intelligence Services Act 2001 requires the committee to undertake a statutory review of these citizenship cessation provisions, examining their operation and effectiveness and any further implications of their functioning.

In terms of the effectiveness of the provision, the committee notes evidence from ASIO that it is 'too early to determine any direct deterrent effects or other security outcomes among
the individuals whose citizenship has ceased pursuant to sections 33AA and 35’. While noting that citizenship cessation is a useful counterterrorism tool in some circumstances, the committee also accepts that the use of such a tool may have unintended consequences and so must be subject to limitations and safeguards, and be regularly reviewed.

The committee found that, as the conduct provisions currently operate, the minister's role is effectively limited to restoring a person's citizenship after it has been lost or exempting a person from the effect of those provisions, which is due to the provisions' automatic nature.

Following an in-depth and considered review the committee found that the current 'operation of law' model, whereby a dual-national's Australian citizenship is automatically renounced through their actions, should be replaced by a ministerial decision-making model. Such a model would allow the minister to take into account a broader range of considerations in determining whether to cease an individual's citizenship. This determination was founded on advice from national security agencies which advised the committee that further flexibility was required to make use of citizenship cessation to maximum effect.

I note that the government has proposed such a ministerial decision-making model in the upcoming Australian Citizenship Amendment (Citizenship Cessation) Bill 2019. The committee is currently finalising its report on the bill, ensuring that the proposed amendments operate as effectively as possible.

With respect to reporting requirements under section 51C of the Australian Citizenship Act 2007, the committee found that further information in this area should be provided to it, especially regarding information contained in ASIO's qualified security assessments. The committee expects that, subject to particular sensitivities, ASIO's qualified security assessments will be provided to the committee to further enable regular oversight and ensure that the reporting requirements under the Citizenship Act are being fulfilled. I commend these reports to the House. Thank you.

Mr DREYFUS (Isaacs—Deputy Manager of Opposition Business) (11:26): by leave—In 2018 the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security celebrated 30 years of operation. As set out in this annual report of the committee's activities in 2018-19, the committee's role and place within the national security architecture has changed considerably over that 30-year period. Today the work of the committee is more important than ever.

The year 2018-19 was one in which bipartisanship on national security issues showed visible signs of fraying. For the first time since the election of the Abbott government in 2013, the Liberal government failed to implement in full unanimous recommendations made by Labor and Liberal members of the intelligence and security committee. That was in relation to the assistance and access bill. For the first time since the election of the Abbott government in 2013, Labor members of the intelligence and security committee broke with our Liberal colleagues to issue a minority report. That was in respect of the strengthening the citizenship loss provisions bill, a bill that has not been proceeded with. Notably, both of these events occurred after the current Prime Minister assumed office.

In his valedictory speech, the former Attorney-General, Senator George Brandis, listed three reasons why our domestic national security policy had been successful during his time as Attorney-General. The second reason he listed was bipartisanship. Referring to eight
national security bills introduced by the Abbott and Turnbull governments and supported by Labor, Senator Brandis said this:

All eight tranches of legislation were passed with the opposition's support after scrutiny by the PJCIS. It was a fine example of government and parliament working hand in hand to protect the national interest. I have heard some powerful voices argue that the coalition should open a political front against the Labor Party on the issue of domestic national security. I could not disagree more strongly. One of the main reasons why the government has earned the confidence of the public on national security policy is there has never been a credible suggestion that political motives have intruded. Were they to do so, confidence not just in the government's handling of national security but in the agencies themselves would be damaged and their capacity to do their work compromised. Nothing could be more irresponsible than to hazard the safety of the public by creating a confected dispute for political advantage.

I disagreed with Senator Brandis on many matters, but on this issue he was absolutely correct. When politicians seek to use national security as a political weapon it's bad for our country, it's bad for our security agencies and, ultimately, it's bad for our national security. I would ask that the current Prime Minister and the Minister for Home Affairs reflect carefully on those comments by Senator Brandis over the Christmas break.

The intelligence and security committee had a busy year in 2018-19. It held over 53 hours of meetings, undertook 16 inquiries and finalised 11 reports. Critically, the committee made dozens of bipartisan recommendations to significantly improve national security legislation. All of those recommendations were accepted by the government, though, regrettably, not all of them have been fully implemented.

The numbers only tell some of the story. On 1 July 2018 the Department of Home Affairs was barely six months old. Until its establishment the Attorney-General's Department was responsible for most national security policy and legislation, and ASIO, the AFP and a number of other national security agencies sat within the Attorney-General's portfolio. The upshot of this relatively new state of affairs was that the Department of Home Affairs, not the Attorney-General's Department, had responsibility for most of the new national security bills reviewed by the committee during 2018-19.

It has not all been smooth sailing. Regrettably, under the leadership of the Minister for Home Affairs, the quality of the new department's engagement with the intelligence and security committee in 2018-19 often fell well below the standard that one would expect from the department tasked with safeguarding Australia's national security. The department regularly produced threadbare submissions on significant national security bills which provided very little, if any, assistance to the committee. The department rarely, if ever, responded promptly to questions on notice and often failed to provide direct responses to basic questions.

Over the course of 2018-19, the committee also heard disturbing evidence about the lack of coordination between the Department of Home Affairs and key agencies in relation to the development of national security legislation. The department learned, for example, that the first time that the Inspector-General of Intelligence and Security and the Commonwealth Ombudsman saw the final draft of the Assistance and Access Bill was after it was introduced into the parliament. That is no way to develop national security legislation. It was also deeply iconic, given the primary rationale for the establishment of Home Affairs was to improve coordination between agencies.
To be fair to the department, the Inspector-General of Intelligence and Security recently told Senate estimates that coordination between her office and the Department of Home Affairs has ’improved significantly since the beginning of this year’. That was very heartening to hear. I commend the department for the work it has clearly done to improve its relationship with the inspector-general. Closer coordination between the department and the office of the inspector-general can only result in improvements to the quality of national security legislation and that can only be a good thing for the parliament and for the country. I hope to see the department make a similar effort to improve the quality of its engagement with the intelligence and security committee over the course of 2019-20.

I will conclude by touching on some positives from 2018-19. Generally speaking, and I think I can say this on behalf of my colleagues, committee members have been impressed by the level of assistance that the AFP, ASIO and other security agencies have provided to the committee. Those agencies have provided the committee with regular and detailed briefings, produced helpful submissions and responded promptly to questions from committee members.

The current government exerted an extraordinary amount of pressure on the committee in 2018-19, and much of that pressure was borne with grace and professionalism by the staff of the secretariat. I acknowledge and thank staff members of the secretariat for their work and support they provided, and continue to provide, to committee members.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the work done by my colleagues on the committee over the course of 2018-19, Labor and Liberal. In many ways it was a difficult year. The committee dealt with very complex and highly contentious legislation in a highly charged and highly partisan political environment. In particular, I would like to thank my friend and colleague the member for Holt for the work that he did, and the work that he continues to do, as deputy chair of the committee. I’d also like to commend the member for Canning for the way in which he conducted himself as chair of the committee over the course of 2018-19. He and I have had our fair share of disagreements, but even in the face of enormous pressure from senior members of the executive government I have always found him to be a professional, fair and principled chair of this committee.

### BILLS

**Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019**

**Second Reading**

Consideration resumed of the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

to which the following amendment was moved:

That all words after "That" be omitted with a view to substituting the following words:

"whilst not declining to give the bill a second reading, the House notes that the Government’s revolving door of sports ministers—no less than five (plus a briefly acting minister) in just six years—have made ad hoc, one-off and non-ongoing funding announcements that have made it extremely difficult for national sports organisations, such as the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority, to make detailed plans beyond the constraints of a single budget cycle, including for the enhancement of their own integrity capabilities".
Mr ALEXANDER (Bennelong) (11:35): Australia is a proud sporting nation with a history of performing well above the level that would normally be expected of a nation our size. From Fred Spofforth to Ash Barty, Australia has always competed at the top level and often been victorious. But Australians don't just expect our sportspeople to win; they expect them to do so fairly and within the rules. Where they don't do this, we expect them to face the music. The sanctions placed on the Australian cricket team for ball tampering were way in excess of the standard punishment for their crimes, showing how we place our sportspeople on a pedestal and expect them to report to a higher standard. We as Australians can't stand unfair behaviour on the field, and athletes like Mack Horton have faced flak from other nations for standing up for these more moral principles. But we can only point the finger because we know our internal systems are robust. Australia has obligations under the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation International Convention Against Doping in Sport to abide by the principles of the World Anti-Doping Code. The Wood Review of Australia's Sports Integrity Arrangements recommended a range of enhancements to the capabilities of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority, ASADA, including through changes to legislation to counteract the increased sophistication of doping practices.

This bill, the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill, will assist ASADA to adapt and harmonise its functions to combat the complex and evolving nature of doping in sport. A version of this bill was introduced into the previous parliament. The election and subsequent introduction of this parliament has allowed for additional consultation to be undertaken with stakeholders in both the private and public sectors. As a result, the explanatory materials have been updated to provide greater clarity and context to the proposed amendments in the bill.

The following changes have been made since the bill's first introduction in the previous parliament: an amendment to allow ASADA's secrecy provisions to be included within schedule 3 of the Freedom of Information Act 1992, and very minor and consequential amendments to harmonise operation with the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019. Many of the proposed amendments will have the effect of streamlining of administrative procedures in relation to anti-doping rule violations, which will reduce the burden on sports, athletes and support personnel and are supported by the feedback of stakeholders. These changes include the removal of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation Panel from the rule violation process and the removal of a pathway for review by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal of a preliminary anti-doping rule violation decision by the CEO of ASADA. Importantly, abolition of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation Panel will not affect the existing right of a participant to have a fair hearing of an allegation of an anti-doping violation. In fact, abolition of the process should serve to expedite the participant's opportunity to have a fair hearing. There will be additional protections against civil action for those working in sports bodies who are expected, under the current anti-doping arrangements, to take forward allegations of anti-doping rule violations within their sport when acting in good faith.

These protections match the existing protections for ASADA staff, and the extension of the immunity is a reflection of the fact that a sport may be required to do things as a result of
ASADA's exercise of its legislative functions. By enhancing statutory protections of information provided to a sporting organisation, there can be greater information-sharing between ASADA and the sporting bodies, which will ensure security around the release of private information of those involved in possible anti-doping processes, while maintaining the ability to seek out violations. The amendment to the Freedom of Information Act 1982 will provide appropriate guarantees to athletes, support personnel and national sporting organisations around the protection of their information, including sensitive medical and health information. It will also provide consistency of information protection between ASADA and the proposed National Sports Tribunal. These changes will ensure that athletes can have confidence that they are playing on an even field, and Australians can have faith not only that the sports that we're watching are fair but that our Australian sports men and women are representing our country with the same ideals of fairness and equality that their forebears have had for over 100 years.

Mr STEVENS (Sturt) (11:40): I start by commending my colleague—

Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (11:41): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the member for Sturt be no further heard.

The House divided. [11:45]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ......................58
Noes ......................73
Majority ...............15

AYES

Aly, A
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Freelander, MR (teller)
Giles, AJ
Gosling, LJ
Hill, JC
Jones, SP
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Leigh, AK
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
Murphy, PJ
O'Neil, CE
Payne, AE
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Stanley, AM (teller)

Bird, SL
Burke, AS
Burns, J
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Coker, EA
Conroy, PM
Dreyfus, MA
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georganas, S
Gorman, P
Hayes, CP
Hasic, EN
Kearney, G
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Mulino, D
O'Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Perrett, GD
Rishworth, AL
Smith, DPB
Swanson, MJ
AYES

Templeman, SR
Thuaites, KL
Watts, TG
Wilson, JH

Thistlethwaite, MJ
Vamvakinou, M
Wells, AS
Zappia, A

NOES

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KJ
Archer, BK
Broadbent, RE
Christensen, GR
Connelly, V
Drum, DK (teller)
Entsch, WG
Falinski, JG
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Haines, H
Hastie, AW
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A
Leeer, J
Littleproud, D
Marino, NB
McCormack, MF
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O'Brien, T
Pearce, GB
Price, ML
Robert, SR
Sharma, DN
Stevens, J
Taylor, AJ
Thompson, P
van Manen, AJ
Webster, AE
Willie, AD
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG
Zimmerman, T

Allen, K
Andrews, KL
Bell, AM
Bachholz, S
Conaghan, PJ
Coulton, M
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hammond, CM
Hawke, AG
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Ley, SP
Liu, G
Martin, FB
McIntosh, MI
Morrison, SJ
O'Brien, LS
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sharkie, RCC
Simmonds, J
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Tudge, AE
Wallace, AB
Wicks, LE
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Young, T

Question negatived.

Mr STEVENS (Sturt) (11:49): I thank the House for their support for me to remark on this antidoping bill. In the speaking time left, I might reflect—as it's quite important—on the Labor Party's sorry and sad history on a particular matter of doping. That is the South Australian Labor government's financial support of now disgraced cyclist Lance Armstrong, someone they paid an inordinate amount of money to attract to South Australia and compete
We now know, after the expiration of the 10-year gag clause in the contract that the South Australian government and Lance Armstrong signed, that he was paid the princely sum of $1½ million—that's a lot of lycra—to come to Adelaide for six days. That didn't include the first-class airfares and the hotel expenses and all the rest of it. Now that this contract is in the public domain, after 10 years, it's interesting to see what it did and didn't include. It certainly did include the requirement for Lance Armstrong to do press conferences with the Labor Premier and participate in all kinds of public relations exercises. As I said, it was adjacent to a state election. He had to be the Premier's best friend, smile for the cameras and have dinner with him. What wasn't in the contract, interestingly, was any potential to claw back that money if Lance Armstrong brought the Tour Down Under into disrepute—say, I don't know, by being exposed as the leader of one of the greatest drug-doping rings in sports history? That is what Labor were complicit in, and it went on for three years. They weren't interested in the reputation of the Tour Down Under. They weren't interested after it transpired what Lance Armstrong had been associated with. They couldn't exercise a clause saying, 'We want that money back,' because they didn't even put one in the contract.

People like Lance Armstrong are looked up to by young kids, who treat these sportspeople as heroes. It doesn't matter whether it's cycling or cricket or tennis. In our country and in our culture, sport is one of the great pastimes—watching it, participating in it. For young people in particular, it is so very important that there are some things that entertain them that don't involve sitting inside on the couch in front of a television. We want kids to have that passionate interest in sport and being outdoors, exercising their minds and exercising their bodies. Part of their sporting ambition is because they have these heroes that they see on the television competing for our country and competing for their favourite sporting team. So those people have a responsibility to set a very high standard in sportsmanship, which includes, as the member for Bennelong commented, seeking to win but doing it fairly and making sure that people understand that principle, and that that's what they should pursue in their own interest in sport and, frankly, their whole lives—fighting hard and fighting fair.

ASADA is a very important institution in this country because, of course, it provides integrity around that and confidence around that. I think that, generally speaking, Australian sports men and women have the highest reputation in the world when it comes to fair play and fair conduct, and it's because of organisations like ASADA providing that guarantee. But it is important, obviously, every now and then to change and enhance and improve the processes that are put in place, to anticipate different developments and changes related to those people who do seek to do the wrong thing. It's highly appropriate that the House consider and, hopefully, support this bill this morning, because it will give ASADA the enhanced framework that they need in order to keep up their vigilant work to make sure that Australian sport is clean so that everyone can participate in sporting pursuits in this country with the confidence that the best person on the field, in the pool or on the court is the one that is going to be successful and win out.

I'm very proud as the member for Sturt of the excellent sporting pedigree of my electorate. I point out that probably the most famous sportsperson in Australian history is from the electorate of Sturt, Sir Donald Bradman, who was from the Kensington Cricket Club and was
a great president of the South Australian Cricket Association. And there are many others. He's
the sort of person that's still looked up to by young people in that particular pursuit in my
electorate, across the country and across the world, because he was renowned for not only his
prowess on the field but his sportsmanship. It's sportspeople like Sir Donald Bradman who
have set such a very high standard, and ASADA need changes like those in this bill that we're
debating this morning to put them in a position to maintain that reputation well into the future.
I commend this bill to the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Andrews): The question is that the amendment be agreed
to.

A division having been called and the bells being rung—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, my mistake; the division is cancelled. The member for
Reid was seeking the call. I call the member for Reid.

Dr MARTIN (Reid) (11:56): It could be said that my electorate of Reid is the heart of
sport in Sydney. Reid is home to Sydney Olympic Park, where everyone from young soccer
players to Olympians train and compete. My electorate has hosted the Sydney Olympics,
NRL grand finals—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Andrews): The member for Reid will just resume her
seat for the moment. The member for McMahon?

Mr Bowen: I don't wish to unnecessarily delay the House, but I do want to clarify, though.
The member for Reid may be speaking on the bill which is listed next. I think she may be
mistaken about the bill before the House. I don't mean to cause trouble, but I do want to be
clear what bill is before the House.

Government members interjecting—

Mr Bowen: It doesn't happen very often.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand what the member for McMahon has said.
However, I've given the call to the member for Reid. If she wishes to continue on this bill, she
has the call. No? The question then is that the amendment be agreed to. I call the minister.

Mr Littleproud: The member for Reid stood up after the division was terminated by the
Deputy Speaker, and then she's sat down. As the minister, I've stood up to do the summing-up
speech.
Mr Burke: On the point of order, the point goes to when the division was called off. If the division was called off without there being leave sought from the House or agreement from both sides of the House, I'm not sure how a division, once declared by the chair, can be called off.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I say to the Manager of Opposition Business that, if there's any mistake here, it's by the chair. I didn't see the member for Reid on her feet; I then gave her the call. The division will still occur. I think it would aid the House if you allow the minister to sum up, and then, obviously, there will be a division.

An opposition member interjecting—

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (11:59): I can sum it up, and we can get it done. The fight against doping in sport continues to get tougher. The key factor in addressing doping across the world is the unrelenting commitment of the international sporting movement and the government's work together to implement harmonised programs that are robust, effective and fair.

Australia continues to be at the front of the fight against doping in sport. To ensure that we remain there, Australia's antidoping capability needs to be enhanced. We need to streamline the antidoping rule violation process and reinvest those efficiencies back into ASADA and sporting organisations to enhance intelligence and investigation capability and education resources to support athletes across all sports and all levels. This bill amends the ASADA Act to enable key measures to be implemented so that Australia meets its obligations to contribute to a safe and fair sporting environment, safeguards athlete health, and continues to protect the fundamental values of sport. I thank the members for their contributions to the debate on this bill and I commend the bill to the House.

The SPEAKER: The original question was that this bill be read a second time. To this, the honourable member for Shortland has moved an amendment that all words after ‘that’ be omitted with a view to substituting other words. The immediate question before the House is that the amendment moved by the member for Shortland be agreed to.
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Question negatived.

The SPEAKER (12:07): The question now is that the bill be read a second time.

Question agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (12:07): I seek leave of the House to move the third reading immediately.

Leave not granted.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I move:

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the motion for the third reading being moved without delay.

Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (12:08): In speaking to the motion, those opposite need to consider: every time they get the opportunity to shut down members on this side, they take it. Every time the Leader of the Opposition stands up—

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (12:08): I move:

That the Member be no longer be heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the Manager of Opposition Business be no further heard.
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Question agreed to.

**The SPEAKER** (12:14): The question is that the motion moved by the minister be agreed to.

**Mr BOWEN** (McMahon) (12:15): This is a government so afraid of what the Leader of the Opposition might have to say—

**Mr LITTLEPROUD** (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (12:15): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

**The SPEAKER:** The question is that the member for McMahon be no further heard.
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Question agreed to.
The SPEAKER (12:17): The question is that the motion moved by the minister be agreed to.

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (12:17): They are so scared of Albo that they won't give him 10 minutes!

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (12:17): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the member for Shortland be no further heard.

The House divided. [12:18]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)
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Question agreed to.

**The SPEAKER** (12:20): The question is that the motion moved by the minister be agreed to.

Ms CATHERINE KING (Ballarat) (12:20): The Prime Minister wants to silence everybody.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ballarat will resume her seat. The minister.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (12:20): I move:

That the question be now put.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be put. Members must remain in their seats unless they're changing their vote or did not vote in the previous division, in which case they must report to the tellers.

The House divided. [12:21]
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Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (12:22): The question now is that this bill be read a third time.

Mr Burke: The third reading has not been moved, because the minister's motion has not been put.

The SPEAKER: This is what happens when we have successive division upon successive division. The question is that the motion moved by the minister be agreed to.

The House divided. [12:24]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 74
Noes ...................... 59
Majority .................. 15

AYES

Alexander, JG  Allen, K
Andrews, KJ  Andrews, KL
Archer, BK  Bell, AM
Broadbent, RE  Buchholz, S
Chester, D  Christensen, GR
Conaghan, PJ  Connelly, V
Coulton, M  Drum, DK (teller)
Dutton, PC  Entsch, WG
Evans, TM  Falinski, JG
Fletcher, PW  Flint, NJ
Frydenberg, JA  Gee, AR
Gillespie, DA  Haines, H

CHAMBER
AYES

Hammond, CM
Hawke, AG
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Ley, SP
Liu, G
Martin, FB
McIntosh, MI
Morrison, SJ
O’Brien, LS
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Ramsey, RE
Sharkie, RCC
Simmonds, J
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Tudge, AE
Wallace, AB
Wicks, LE
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Young, T

Hastie, AW
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
Marino, NB
McCormack, MF
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O’Brien, T
Pearce, GB
Price, ML
Robert, SR
Sharma, DN
Stevens, J
Taylor, AJ
Thompson, P
van Manen, AJ
Webster, AE
Wilkie, AD
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG
Zimmerman, T

NOES

Albanese, AN
Bird, SL
Burke, AS
Burns, J
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Coker, EA
Conroy, PM
Dreyfus, MA
Freelander, MR (teller)
Gorman, P
Hayes, CP
Husic, EN
Kearney, G
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Mulino, D
Neumann, SK
O’Neil, CE
Payne, AE
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Stanley, AM (teller)

Aly, A
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Georganas, S
Gosling, LJ
Hill, JC
Jones, SP
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Leigh, AK
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
Murphy, PJ
O’Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Perrett, GD
Rishworth, AL
Smith, DPB
Steggall, Z
Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (12:25): I move:

That the bill be now read a third time.

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (12:25): I can confirm that Labor will be supporting the third reading of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia’s Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019, which is a very important outcome of the Wood review into antidoping. But let's be clear about what just happened here. What happened here is that those opposite have attempted to shut down parliament because they're scared of the Leader of the Opposition.

If we're talking about antidoping, those on the other side are truly dopes. They are truly dopes. This is an important piece of legislation that comes out of the Wood review and gives ASADA important powers into confirming the antidoping regime in this country. It arose out of some very important sporting events of the last decade. Who can forget the scandals in the Manly and Essendon football clubs, where we saw vile accusations around antidoping? This is an important legislative initiative, and that is why Labor is supporting it.

This bill complements the second bill that we'll be discussing around enhancing integrity in Australia, and it's very important that we have confidence in the sporting regime in this country. The Wood review, led by Justice Wood, was a seminal moment in the sports regime in this country. It's very important that it has bipartisan commitment. Recommendation 18 from the Wood review went to many matters. Most importantly, it was about providing ASADA with the relevant powers to really get to the nub of those sports scandals. There were accusations around calf blood with Manly and Essendon, and it's very important we get to the nub of those matters.

Our second reading amendment, which, sadly, we lost the vote on, stated:

"whilst not declining to give the bill a second reading, the House notes that the Government’s revolving door of sports ministers—no less than five (plus a briefly acting minister) in just six years—have made ad hoc, one-off and non-ongoing funding announcements that have made it extremely difficult for national sports organisations, such as the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority, to make detailed plans beyond the constraints of a single budget cycle, including for the enhancement of their own integrity capabilities"

So this bill seeks to strengthen Australia's capability to prevent, detect and deal with the issue of doping in sport.

Confidence in the integrity of sport is vital and it leads us, if it fails, to question whether sporting events we love to watch are really being contested on a level playing field. In government, Labor recognised the need to upgrade and update Australia's antidoping regime to keep up with new and evolving risks. In 2012, the federal Labor government established
the National Integrity of Sport Unit and in 2013 we passed legislation to strengthen the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority's powers. So this bill is a continuation of those important legislative reforms.

But let's be clear about what's occurred over the last hour. What's occurred over this last hour is the direct price being paid because those opposite want to shut down parliament. They wouldn't let the Leader of the Opposition speak on the very important matter of wages. This is the price that's being paid and, in fact—

Mr Littleproud: On a point of order: I think the honourable member is straying from the topic of the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Goodenough): I will call the member for Shortland, but please be relevant.

Mr CONROY: I was reflecting on broad tendencies around doping in the country, particularly the dopes on the other side.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member to withdraw—

Mr CONROY: It was a collective application of 'dope'. I didn't call any individual over there a dope, so I don't think there is anything to withdraw. The standing orders make it very clear that it is individual reflections that are against the standing orders. I was reflecting on a collective of the coalition, but, to assist parliament, I will withdraw it, because I'm a true gentleman!

The important nature of this bill is that it goes to the Wood review, which had 52 recommendations. This pertains to recommendation No. 18, which I was talking about, which is that ASADA's regulatory role and engagement with sports in relation to the audit and enforcement of sports compliance with antidoping rules and approved policies be enhanced by establishing regulatory compliance powers exercisable by a proposed NSIC in collaboration with, and at the request of, the ASADA CEO. This bill, to some extent, seeks to implement that recommendation. However, I note the review also recommends retaining ASADA as Australia's national antidoping organisation, whereas the government has decided to bring antidoping operations under the umbrella of a new agency, Sport Integrity Australia. That agency will be established by the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019, which will be debated later, it's in response to another recommendation of the Wood review, which calls for the establishment of a national sports integrity commission. In conclusion, Labor is opposed to doping in sport, opposed to doping in politics and opposed to the dopes on the other side of this chamber. I support the passage of the bill.

Question agreed to.

Migration Amendment (Repairing Medical Transfers) Bill 2019

Returned from Senate

Message received from the Senate returning the bill without amendment.
Consideration resumed of the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (12:32): I rise to speak on the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019. I move:

"whilst not declining to give the bill a second reading, the House notes that the government's patchy approach to sport continues, with three different ministers having had carriage of sports integrity reforms in just two years, resulting in uncertainty for athletes and other parts of the sport sector in relation to sports integrity reform".

Australia has a long and proud history as a sporting nation. From backyard games to the Boxing Day Test, from grassroots participation to competition on the national and international stage, sport has and continues to play an important role in our way of life and our national identity. Whenever we hear good news stories about sport at any level, those stories enhance the reputation of Australian sport and our love for it. But reports of doping in sport and reports of match fixing damage and devalue Australian sports reputation and our relationship with it.

Labor, when in government, was proactive in deploying measures to protect against those and other threats to the integrity of sport in Australia. We recognised the need to evaluate the effectiveness of Australia's sports integrity measures and to upgrade and update those measures when needed to address changing environments and new threats.

In 2012, the Labor federal government established a National Integrity of Sport Unit, and in 2013 we passed legislation to strengthen the Australian Sports Anti-doping Authority's powers, but threats to the integrity of Australia's sports continue to evolve, and so must our protective measures. In response to those ever-evolving risks, the government announced the review of the sports integrity arrangements in August 2017. The panel that conducted the review was chaired by Justice James Wood, and the review has come to be known as the Wood review.

The government received the Wood review in March 2018 and released its response to the review in February of this year. It is a detailed and extensive review, with nearly 300 pages and containing 52 recommendations. One of those recommendations was the establishment of a national sports integrity commission to cohesively draw together and develop existing sports integrity capabilities, knowledge and expertise and to nationally coordinate all elements of the sports integrity threat response, including prevention, monitoring, detection, investigation and enforcement.

The Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sports Integrity Australia) Bill 2019 seeks to implement the government's response to that recommendation. The bill would allow a new Australian government agency, to be known as Sport Integrity Australia, designed to protect the integrity of Australian sport. It is proposed that the new agency will bring together a range of sports integrity functions that are currently the responsibility of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority, the National Integrity of Sport Unit and Sport...
Australia. To paraphrase from the review, a centrally coordinated response to sports integrity issues will help overcome the silo effect that currently exists, with multiple bodies, including NSOs, law enforcement and regulatory agencies, engaged in protecting sports from threats. The review also noted that difficulties in securing a coordinated response are compounded by our federated system, in which there are differences in state, territory and federal regulatory and criminal laws.

Protecting Australia's sports integrity is a goal that has bipartisan support. Labor intends to continue that bipartisan approach by supporting the establishment of Sport Integrity Australia through these bills. Labor has engaged with stakeholders across the sports sector and taken into account their views on the reforms that would be implemented by this bill and the associated Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019.

While the majority of feedback has been supportive, some stakeholders have raised specific concerns regarding certain specific aspects of this bill and the enhancing Australia's antidoping capability bill. In relation to this bill, the Scrutiny Of Bills Committee is seeking advice from the Minister for Youth and Sport as to why it is considered appropriate to provide members of the Sport Integrity Australia advisory council with civil immunity so that affected persons have the right to bring action to enforce their legal rights limited to situations where lack of good faith is shown.

The scrutiny committee has also asked for more detailed advice as to why it's considered necessary and appropriate for Sport Integrity Australia to be an enforcement body for the purpose of the Privacy Act 1988. Specifically, the committee has noted that consideration of this aspect of the bill will be helped by further explanation of how Sport Integrity Australia's enforcement related activities will be undertaken in practice, including the nature of the enforcement powers and who will be exercising the enforcement powers.

These scrutiny committee concerns largely mirror the issues that some stakeholders have raised with Labor. Broadly speaking, these concerns are related to appropriate checks and balances ensuring that, in bolstering Australia's defences against sports integrity threats, the rights of individuals are not inappropriately eroded. In recognition of the concerns, the Senate has referred this bill to the Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee for a short inquiry to report on 3 February next year. Labor hopes that process will enable stakeholders that still have concerns to outline these issues and allow them to be appropriately considered before this bill is passed in its final form. The Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019 has been referred for inquiry over the same time frame given its connection with this bill.

Given the great value of sport to Australians and our society and economy, protecting the integrity of Australian sport is something Labor supports. Labor will continue to engage with stakeholders, the government and the crossbench through the community affairs committee inquiry on the establishment of Sport Integrity Australia. We will also continue to work to ensure that government's response to the recommendations of the Wood review effectively protects the important role sport plays in our Australian way of life now and into the future. Labor will support the passage of this bill in this place, noting its referral in the other place to the Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee. We reserve the right to move
amendments to this bill based on the outcomes of that committee inquiry process. Labor supports integrity and truthfulness in sport.

I conclude by correcting the record on the member for Sturt's outrageous previous claim that Don Bradman was from South Australia. Don Bradman was a proud Bowral boy from New South Wales, yet again emphasising the fact that New South Wales is the premier state for sport as it is for all other things! I commend the bill to the House.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Goodenough):** Is the amendment seconded?

**Mr Thistlethwaite:** I second the amendment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The original question was that this bill be now read a second time. To this the honourable member for Shortland has moved as an amendment that all words after 'that' be omitted with a view to substituting other words. The question now is the amendment be agreed to.

Debate adjourned.

**Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019**

**Third Reading**

Bill read a third time.

**Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019**

**Second Reading**

Consideration resumed of the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

to which the following amendment was moved:

That all words after "That" be omitted with a view to substituting the following words:

"whilst not declining to give the bill a second reading, the House notes that the government's patchy approach to sport continues, with three different ministers having had carriage of sports integrity reforms in just two years, resulting in uncertainty for athletes and other parts of the sport sector in relation to sports integrity reform".

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Goodenough) (12:40):** The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

**Mr ALEXANDER (Bennelong) (12:40):** As I said in relation to the previous bill, integrity on the sports field is important. As sportspeople we look across the net and expect the person facing us be to playing by the same rules and competing on a fair field—of course, if you're playing against the great Romanian Ilie Nastase it's a bit tricky! Currently, the assurances that this is the case come from an impractically large number of agencies from the ASADA, the National Integrity of Sport Unit in the Department of Health, and the relevant national sports integrity functions of Sport Australia. This bill will make the logical step of establishing Sports Integrity Australia to unite this disparate group.

At the heart of the Wood review was the recommendation accepted by government that a new agency be established to cohesively draw together and develop existing sports integrity capabilities, knowledge and expertise. Commencing from July 2020, Sports Integrity
Australia will support all sports integrity stakeholders to manage the spectrum of sports-integrity related issues. Its focus will be on regulation, monitoring and intelligence, and policy and program delivery, including education and outreach.

A version of this bill was introduced into the previous parliament. The election and subsequent need for re-introduction have allowed for additional consultation to be undertaken with stakeholders in both the private and public sectors. Changes to the bill since its first introduction include updates to the object of the act and to the CEO's functions and powers to better reflect the role and remit of the new agency, amendments to provide for better information-sharing by the new agency, and minor and consequential amendments to harmonise operation with the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019.

In February the government committed to the establishment of Sport Integrity Australia in response to the review of Australia's sports integrity arrangements, the Wood review. The Wood review is the most comprehensive examination of sports integrity arrangements ever undertaken in Australia, and it found sports are challenged by a range of mounting integrity threats.

As part of a second tranche of reforms, which are currently under development, Sport Integrity Australia will have an enhanced intelligence and investigations function focusing on a broader range of sport integrity matters, including match fixing. In the interim, Sport Integrity Australia will maintain a close working relationship with the Sports Betting Integrity Unit within the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, a joint initiative of the National Integrity of Sport Unit, the ACIC and Sport Australia. The ability for entities to share information with Sports Integrity Australia and for Sport Integrity Australia to provide, where appropriate, information to relevant entities will be critical to successfully delivering its important function to the Australian community. The legislation has been drafted to allow for this in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles.

The new agency will act as Australia's national antidoping organisation and in time will also act as Australia's national platform for the purposes of the Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions, the Macolin convention, which was signed in January 2019 in a demonstration of this government's commitment to delivering critical sports integrity outcomes without delay.

The government released its response to the Wood review on 12 February 2019, committing to a range of important reforms, including the establishment of Sport Integrity Australia. The government's introduction of this bill is an important signal that this government remains firmly committed to protecting Australian sport from the increasingly sophisticated threats to its integrity. The amendments to the Privacy Act will bring Sport Integrity Australia within the definition of 'enforcement body', enabling stronger information intelligence sharing links with law enforcement agencies, allowing those organisations to disclose information to Sport Integrity Australia if the belief is formed that it would be necessary for the administration of anti-doping related activities.

The amendments to schedule 3 of the FOI Act exempt material from release under section 38 of the act where it is covered by the secrecy provision in the bill. While the FOI Act does provide some protection in relation to the release of material, including an athlete's personal
health and medical information, it does not provide the same guarantees as the specific secrecy provisions under the proposed Sport Integrity Australia legislation.

Through this bill and the creation of Sport Integrity Australia, the sporting community will benefit from an organisation that is able to cohesively draw together existing sports integrity capabilities and nationally coordinate all elements of the sports integrity threat response through a single agency. And by the way: Bradman was born in Cootamundra. He played his first cricket in Bowral, and my dad played against him!

Mr STEVENS (Sturt) (12:46): With a little trepidation—

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (12:46): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the member for Sturt be no further heard.

The House divided. [12:51]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 58
Noes ...................... 74
Majority ............... 16

AYES

Albanese, AN
Bird, SL
Burke, AS
Burns, J
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Coker, EA
Conroy, PM
Dreyfus, MA
Freelander, MR (teller)
Giles, AJ
Gosling, LJ
Husic, EN
Keane, G
Kalma, P
Kearney, G
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Mulino, D
Neumann, SK
O'Neil, CE
Payne, AE
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Stanley, AM (teller)
Templeman, SR
Thwaites, KL
Watts, TG
Wilson, JH

Aly, A
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Georganas, S
Gorman, P
Hayes, CP
Jones, SP
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Leigh, AK
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
Murphy, PJ
O'Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Perrett, GD
Rishworth, AL
Smith, DPB
Swanson, MJ
Thistlethwaite, MJ
Vanvakinou, M
Wells, AS
Zappia, A
Question negatived.

Mr STEVENS (Sturt) (12:56): It doesn't surprise me that Labor would try to shut down a debate on integrity. Integrity to them is like sunlight to a vampire—run away! This is not your topic; you don't want to face up to it. And I don't know why it is that every time I try to say a nice word about the member for Bennelong they shut me down, particularly on this topic, when it comes to integrity in sport. The member for Bennelong, one of the great athletes—a great Australian athlete, a fair athlete, a man who likes to win, which is why he's a member of the parliamentary Liberal Party!—I pay tribute to him and the contribution he's made to Australian sport and thank him for his contribution. I will just add a few words in the brief time that I now have left.

There's a great amount of logic, of course, in creating a single, unified integrity body to deal with these sport matters, as this bill proposes. I suspect, frankly, that there's going to be a
lot more of this, not just in sport but in other areas going forward, particularly in the modern era of the complexity and the spread of data that we've got available and the need to be sharing it much more effectively. It's very important that we have a combined agency that can work with the various codes, with the various sporting administration bodies and, of course, with the various other jurisdictions that have relevant information, to make sure that we keep sport clean and that it maintains, as this agency is focused on, integrity.

We've had a debate just recently about antidoping, and I won't revisit that. But one of the other areas relevant to this measure that I think is very important and concerns me personally—and I'm sure it concerns a lot of people—is making sure that we've got proper regulation around gambling and betting on sport. We all like to put a bit of money on the Melbourne Cup or maybe the AFL grand final, but there's been a pretty disappointing trend in recent times where we've seen some pretty low and petty things being put into the betting markets, and of course that has the serious and significant risk of putting at risk the integrity of some of the sports that are being introduced into the commercial space much more than the amateur space. So, I'm glad that we've got a legitimate entity to oversee these areas, and I think the data sharing that can occur now is very important and is going to mean that people who are doing the wrong thing have a lot more to fear, as they should, because we want to keep sport in this country very, very clean.

I think the other thing that's a good opportunity and outcome of this consolidation is that there are lots of sport codes that are looking for a lot more guidance, help and support from a national body such as this. There's a big difference between the AFL and some of the very small codes that operate particularly in the smaller jurisdictions, and they need guidance and support around integrity, around practices, around disciplinary measures, around education, and around ensuring that the people who participate in their sports—not just the players but also the officials, umpires, referees et cetera—get support in the way in which they're administering their code. Some of these organisations are small organisations. They don't have the ability to engage law firms to give comprehensive advice on dealing with some of the challenges that might come up.

There will also be new issues that develop into the future that we can't even anticipate or predict right now, which is why having this consolidated integrity body that has a remit across a whole range of areas—particularly anti-doping, gambling, betting, general governance and the like—is going to put a lot more robustness around the way in which all of the sporting organisations and entities in this country administer themselves. I think that's a great thing. It is going to ensure the integrity—integrity that is already in place, frankly; I don't think there's a crisis of confidence in the integrity around the sporting codes of our country. There are individual examples that will always come up that are disappointing, but the good thing is that when they come up we find out about them, we discover them, we uncover them and we shine a light on them. We don't sweep them under the carpet or hide them, and we make sure that it is well known that we have absolutely zero tolerance towards bad behaviour across any of those measures in our sporting sector. More importantly, I think this is only going to provide more robustness and give more confidence.

It comes back to the fact—as I mentioned in my previous contribution—that we are a great nation with a great sporting culture but we're also very proud that our sporting culture is clean, that it's fair and that the best person on the day will win the contest. We have to be
always vigilant in supporting and defending those principles. That's exactly what this bill does, so I commend it to the House.

Dr MARTIN (Reid) (13:01): Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (13:01): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the member for Reid be no further heard.

The House divided. [13:06]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes .......................... 58
Noes .......................... 73
Majority ..................... 15

AYES

Aly, A
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Coker, EA
Conroy, PM
Dreyfus, MA
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georgaras, S
Gorman, P
Haines, H
Husic, EN
Kearney, G
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Mulino, D
Neumann, SK
O’Neill, CE
Payne, AE
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Stanley, AM (teller)
Templeman, SR
Thwaites, KL
Watts, TG
Wilson, JH

Bird, SL
Burke, AS
Burns, J
Butler, TM
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Freelander, MR (teller)
Giles, AJ
Gosling, LJ
Hayes, CP
Jones, SP
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Leigh, AK
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
Murphy, PJ
O’Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Perrett, GD
Rishworth, AL
Smith, DPB
Swanson, MJ
Thistlethwaite, MJ
Vamvakou, M
Wells, AS
Zappia, A

NOES

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KL
Bell, AM
Buchholz, S
Christensen, GR
Connelly, V

Allen, K
Archer, BK
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Conaghan, PJ
Coulton, M

CHAMBER
Dr MARTIN (Reid) (13:09): What a waste of taxpayers' time for the Labor Party to conduct themselves in this way—disgusting.

I'm here to talk about the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019. It could be said that my electorate of Reid is the heart of sport in Sydney. Reid is home to Sydney Olympic Park, where everyone from the youngest soccer players up to Olympians train and compete. My electorate has hosted the Sydney Olympics, the NRL grand finals, the Invictus Games, the Sydney International tennis tournament, the Australian Masters and a whole range of professional sporting competitions. We've got professional training facilities for swimming, hockey, cricket, tennis, rugby, athletics—and the list goes on. Sydney Olympic Park contributes more than $1 billion to the New South Wales economy each year.

I am passionate about sport and its benefits to all Australians and understand that Australians expect sport to be conducted fairly and under regulated conditions. The establishment of Sport Integrity Australia will consolidate work currently undertaken by the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority, the National Integrity of Sport Unit within the
Department of Health and aspects of Sport Australia. Following the Wood review, the Morrison government committed to taking action on a number of recommendations to improve integrity across professional sporting bodies. As part of this response, the government introduced this bill to the House in the previous parliament. With the election delaying this bill, further consultation has been undertaken with stakeholders in the public and private sectors, to enhance how Sport Integrity Australia will be able to work with other government agencies to conduct investigations. Sport Integrity Australia will have the capacity to investigate a range of matters, including doping, match fixing, illegal betting and corruption in sport. Australians hold sport at the centre of our national identity, and this regulatory body will ensure that players are able to participate in fair and equal conditions and spectators are able to respect competitive sport.

I want to take this opportunity to highlight a number of other ways that we support sporting communities in Reid. During the election, the Morrison government committed $5 million towards the establishment of a new home for New South Wales cricket at Sydney Olympic Park, with indoor and outdoor training facilities for all cricketers, from community clubs to professional teams such as the Sydney Sixers. Only a couple of weeks ago I had the privilege of conducting the bat toss at the Women’s Big Bash League derby between the Sydney Thunder and the Sydney Sixers at Drummoyne. The new facilities at Sydney Olympic Park will ensure that female cricketers have their own facilities just like the male cricketers have. If we want to drive equality in sport, we need to make sure women at all levels of competition have access to the same facilities as men, and I commend New South Wales cricket for making this a priority.

During the campaign, I also announced funds to support enhanced facilities for Drummoyne Water Polo Club. Located at Drummoyne swimming pool, this club has produced many national and international champions. The Morrison government is also backing in the Wests Tigers, whose home ground at Concord Oval is just up the road from my electorate office. The Tigers are at the heart of our community, and our announcement of $5 million towards the redevelopment of Concord Oval will help more local rugby league players make the jump to a professional club. The redevelopment will include high-performance training and rehabilitation facilities; sports science, medical and conditioning facilities; aquatic recovery and hydrotherapy pools; education facilities, including integrated learning spaces, classrooms and lecture facilities; and multisport community facilities and sport and social spaces.

Professional sport is a great way to connect with the community, and we also announced $1 million for the establishment of a new CUBS program, to connect with multicultural communities in Reid through sport. By encouraging new migrants and isolated communities to engage with sport, we are encouraging greater social cohesion in our area. The Tigers demonstrate that our community expects professional sports men and women to be role models for younger and more vulnerable Australians, and sporting organisations are now taking an active role in ensuring that their clubs and players are good examples for these groups. Across my electorate we have begun work on a number of upgrades to sporting facilities, to encourage more kids and families to get involved in sport. Blair Park, Timbrell Park, Strathfield Park and Goddard Park have all received funding to benefit
sporting clubs such as the Strathfield Strikers, the Concord-Burwood Wolves, the Inner West Netball Association and local school sporting groups.

Any family with a child who plays sport at a competitive level knows how quickly the costs can build up, with equipment, travel, uniforms and registration fees being costly for families.

On a smaller scale, we're supporting some of our youngest high performance athletes through the Local Sporting Champions grants, providing financial assistance for young sporting competitors travelling to compete interstate or overseas. I'd like to take this opportunity to acknowledge our latest sporting champions in Reid. I'd like to acknowledge: James Slade, for his ability in squash; William Slade, also for squash; Cecelia Addabbo, for volleyball; Summer Giddings, for athletics; Lucy Palmer, for volleyball; Lawrence D'Mello, for weightlifting; Rio Agustino, for badminton; Angelina Lee, for flying disc; Angie Le Roux, for athletics; Alex Woolley, for skiing; Charlotte Gates, for water polo; Samuel Vickery, for volleyball; and Nathan Stanmore, for athletics.

Sporting communities at all levels play an important part in keeping Australians healthy, active and connected. Local players look to the professional leagues for role models, and the introduction of Sport Integrity Australia will help to uphold the high standards that Australians have for sports men and women, as well as the teams that they represent. I welcome the introduction of Sport Integrity Australia to strengthen fairness, integrity and equality in all levels of sport in Australia.

Ms HAMMOND (Curtin) (13:16): I'm very happy to—

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (13:16): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the member for Curtin be no further heard.

The House divided. [13:20]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)
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Ms HAMMOND (Curtin) (13:24): I'm tempted to say that the shenanigans of this morning are a bit like John McEnroe throwing down his tennis racquet. You cannot be serious with the behaviour that has been taking place in this chamber. I only have a few moments and I've had to cut down my speech, which was actually going to celebrate many of the sporting triumphs of the fifties, sixties, seventies and eighties.

Like many Australians, I like watching elite sport, and I have a particular fondness for watching the Olympic Games. Like many of generation X, I have fond memories of watching Nadia Comaneci in the 1976 Montreal Olympics—the first woman to score a 10 in gymnastics. Of course the Australian swimmers at Olympic Games and Commonwealth Games over the last 50 or 60 years—perhaps even more, but I don't go back that far—have astounded us all with their grace, their speed and their sportsmanship. We also have our fabulous Australian tennis players—and there normally is one who sits behind me, who just happens to be absent for one of the few compliments he's ever going to get from me!

Then of course we also have those tragic memories, those really bad memories of things that happened at Olympic Games. Who, if they were alive then, can forget the 1988 Seoul Olympics 100-metre final: Ben Johnson, Carl Lewis? Ben Johnson got the gold taken off him. We then had Marion Jones—another awful event with somebody cheating the system.

Australians love to play sport. They love to play sport very hard, but they like to play fair. When people cheat the system, or rort the system, they don't just ruin it for those who have been beaten; they ruin it for everybody. It undermines the integrity of the system. It undermines our culture. It undermines our national identity. So I am very pleased to stand up and support the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019.

This bill is an outcome of the Turnbull government's commissioning a review looking into Australia's sports integrity arrangements. The Wood review was released in late 2018, and this government responded earlier this year, committing to a range of important reforms, including the establishment of Sport Integrity Australia. The government's introduction of this bill is an important sign that the government remains firmly committed to protecting Australian sport from the increasingly sophisticated threats to its integrity.

Sport Integrity Australia is going to unite existing functions carried out by ASADA and by the National Integrity of Sport Unit in the Department of Health, along with relevant national sports integrity functions of Sports Australia. Commencing from July 2020, Sport Integrity Australia will support all sports integrity stakeholders to manage the spectrum of sport integrity related issues. Its focus is going to be on regulation, on monitoring and intelligence, and on policy and program delivery, including education and outreach. The new agency is going to act as Australia's national antidoping organisation and, in time, will also act as Australia's national platform for the purposes of the Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competition, which was signed in January 2019, in a demonstration once again of this...
government's commitment to delivering critical sports integrity outcomes without delay. Through this bill and the creation of Sport Integrity Australia, the sporting community of Australia is going to benefit from an organisation which is able to cohesively draw together existing sports integrity capabilities and nationally coordinate all elements of the sports integrity threat response through a single agency.

This bill reinforces so much of Australia's long-held values about sport—playing hard but playing fair, playing to win but not playing at any cost. This bill, in establishing the Sport Integrity Australia body, is absolutely essential. It's a great step forward to ensure that the integrity in Australian sports remains. Thank you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hogan): The debate is interrupted in accordance with standing order 43. The debate may be resumed at a later hour.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Chronic Fatigue Syndrome

Mr BOWEN (McMahon) (13:29): We do not know how many Australians suffer from chronic fatigue syndrome but it is likely as many as 250,000. Their suffering is real. It is not imagined. It's important that they know we in this building know that. Chronic fatigue syndrome is a complicated disorder characterised by extreme fatigue that can't be explained by any underlying medical condition. Fatigue may worsen with physical or mental activity, but it does not improve with rest. Around a quarter of the people with the syndrome suffer a mild form and are able to get to work or school part time while reducing activities. Another half will have a moderate to severe form, while another quarter will experience severe chronic fatigue syndrome and have to stay at home in bed.

I recently met with Dr Heidi Nicholl, the CEO of Emerge Australia, which advocates on behalf of those 250,000 of our fellow Australians. She is in the gallery today. I also acknowledge Susan Hutchinson, who is also in the building, who is an advocate. And I do want to acknowledge the member for Perth, who has raised this issue with me and has been an advocate for people with chronic fatigue syndrome as well.

There are issues with access to telehealth. We need broader access to telehealth anyway, but people with chronic fatigue syndrome have a very strong case for access to telehealth when you consider their condition stops them from getting to the doctor. There are issues with Centrelink and with the NDIS. I welcome the recent Medical Research Future Fund grant for further research, but we need to do more. We need to understand this condition better. The fact that this condition is hard to explain is not a reason to disbelieve people; it's a reason for more research and more attention.

Wide Bay Electorate

Mr LLEW O'BRIEN (Wide Bay) (13:31): It is a great honour to represent Wide Bay in the 46th Parliament, and I deeply respect the great responsibility the voters of Wide Bay have given me. I couldn't do this work without the love and support of my family, who are always in my corner, are always backing me up and give me the will to continue on some days—but none more so than my beautiful little granddaughter Penny, who is growing into a real little character. I also value the hard work and commitment of my electorate staff: Simon Kelly, who keeps everything running smoothly; the unflappable Barb Morris, who manages my diary; Jack Carr, who helps me on the road; and Rae Hurley, Clementine Norton and Cathy
Davis, who help me look after Wide Bay's constituents. I also thank Liam Smith, who has been a big help to me in the parliament in the last fortnight. To the staff at Parliament House—the attendants, cleaners, librarians, researchers, hospitality, security, 2020, FCM Travel, Comcar and shuttle service—I say thank you for all your help throughout the year. To everyone in Wide Bay, my friends and my parliamentary colleagues, have a wonderful Christmas, please stay safe on the roads and I wish you all the best for 2020.

Garlett, Reverend Sealin

Mr JOSH WILSON (Fremantle) (13:32): I take this opportunity to express gratitude for the life of Reverend Sealin Garlett, who died last week. Reverend Garlett was a Ballardong Whadjuk man of the Nyungar nation in Western Australia and a leader in my community. At the age of seven he was taken from his family, with two siblings, to the Mogumber Methodist Mission. He suffered the dislocation from family and culture that was a common and institutionalised feature of life for Aboriginal people in Western Australia.

I didn't have the privilege of knowing Sealin Garlett very well, but I'm speaking today to express the enormous respect in which he was held by the people in Fremantle and Cockburn. I was lucky to spend time with Reverend Garlett at various civic and community events over the last 10 years. He always spoke softly and with great power. That's because from his whole being emanated his capacity for compassion, truth and reconciliation. At citizenship ceremonies in the city of Cockburn, his welcome to country was the speech that carried the greatest natural meaning. It was gracious, it was honest and it invited new citizens to share in the great treasure of our Indigenous heritage.

A couple of years ago, Reverend Garlett decided he would no longer participate in citizenship ceremonies held on 26 January. I respected that decision. I'd like to think that everyone can respect and understand that decision, whatever their view. I send heartfelt condolences to Reverend Garlett's wife of 43 years, Marilyn, his seven children and his 27 grandchildren.

Christmas

Mr TED O'BRIEN (Fairfax) (13:34): I rise today to say Merry Christmas. Merry Christmas to you, Deputy Speaker Hogan, to my colleagues and to those on the other side of the chamber. I know we're all very excited; we're all pumped about Christmas coming up. But there is a five-year-old little girl in my electorate of Fairfax whose name is Scarlett. This year I suspect she's going to be excited not about Santa coming down the chimney but about something arriving in her letterbox. Take a guess what that is.

Mr Tudge: Your Christmas card?

Mr TED O'BRIEN: Aha! We have an interjection, and it's right. Scarlett, who's from the Coolum Beach Community Kindergarten, has won this year's Christmas card artwork award. How good is that? That means that not only will she receive that Christmas card in her letterbox, but so too will tens of thousands of people on the Sunshine Coast. I believe she'll also be sharing a copy of that with her grandparents, who live interstate.

This time of year is a time where we celebrate and we come together, for people of faith and people who don't have faith. I know, as someone who does have deep faith, that Christmas is vitally important—and let us take the joy and happiness of children as we enjoy it ourselves.
Mr DICK (Oxley) (13:36): I rise to acknowledge and celebrate this week the election of Wayne Goss and the Queensland Labor government in 1989, 30 years ago. This ended 32 years of the draconian-like reign of the dreaded National Party. Wayne Goss overcame almost insurmountable odds with an electoral system that was stacked against him after years of gerrymandering by a corrupt government, only to achieve a comfortable electoral win of more than 50 per cent of the vote.

He went on to rid the state of the unfair gerrymander, establish the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission to redraw electoral boundaries more fairly, implement the Fitzgerald inquiry reforms, establish the CMC, save Fraser Island, appoint the first women judges and the first women directors-general, and leave us the Gallery of Modern Art. There can be absolutely no doubting the legacy and impact that Wayne Goss and the Labor government had on our great state of Queensland.

My community is proud to share a deep connection with Wayne Goss and the Goss family, who lived in Azalea Street in Inala. Wayne was the eldest of six children to Allan and Norma Goss, and in 1954 the family moved to Inala, where Wayne attended Inala Primary School and, later, Inala State High School. He was a true son of Inala.

Wayne Goss was still a true working-class hero who brought important reforms to Queensland that will continue long into the future. We thank Wayne for his service. We miss you and will forever remember everything you've done to make Queensland a better, fairer place.

Ms BELL (Moncrieff) (13:37): Two weeks ago the Morrison government brought forward funding for key infrastructure projects in my electorate of Moncrieff on the Gold Coast. We are still celebrating the additional funding that was injected into Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 3A, which will go from Pacific Fair in Broadbeach all the way to iconic Burleigh Heads—6.7 kilometres of transport infrastructure that residents and visitors alike will be able to enjoy as they board and ride all the way from Burleigh to Helensvale and then interchange to heavy rail to Brisbane.

The new infrastructure funding announced by the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister includes $157 million for stage 3A of the Gold Coast light rail project. I think you'll all agree that's a fantastic Christmas present for the people of the Gold Coast and, indeed, for the people of Moncrieff. The total cost of the project is $709 million. It will create more than 760 jobs in my electorate, which I'm so thrilled about. It will boost the local economy. I thanked the Prime Minister personally during his visit for the green light on this very important project. In addition, $45 million was brought forward for the M1 Pacific Motorway upgrades, which affects everybody in my electorate going to and from Brisbane and Tweed Heads. Funding for this upgrade will flow from next year to deliver on our promise to the people of the Gold Coast of getting home sooner and safer instead of looking at brake lights on the motorway.

It's a fantastic present to everyone in Moncrieff for Christmas, and I wish everybody in my electorate a very happy and safe holiday season, Christmas and new year.
Ms MURPHY (Dunkley) (13:39): The 2018 PISA data released yesterday revealed that Australian students have recorded the worst results in reading, maths and science since international testing began. Our students are now around a year behind in these basic subjects. This is a wake-up call to this Liberal government, which walked away from Labor's Gonski reforms, cutting billions from public schools and junking improvements to early literacy programs, to keep high-performing teachers in the classroom and to make sure we educate and train great teachers. If we want to find true justice in our society and if we want to break the cycle of disadvantage that plagues too many communities then we must make sure our public school system, which teaches two-thirds of all students, including the most disadvantaged, is properly funded and attracts and supports the best and brightest into teaching and support roles. The public schools and the teachers in my electorate of Dunkley do amazing work, sometimes with some of the most disadvantaged children in the area, but they don't have enough funding and they don't have enough support. Australian public school students do not deserve to have their futures undermined and to leave school one to three years behind students from higher performing countries around the world, because of this government's failure to properly step up, fund our public schools and support our hardworking teachers and students. It's time to do something. It's time to do it now.

Circular Head Show

Mr PEARCE (Braddon) (13:40): Congratulations to everyone involved in this year's 111th Circular Head Show for making it a huge success. The grand parade was something to behold. It would rival the Royal Hobart Show. The participation and the effort by exhibitors was first class, especially by our younger generation leading their cattle and caring for their horses and livestock. Tractors and agricultural machinery were everywhere, and the place was abuzz. The Circular Head Show is important for the region. It's where the community comes together without someone's barn burning down or a fire or a flood. Everywhere you looked there were smiles on faces. It was a happy and joyous time. The agricultural sector in our region has had a good year. The feeling on the ground is upbeat and positive for the future. Congratulations to Tony Hine, the president of the Circular Head Show society, and his tireless committee. A special mention goes to Sue Smedley. If it wasn't organised by Sue then she certainly knew about it. She was all over that show like white on snow. The Circular Head Show was a shining example of why agricultural shows must continue in our regions. They embody the very essence of what the agricultural community really is—that is, fine people working together to produce a fine community.

Tasmania: Environmental Conservation

Mr WILKIE (Clark) (13:42): This weekend a group of bushwalkers, fishers and other community members will host a picnic on Tasmania's Central Plateau before a small group of walkers depart for Lake Malbena, where they will stage a symbolic reclamation of Halls Island and the surrounding wilderness. Tasmanians should not have to stake a claim like this to our treasured wilderness, which actually belongs to all of us. Moreover, it is patently shameful that the Tasmanian government is hiding behind a secretive process and has gifted Halls Island to a developer for a luxury private camp. Heavens, we don't even know the details of the lease or the money that might have changed hands. Tasmanians are right to be appalled by our government's dodgy expression-of-interest process for developments inside
our national parks and Wilderness World Heritage Area. There is so much we don't know, not least because proposals are assessed with little public scrutiny. In fact the whole process is so disturbing that it has caught the attention of the state Auditor-General, who is now investigating the EOI process. To top it all off it now seems that taxpayers' money is being used to upgrade public sites that had been earmarked for private development. Tasmania's precious wilderness belongs to all of us. It is not the government's and it is not for the government to virtually gift it to private developers.

**Bennelong Cup**

Mr ALEXANDER (Bennelong) (13:43): I'm proud to say that recently I hosted the ninth year of the Bennelong Cup. This annual table tennis tournament is held between all schools in the electorate in a single, action packed day. I started the cup almost a decade ago, after I'd toured several schools and found that students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds struggled to engage with some of the more populous, typical Australian sports of netball, cricket and rugby. So, in partnership with Hyundai, we gifted every school in the electorate table tennis tables and equipment to provide the students with an easy and fun sport they could all share. I'm proud to say that this is the ninth year of the competition, but it would not have been possible without several people—in particular, the extraordinary Andrew Hill, who has been organising and managing the competition from day one, and Ted Davis from Table Tennis NSW. Finally, I would like to acknowledge a special guest who we hosted at the Bennelong Cup this year: Jessy Chen. Jessy is a local Paralympic table tennis champion who recently won a gold medal at the Para Oceania Championships in Darwin. He was a great inspiration and presence for all of the students, and they thoroughly enjoyed playing with him, as I did. I look forward to seeing the cup celebrate its 10th anniversary next year. The game begins at love-all.

**Asylum Seekers**

Mr BURNS (Macnamara) (13:45): It had been 90 years since this place passed a bill in the House of Representatives that didn't have the support of the government, 90 years before this place passed a simple bill that said that, if you need medical care and you are under the care of the Australian government, you can get that care. It was the medevac legislation. What a disgrace it is that the Senate, under a secret dodgy deal, has just repealed the medevac legislation.

When that bill was passed through this place, what was the response of the government? It wasn't to respond with facts. It wasn't to respond with reason and argument. It was to respond with fear. All of them on that side of the House came back with fear because that is all they have. They don't have facts in the debate. When the medevac bill passed the parliament, their response was to spend $185 million to open the Christmas Island detention centre, because that was apparently the response this country needed. How many people were put inside the Christmas Island detention centre? There was not one until a family of four were dragged there in the middle of the night.

This government is a government without a vision. It's a government without an agenda. Today it confirmed it is a government without a heart. This medevac bill was a baseline of decency. The government has trampled all over it and they should all be ashamed of themselves.
Parliament House: School Visit Program

Mr RAMSEY (Grey—Government Whip) (13:46): I think a trip to Canberra would be good for all Australians. It's no great secret that sometimes they wonder what we do in this place—and perhaps this morning I've even wondered that myself—but all those people who do visit Canberra come away from a visit to Parliament House with a better idea of what we do, why we do it and how we represent people. This is especially so of the School Visit Program.

On Monday of this week I was very pleased to host 11 students from my old school, Kimba Area School, and today I had 17 students from Cleve Area School, which is in the nearest town to Kimba, just down the road. I hope they had an informative time. Certainly in the past students have come up to me and said: 'Remember when we visited you? I was surprised at how Parliament House worked.' It's a good program.

Both schools live approximately 1,200 kilometres from this place. Consequently, they receive $60 assistance from the Commonwealth government to get their students here. It's been $60 for a while and, if they lived in Adelaide, it would be the same amount of money. Of course, there could be loads of additional costs for people who live in the country. I think it's probably time we reviewed these subsidies, tried to make it easier for students to come and encouraged more of them to come so they too can participate in this place, learn what it's about and take a positive view back for the rest of their lives.

Macquarie Electorate: Infrastructure

Ms TEMPLEMAN (Macquarie) (13:48): Tonight is the first chance the wider Hawkesbury community gets to ask about the options the New South Wales government has identified for a duplication of Richmond Bridge. I seem to talk a lot about bridges, and that's because they are the primary bottleneck in the Hawkesbury and make life really difficult for so many workers and families. Looking for ways to improve Richmond Bridge is one of the first things I did as a Labor candidate in the 2010 election, with $20 million of funding. I was proud to announce a $200 million commitment if Labor won office at this last election. There is a terrible track record of community consultation in the Hawkesbury, so this time I welcomed the approach of working with a stakeholder group.

Unfortunately, there's only been a little more than a week's notice of the two two-hour community information sessions, one tonight from five till seven at North Richmond Community Centre and one on Saturday from 10 to 12 at Richmond Community Services. The early information being put out was confusing. The news report said 13 December was the closing date for submissions, the website shows 20 December and a community group has been advised you can still put in a submission in January. I call on the New South Wales government and the RMS to extend the 20 December deadline into January because five days before Christmas Day is not good enough. It reminds us of how we were treated over Windsor Bridge, which was with contempt.

Friends of Our Pacific Family

Mr SHARMA (Wentworth) (13:49): On Monday I was delighted to help launch Friends of our Pacific Family, and I want to acknowledge the role of my co-chair there, the member for Shortland, in doing so. We were joined by the Prime Minister; the Leader of the Opposition; a number of ministers, shadow ministers and parliamentarians from all sides of
the chamber; a parliamentary delegation from Fiji led by the Hon. Alexander O'Connor; diplomatic representatives including the ambassador for the United States and the high commissioner for the United Kingdom; and a number of church leaders and other civil society groups. I think the turnout we had at the launch event on Monday is a testament to how warmly and enthusiastically the government’s ‘Pacific step-up’ has been embraced.

My first overseas posting as a diplomat was to Papua New Guinea—to Bougainville, for that matter. I’ve been involved with multiple step-ups we’ve had in the Pacific, from the Bougainville peace process in the late 1990s to the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands which we sent in in 2003. As the Prime Minister said on Monday, the reasons we’re so committed and so involved in the Pacific are multiple. We do, indeed, owe the people there a great debt for the service they provided to us during the Second World War. It’s true that our security and our prosperity is inextricably linked with theirs; it’s in our interests. But it is also very much because of the ties that bind us. As the Prime Minister is fond of saying, ‘We are family, and families look after one another.’

State Emergency Service Randwick Unit

Mr THISTLETHWAITE (Kingsford Smith) (13:51): I wish to congratulate all of the staff and volunteers of the Randwick SES, the State Emergency Service, who recently celebrated its 60th anniversary. Last Friday I joined members of our community to celebrate this milestone. It was an opportunity to thank those unsung heroes who have dedicated their time and skills to our community over the last six decades. The Randwick SES and its volunteers do so much in our community and beyond. They’re the men and women in orange that are there after storms, repairing homes, removing fallen trees and the like.

Our Randwick SES were involved in the largest insurance event ever in Australia’s history, the 1999 hail storms that saw many homes and small businesses in our area damaged. They’ve also helped out in other areas across New South Wales, particularly during the recent bushfire crisis, and after storm and flooding damage in other parts of Sydney. When the SOS goes out, our SES volunteers respond.

But they’re also there during the good times. The volunteers have been there for major community events. Just over the last six weeks they’ve been involved in the Bali commemoration, the Maroubra fun run and the Step Out Speak Out walk against domestic violence in our community.

I was delighted to see the new improvements made to the Randwick SES operations centre with the help of one of our Stronger Communities Program grants, and see that funding put to good use. Congratulations to all concerned with Randwick SES and thank you for your 60 years of dedicated service.

Ryan Electorate: Infrastructure

Mr SIMMONDS (Ryan) (13:52): I rise to speak about something of incredible importance to my local community, and that is fixing local roads and reducing congestion, and, in particular, a looming threat to those efforts to get local residents home to their families sooner and safer—that is, the Queensland Labor Party. During the federal election I managed to secure $25 million from the Morrison government to upgrade a local congestion hotspot. Working with the lord mayor, Adrian Schrinner, we have already got work underway. Just last week, we announced a successful overpass design so that work could get started on this
project. How did Queensland Labor respond? Well, the Brisbane City Council Labor lord mayorial candidate responded by calling it a 'wicked, wicked waste'. This is what the Labor Party really thinks about reducing congestion.

I say to the residents of Ryan: when it comes to federal funding to reduce congestion, Labor says it's a waste; when it comes to getting you home to your families sooner and spending less time in the car, Labor says it's a waste; when it comes to making sure that mum and dad make it home to the kids at night, Labor says it's a waste.

This is a very, very dangerous intersection. There have been 32 serious incidents in the last couple of years, 10 requiring serious and ongoing hospitalisation. Apparently that isn't enough for Labor. They still think it is a waste. What a disgrace. Queensland Labor should disown this candidate or prove once and for all, after decades of Labor neglect, that only the LNP will help reduce congestion in the western suburbs and in the Ryan electorate.

**Pensions and Benefits**

Mr STEPHEN JONES (Whitlam) (13:54): There have been reports this week about the member for Dawson's travel to Manila, his having racked up almost 300 days overseas in the last four years. A lot has been said about the member for Dawson's judgement. I'm going to let others focus on that. I'm more concerned about the double standards at work. This week, the government decided that the final sitting week before Christmas would be an excellent time for them to introduce a cut to pension payments. All government MPs voted for it, breaking a promise that they made to their electors not six months ago. The new rule, originally drafted by the Prime Minister when he was Treasurer, applies to people who go overseas for more than six weeks at a time. If they're away for more than six weeks, they have their pension cut. Clearly this impacts on migrant retirees more than anyone else—the elderly nonnas and nonnos who return home to visit their families, perhaps for one last time while they're still able.

So we have to ask ourselves this question: why is it okay for the member for Dawson to represent his electorate from the suburbs of Manila for 300 days in the last four years without penalty? Why is it okay for the member for Dawson to be overseas for an average of 10 weeks a year without loss of pay, but, for a pensioner, it's not? This is hypocrisy at its finest and it's a betrayal of trust.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hogan): The member will resume his seat. I call the member for Sturt.

**Meucke, Dr James**

Mr STEVENS (Sturt) (13:55): I rise today to pay tribute to Dr James Meucke, who has been recently announced as the South Australian of the Year. This is the third time I've been on my feet in the last couple of hours, so I'm grateful I've lasted this long. I thank the chamber for the leniency.

Dr Meucke is a very famous South Australian ophthalmologist—eye surgeon, to assist those opposite—but it's not for his services as an ophthalmologist for the South Australian community per se. I have actually gone under his knife; I never needed glasses until he had a crack at me a few years ago! But, more importantly, he established a charity with his wife, Mena, called Sight For All. It's an initiative that has raised money in South Australia to provide ophthalmic services in remote and regional Australia but also in developing nations in
South-East Asia. They were established more than 10 years ago and they have undertaken so many fundraising activities to assist in the early identification of preventable eye diseases, particularly in young children throughout remote communities of Australia and developing nations in Asia. I pay tribute to him for that great honour today.

Perth: Infrastructure

Mr KEOGH (Burt) (13:57): Under this federal Liberal government and the last WA Liberal state government, Perth's south-eastern suburbs were ignored. Early in the 2015 by-election, I was joined by WA Labor in calling for federal funding not only for the duplication of Armadale Road but also for a new Armadale Road to North Lake Road bridge at the Kwinana Freeway. Eventually the Abbott government agreed to fund the road but not the bridge. Again, in 2016, federal and state Labor committed to the road and the bridge. In 2017, working with the new WA Labor state government, we succeeded in dragging the Turnbull government to fund the new bridge. Just last weekend, the sod was turned on this transformational bridge project—a project that my community and those in the federal seat of Fremantle have been waiting years for. But, lo, with the state Premier, the minister, the local state MPs all ready for the sod turning, the Morrison government sent not the minister but two WA Liberal senators and—wait—refused to invite the local federal members: the member for Fremantle and me.

What we have seen in the behaviour of this government in this chamber this week and last was reflected in its conduct at the Armadale Road bridge sod turning—capriciousness, not allowing the Labor leader to speak in this place, the people's house, and not allowing local Labor federal MPs to attend events in their own electorates. Shame!

Forde Electorate

Mr VAN MANEN (Forde—Chief Government Whip) (13:58): We all know that Christmas is a time of joy and spending time with our families. But, sadly, there are many vulnerable people in our communities and we need to give them thought as well. I think of the families at risk of homelessness, single-income families, those living in care and our veterans. Thankfully, Christmas is also a time of giving, especially to those in need.

I’d like to take this opportunity to commend the good work of some local community groups and businesses across my electorate of Forde who strive to make Christmas special for these disadvantaged groups. This week, the volunteers at Loganlea Community Centre packed over 70 Christmas hampers that will be distributed to struggling families in our communities over the coming days. I was delighted to be able to do my bit and donate Christmas cakes to include in the hampers and help those who need to have a Merry Christmas.

This year also Mitre 10 Mega in Beenleigh, managed by Dave Woodman and the team, were very generous in their donations to the Palm Lake Resort 'toy boys' and supported them making toys for the children of Beenleigh Special School to add to the store's annual Christmas toy drive. Lighthouse Care in Logan is running a Christmas appeal. I want to thank all of these community groups for the terrific work they’re doing each and every day in our community.

The SPEAKER: It being 2 pm, in accordance with standing order 43 the time for members' statements has concluded.
QUESTIONs WITHOUT NOTICE

National Education Standards

Ms PLIBERSEK (Sydney) (14:00): My question is to the Prime Minister. In 2013 the former Labor government agreed a detailed plan with the states to improve school performance in reading, maths and science. Later that same year, this government junked it, calling the plan ‘red tape’. In the seventh year of this government—enough time for a student to start and finish high school—will the Prime Minister apologise to parents for turning his back on school improvement?

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Prime Minister and Minister for the Public Service) (14:01): I never take anything the member for Sydney presents at the dispatch box as having any accuracy, because she's been found out on so many occasions to have come to the dispatch box and made a series of smears and assertions which are not borne out, as indeed is the case with what she's just presented to this House.

I can tell parents right across this country that, under our government, we are providing record funding for schools. Under our government, for the first time, real needs-based funding is being provided, growing from $13.8 billion in 2014 to $17.5 billion in 2017, and that will grow to $32.4 billion in 2029. We are providing that funding for schools around the country without increasing taxes. We're not going to put our hands into the pockets—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order?

Mr Albanese: Yes, Mr Speaker, on relevance. The question went to school performance and the latest figures, which show Australia falling behind the world. That's what it went to—maths, English, science.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has made his point of order on relevance. I hear the point of order from the Leader of the Opposition. There are a number of aspects to it, but, when questions have taglines, as indeed this did—let me be very specific: asking whether the Prime Minister would apologise. What I'm hearing is a response to that from the Prime Minister. He can answer it in any way he wishes provided he's on the policy topic that's there. So the Prime Minister is in order.

Mr MORRISON: I was asked about funding of schools.

An opposition member: No, you weren't!

Mr MORRISON: Accusations were made by the Labor Party, as they made at the last election—

Opposition members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, I'm going to be very clear on this: the question did not ask about funding—it asked about other aspects—but I said it was in order for the Prime Minister to go to the government's policy approach, given the tagline that was asked.

Mr MORRISON: The member for Sydney raised the proposals that were previously put forward by the Labor Party. The member for Sydney, at the last election and at previous elections, maintained an untruth about the government's policies when it comes to education funding. Our education funding is at record levels. The reason we can fund our schools at record levels is that we know how to manage money. The reason no-one can believe anything the Labor Party say about schools funding, about hospitals funding or about funding for
disabilities is that they know Labor cannot manage money. That means they cannot keep any promise they make when it comes to the commitments they make on schools, hospitals, disability services, aged care or any of this—because the Australian public know that the Labor Party cannot manage money. That was true under the former Leader of the Opposition and it's even more true under this Leader of the Opposition, who hasn't sat around and put a budget together. Not once in all of his years in government did he sit on an ERC that led to a budget. Not once—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has already called a point of order on relevance.

Mr Albanese: This is about him misleading parliament again, continually.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition doesn't have the call. And the Leader of the Opposition well knows that, if he takes issue with something that's said that he believes is a misrepresentation, there is a very clear procedure for him to follow at the end of question time.

Mr MORRISON: The outcomes of the PISA 2018 today are deeply concerning to the government, and that is why we have put the funding in place—(Time expired)

Morrison Government

Ms HAMMOND (Curtin) (14:05): My question is to the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister advise the House how the stability and certainty of the Morrison government is strengthening Australia's resilience to deal with future threats and challenges? And is the Prime Minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Prime Minister and Minister for the Public Service) (14:06): I thank the member for Curtin for her question. Earlier today, together with the Deputy Prime Minister and the foreign minister, I had the great privilege to meet with Tim Weeks, who has come home to Australia after one of the most incredible ordeals that you could imagine an Australian to go through. I had the opportunity to thank the President of the United States recently for the incredible role the United States played. I raise this because Mr Weeks's story is one of the incredible resilience of an Australian. This is the nature of Australians. We are an incredibly resilient people, and our government is building our nation's resilience by backing those Australians in about their optimism in the future—not the pessimism of the Labor Party. The irrepressible optimism of Australians is what our government is investing in. We're investing in their financial resilience; we're investing in the economic resilience of this country and the national security resilience of this country.

Today's national accounts show that, through the year, growth has risen from 1.4 per cent to 1.7 per cent. What it shows is that Australians over the past year have earned more. Household disposable income is up 2½ per cent—that's the highest increase in 10 years—and average compensation was up 2.9 per cent over the year, rising to above the 10-year average. We are now in a place where we can say that we have ensured—since the last election, and through these results it's demonstrated, we have said Australians would earn more and they could also keep more of what they earned. And, through the tax relief that we have provided those Australians, they have chosen to invest that in their own resilience. I can tell you—

An opposition member interjecting—
Mr MORRISON: I just heard an interjection from that member opposite. He says they haven't earned more. Well, household disposable income went up by 2.5 per cent—it's the highest in a decade—and the average compensation for Australians went up by 2.9 per cent, which went up over the 10-year average. Now, I know those opposite are illiterate with the economy and national finances. That's what the Australian people also know. I trust Australians with their money and Australians trust this government with their money, too, and that's why they returned us. They returned us because they know this government knows how to manage money and they know the Labor Party doesn't. Our investment in expanding our export markets and our investment in the essential services that Australians rely on are backed up in the public final demand figures that are in those national accounts. We have been taking the right decisions for the Australian economy. We're backing in the irrepressible optimism of Australians, because we know that's where our future lies.

National Education Standards

Ms PLIBERSEK (Sydney) (14:09): My question is to the Minister for Education. According to the PISA 2018 results released overnight, Australia has recorded our worst-ever international test results in reading, maths and science. Earlier this week, the minister said that government reforms will 'lift student outcomes'. Minister, when?

Mr TEHAN (Wannon—Minister for Education) (14:09): I thank the shadow minister for her question, because it enables me to tell the House how we are not only providing record funding for public schools, record funding for Catholic schools and record funding for independent schools but also focusing on turning that record funding into better outcomes and better results. For too long, especially from those opposite, all we have heard about is funding, funding, funding and funding. And that comes from a party who, when in government, had 27 different funding arrangements in place. We now have needs based funding in place and we are focusing on getting better results and better outcomes. That is why next week's COAG meeting is so important.

Mr Thistlethwaite and Mr Gosling interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Kingsford Smith and the member for Solomon.

Mr TEHAN: If the Leader of the Opposition would just listen for once, he might just learn something. Next week's COAG, as I said yesterday, is going to be one of the most important COAG meetings of the year. What we need to see from state and territory governments is a commitment to reform and to turn around our outcomes and results. What we need to hear from state and territory governments is a commitment to put students first and to ensure that those basics, those fundamentals, of literacy and numeracy, are at the heart of everything that we teach. If we do that, we will turn these results and these outcomes around.

Mr Thistlethwaite interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Kingsford Smith is warned!

Mr TEHAN: We are taking a proposal to state and territory education ministers. We want to ensure that there are progressions in place so that we can map, for every student across the nation, their progression when it comes to literacy and numeracy. This was something that was never done on that side.

The SPEAKER: The member for Sydney, on a point of order?
Ms Plibersek: It's on relevance. I said, 'When are the reforms that he claims he's made going to work?' It's a very clear question. When?

The SPEAKER: The minister is being relevant. I'll just say to the member for Sydney, I shouldn't have to remind her of everything she asked in the question. I think the fact her point of order was much shorter than the question illustrates the point.

Mr Tehan: Next week's COAG is going to be incredibly important. Can I say to those opposite that, rather than coming in here and lecturing us about this or that, why don't you actually encourage the state and territory ministers to come to that meeting next week and be bold? Be ambitious. Put students at the heart of the agenda. Put literacy and numeracy at the heart of the agenda.

Ms Plibersek interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Sydney is warned!

Mr Tehan: That is what we want to see. The results that we've seen overnight mean that we need to take action, and take action now. That is what the federal government wants to do next week. (Time expired)

Mr Gosling interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Just before I call the member for Lyne, in case they didn't hear it over their own shouting, the members for Kingsford Smith and Sydney are warned. So too is the member for Solomon. And since the member for Cooper is looking at me, I'll remind her she was already warned at about 9.33 this morning.

Budget

Dr Gillespie (Lyne) (14:13): My question is to the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and Regional Development. Will the Deputy Prime Minister please inform the House how the Morrison and McCormack government's stable and certain budget management is building resilience for rural and regional Australia, ensuring future opportunities are realised?

Mr McCormack (Riverina—Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Development and Leader of the Nationals) (14:14): I heard one of the most inspiring stories ever in this place this morning when I met Timothy Weeks. What a courageous Australian. He spent three years going from remote location to remote location in Afghanistan. Yet, despite that, despite the fact that he endured this terrible ordeal, he remained gracious to his captors after being freed. He is truly a remarkable Australian. We have much to thank officials for—our DFAT officials and defence officials and US officials as well—in being able to free Timothy Weeks.

Timothy and I share something in common. We went to the same schools together, St Michael's Regional High School and Trinity Senior High School. He was probably far more studious than I! He is truly an inspiration. He is an example of a resilient Australian. He is a fine example of a regional Australian. I've already taken steps to make sure that when we have a homecoming in Wagga Wagga, before year's end, it will be one to remember.

The member for Lyne asked me about resilience. He asked me about the resilience of his communities and, yes, they are hurting. A quarter of a million hectares have been burnt out in the electorate of Lyne. There are still fires burning between Taree and Forster. We absolutely
owe a debt of gratitude to our first responders, to our volunteers, to our full-time firefighters and to our SES people.

We're certainly building resilience in our communities in regional Australia by backing our farmers.

Mr Fitzgibbon interjecting—

Mr McCORMACK: I can hear the member for Hunter yelling out. He's just a recidivist. When I'm talking about building resilience in regional communities, when I'm talking about fires and when I'm talking about our farmers, he could be quiet just for a change. When I talk about our farmers, I talk about our free trade agreements—

Mr Dreyfus interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Isaacs!

Mr McCORMACK: The member for Isaacs shouldn't be speaking again this week. He wouldn't know a farmer if he met one, quite frankly. What a disgrace he is! He wouldn't know a constituent. He doesn't even live in his own electorate.

When I talk about farmers, I talk about the three free trade agreements that we've been able to sign—

Mr Perrett interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Moreton is warned.

Mr McCORMACK: we've been able to ratify and we've been able to pass through the Senate with Peru, Hong Kong and Indonesia.

We're building the Inland Rail—$9.3 billion. We're certainly investing $100 million into taxiways and runways for regional airports. That's building a better future. (Time expired)

**DISTINGUISHED VISITORS**

The SPEAKER (14:17): I inform the House we have present in the gallery this afternoon Mr Tim Weeks, who's been mentioned by both the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. As you all know, Tim has recently returned to Australia after being held captive in Afghanistan for over three years. Tim, the whole country is glad you are home, and we're glad you're here with us today.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr ALBANESE (Grayndler—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): on indulgence—I join with the Prime Minister, the leader of the National Party and the Speaker, on behalf of Australian Labor, to welcome you here as well.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

Murray-Darling Basin

Ms BUTLER (Griffith) (14:18): My question is to the Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management. In August, the states greenlighted a new inspector-general for the Murray-Darling Basin, and Mick Keelty became the interim inspector-general. Yesterday, after meeting with irrigators, the NFF's Tony Maher said, 'What we've agreed to is to make sure that Mick Keelty has the powers to take action where it's needed.' When will we see the legislation?
Mr LITTLEPROUD (Maranoa—Minister for Water Resources, Drought, Rural Finance, Natural Disaster and Emergency Management) (14:19): We are continuing to work with the states. There are constitutional issues pertaining to the powers which we wish to give to Mr Keelty, who is the interim inspector as we stand at the moment, and then there'll be a cabinet appointment. If Mr Keelty applies, his name will come forward. The reality is there is crossover of the constitutional powers that we are asking for Mr Keelty to have. So, until I can get that agreement from the states, it is difficult for us to prepare the legislation and to bring it to this parliament to finalise.

We have been engaging with the states, as has the inspector-general, to ensure that they have comfort around that. And that's around some of the powers we wish to give him, around being able to compel evidence and actually being able to refer to integrity commissions. So we are working with the states as quickly as we can. But, in the interim, to be able to continue on, we are asking the states to act with cooperation—and they are, and they have.

Mr Fitzgibbon interjecting—

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I think one of the things we should be proud of is the fact that there are legislative requirements, Member for Hunter. That is why we work in this place—you here longer than me. Let me just make it clear that we have come a long way with the Murray-Darling Basin Plan over the past 18 months, and with a bipartisan approach, and I acknowledge the member for Watson. We'll continue to work through that. The only delay is having the agreement with the states. Once that is done, this legislation will be entered into this parliament, and we'll expect a bipartisan approach in supporting that, and the states will work through that to ensure that there's further review if Mr Keelty is complied with.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER (14:20): I'd also like to inform the House that we have present in the gallery this afternoon the Hon. Martin Pakula, a minister in the Victorian government. He is the Minister for Racing, the Minister for Jobs, Innovation and Trade and the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Major Events—and, can I say, also a passionate and loyal Carlton supporter! Welcome to the House, Martin.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Organ and Tissue Donation

Mr KATTER (Kennedy) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Health. Are 1,400 Australians currently waitlisted for transplants? Are 11,000 Australians on dialysis and needing life-saving kidney transplants? In 2018, with 160,000 deaths, there were only 1,544 transplants. Minister, therefore should we continue with the opt-in donor system where only one in three Australians is registered and where 69 per cent of people oppose it, favouring a universal donor register with an opt-out option and/or next-of-kin approval? Can a Christmas present to those at death's door be an all-in, opt-out register?

Mr Porter: If I might assist the member for Kennedy, I understand that organ donation falls inside the responsibilities of the Minister for Regional Services, Decentralisation and Local Government, not the Minister for Health.
Mr COULTON (Parkes—Minister for Regional Services, Decentralisation and Local Government and Assistant Trade and Investment Minister) (14:22): I thank the member for Kennedy for his questions. Obviously the donation of an organ is one of the most precious gifts someone can leave on their passing. The member does mention a large number of people on waitlists. Sadly, while it is a wonderful thing to do, it is quite complicated. Only two per cent of the people who pass away in hospital in Australia are suitable to donate.

There are a couple of things that I might say to the member for Kennedy need to be done. At a government level, we need to make sure we've got the processes in place so we can use those organs when they come through. At the moment we've got about 250 doctors and nurses trained in transplant at around 95 hospitals, and we are growing that. The other one is that people can go and register online at donatelife.gov.au.

Mr Katter interjecting—

Mr COULTON: I understand the member for Kennedy's reluctance about online access. The member did mention that it is coming up to Christmas, and I think the most valuable thing we can do is talk to our family and friends, because, whether it's opt-in or opt-out—and in other countries around the world that have had the opt-out system it hasn't changed a lot—the main reason people are able to donate their organs is that they've had a conversation with their family. So, I would encourage everyone in this House and anyone who is listening, over Christmas, to have that conversation with your family to make your wishes clear.

I have personal experience. A young lad from my home town tragically found himself in a Sydney hospital on life support after a vehicle accident. His death saved the lives of seven other people. It is clearly a wonderful gift. The best thing you can do is talk to your family and friends, go online—donatelife.gov.au—and make sure that you give the gift that can give life to others.

Economy

Mr GOODENOUGH (Moore) (14:24): My question is to the Treasurer. Given the international headwinds and other challenges our economy is facing, will the Treasurer remind the House why stable and certain economic management is crucial to our economic resilience; and is the Treasurer aware of any alternative policies that could jeopardise our economic growth?

Dr Chalmers interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Just before the Treasurer starts—I want to be more efficient; I'll just warn the member for Rankin now!

Opposition members interjecting—

Mr FRYDENBERG (Kooyong—Treasurer) (14:25): He can't get a question, so he's left to shouting out! There he goes! I thank the member for Moore for his question. I acknowledge his experience in business prior to coming to this place and also the fact that, in his electorate of Moore, more than 70,000 taxpayers will get a tax cut as a result of legislation that we on this side of the House have supported, and more than 10,000 small businesses are able to access the instant asset write-off that, again, we announced in this year's budget.

The Australian economy, like many economies around the world, is facing significant domestic and international economic headwinds. When it comes to the trade tensions between
the United States and China, the IMF have said that, if they're not resolved by next year, you
could see some $700 billion wiped off global GDP. In the national accounts today we saw
the impact of the drought—5.9 per cent farm GDP down through the year. We know that the
drought is affecting two-thirds of Queensland and around 95 per cent of New South Wales.
Despite that, despite those economic headwinds, the Australian economy showed remarkable
resilience and continues to grow. In fact, growth has increased to 1.7 per cent through the year
and 0.4 per cent through the quarter. We've seen increases in public final demand, we've seen
net exports contribute to GDP, and we continue to see the government, with its $100 billion
10-year infrastructure pipeline, creating more jobs across the economy.

For the first time in more than 40 years, we've seen a current account surplus—now a
record current account surplus—of $7.9 billion as a result, in part, of the free trade
agreements that this side of the House has supported. We've also seen, for the first time in 30
years, welfare dependency down to a low, such as it is. We've seen the biggest tax cuts in
more than 20 years. And, as the Prime Minister has said, household disposable income has
had its fastest increase in a decade. Of course, the budget is back in balance for the first time
in 11 years and we're delivering the first surplus in 12 years.

Mr Speaker, could you imagine if those opposite had got their chance in government? They
would have been whacking the Australian economy with $387 billion in higher taxes—higher
taxes that the member for Rankin said he was pleased about and higher taxes that 'Chairman'
Swan still wants Labor to hold onto. Only this side of the House can be relied on to see the
economy continue to grow. Only this side of the House can create more jobs and only this
side of the House can continue to lower tax. *(Time expired)*

**Economy**

**Mr ALBANESE** (Grayndler—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is
addressed to the Prime Minister. I refer to the Prime Minister's statement, after the release of
last quarter's national accounts, about the economy, when he said the following:

… you'd expect that things would improve in the next quarter.

Given economic growth has slowed in the September quarter, to 0.4 per cent—down from 0.6
per cent last quarter—how did the Prime Minister get it so wrong?

**Mr MORRISON** (Cook—Prime Minister and Minister for the Public Service) (14:29):
The September quarter growth figures this year are higher than last year's September quarter
growth figures. I'll take you through it again. The September quarter this year was higher than
the September quarter last year. The growth in this year's September quarter was higher than
the growth in the September quarter last year. Now, I know the Leader of the Opposition is
not economically literate—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order?

Mr Albanese: Yes, on relevance. The quote was from the Prime Minister at the end of the
September quarter, at the end of the last quarter, 'You'd expect that things would improve'—

*Government members interjecting*

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will cease interjecting.

Mr Albanese: 'You'd expect that things'—

*Mr Frydenberg interjecting*
The SPEAKER: No, the Leader of the Opposition can just wait, because I can't hear him. It's not his fault. The Treasurer and others will cease interjecting. Could the Leader of the Opposition just repeat that.

Mr Albanese: It went to the Prime Minister's own quote that things would improve in the next quarter. It was 0.6; now it's 0.4. That's not improvement.

Mr MORRISON: Let me run through the quarterly results for September across the G7 countries. Australia is not a member of the G7, but our quarterly growth was 0.4. The United States was 0.5. Japan was 0.1, down from 0.4 in the previous quarter. Germany was 0.1. France was 0.3. The United Kingdom was 0.3. Italy was 0.1. Canada was 0.3. For the Euro area it was 0.2. For the OECD it was 0.3. The Australian economy grew by 0.4, and it wasn't just that; through the year growth went from 1.4 to 1.7. Our through-the-year growth is higher at the end of the September quarter than it was at the end of the June quarter. But, importantly, we had a 2½ per cent growth in household disposable income, which is the biggest increase in a quarter we've seen in a decade, and the average compensation per employee, the average wage, rose by 0.7 in the quarter to 2.9 per cent higher over the year.

Those opposite like to talk the economy down, but the Australian people have a different view; they wanted to earn more and wanted to keep more of what they earned. That is what they voted for at the last election, because they knew the Labor Party wanted to take more of their hard earnings. They wanted to increase taxes. They thought the answer to the challenges in our economy was higher taxes. Only an economic genius of Labor Party pedigree, of those opposite, could think that increasing taxes at a time of international and domestic strain on our economy was a good idea, but it takes an absolute economic incompetent like the Leader of the Opposition to think of keeping those taxes six months later. He has had six months to say: 'That was a bad idea. That was a shocking idea. We shouldn't have sought to take money away from retirees. We shouldn't have sought to tax housing. We shouldn't have done any of that.' He is stuck to those taxes just as much as the previous Leader of the Opposition was.

National Security

Mr CONNELLY (Stirling) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Home Affairs. Will the minister outline to the House how the Morrison government is building Australia's border protection resilience through its stable and certain policies, and is the minister aware of any alternative policies that would put our borders at risk?

Mr DUTTON (Dickson—Minister for Home Affairs) (14:33): I thank the member for Stirling. He has real commitment to his questions. Well done. Thank you very much. I'm very proud of the fact that this government, under the Prime Minister's leadership, has been working hard for a long period of time to clean up Labor's mess on our borders. When the Prime Minister was Minister for Immigration and Border Protection, and when I took over from that position, we had a very significant issue, given that people still want to get on boats today. We had a very significant problem, because we knew that under Labor some 1,200 people had drowned at sea, 50,000 people had arrived on 800 boats and 8,000 children were in detention. We set about making sure that we could clean up that mess, and we have, to our best ability, dealt with Labor's problems, but there is still a way to go.

Twelve months ago, almost to the day, the Labor Party sided with the Greens to weaken our border protection policies by voting into legislation the medevac law. It provided no
option for the minister of the day to discriminate against people who would be of bad character. The government was compelled to bring those people to our country, and, worse than that, once people had received medical attention, they couldn't be sent back to their country of origin or to either Nauru or PNG.

We had already in place a regime that allowed people who required medical attention off Manus and Nauru to receive that medical attention, either on Nauru or in PNG, through multimillion-dollar investments that we made to provide support to upgrading of facilities and to provide support to medical staff on the ground. People received that medical attention in either of those two countries, perhaps at the international hospital in Port Moresby, or in Taiwan. In some cases, if they weren't able to be dealt with offshore, those people came to our country for medical attention. In total about a thousand people—not just those who were in need of medical attention but support members from their family groups as well—did come to our country, and we were providing those people with the support that they needed. So it is evidenced through this whole debate that the medevac law was never about providing support to people who needed medical attention; it was always a backdoor way to get into our country.

Today we saw the Labor Party and the Greens yet again unite to try and weaken our border protection policies by opposing our proposal to abolish the medevac laws, as bad as they were. The Labor Party, even to this very moment, say, with a foghorn, to the Australian people that they have no capacity to deal with the threats off our coast and they have no ability to keep our borders secure. The Leader of the Opposition today proved that he's just as bad as any of his predecessors. (Time expired)

**Economy**

Dr CHALMERS (Rankin) (14:36): My question is to the Treasurer. Is annual economic growth of 1.7 per cent below average, below budget forecasts, below what it was before the election, below what it was when he became Treasurer, below what it was when the government was first elected, or all of the above?

Mr FRYDENBERG (Kooyong—Treasurer) (14:37): Economic growth is at 1.7 per cent through the year, and at the budget we had it at 2¼ per cent for 2019-20, and we will make updates to our forecasts at MYEFO. But the bottom line is: the Australian economy continues to grow, and, no matter how many times the member for Rankin disregards the advice of the former member for Lilley and goes out there and talks down the Australian economy and puts Australian jobs at risk, the Australian economy is resilient and jobs are being created. The reality is: today's national accounts show the remarkable resilience of the Australian economy. While countries like the United Kingdom, Singapore, South Korea and Germany experienced negative growth this year, the Australian economy continues to grow.

Can you imagine if the Australian economy had been hit by $387 billion of higher taxes at a time when we are facing a punishing drought, which has reduced farm GDP; at a time when we're seeing trade tensions, which have reduced global consumer confidence; at a time when we've seen global trade volumes down, capital flows slow and investment decisions deferred? The Labor Party had planned to hit retirees, so-called people from the top end of town, small business, family businesses, people who save for their superannuation and people who want to get ahead by working an extra shift, by working a second job. They were going to hit them with higher taxes.
The Australian economy has continued to grow on our watch because of our infrastructure spending, because of our tax cuts and because we put the interests of the Australian people first.

**Budget**

Ms FLINT (Boothby—Government Whip) (14:39): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer update the House on how the Morrison government is providing record spending on essential services because of its stable and certain budgetary management? Is the Treasurer aware of any alternative policies that may undermine the resilience of our economy?

Mr FRYDENBERG (Kooyong—Treasurer) (14:39): I want to congratulate the member for Boothby for withstanding those grubby, disgraceful attacks from GetUp!, supported by the Labor Party. They were attacking her personally. The fact that she is back in this place is not only a credit to her and all the people who supported her but a credit to the values of the Liberal Party and a credit to the people of Boothby for selecting her. In her electorate, there are more than 70,000 taxpayers who are getting a tax cut as a result of tax policies that we supported on this side of the House and those opposite opposed. And more than 20,000 small businesses are going to be able to access the instant asset write-off that we announced in this year's budget.

As I've said before, and I'm saying it again: the budget is back in the black and back on track, and we've done that without increasing taxes. When we came to government, we inherited an economy where unemployment was rising, investment was falling and we saw $240 billion of accumulated deficits. But, through disciplined and considered policymaking, now we're starting to pay back Labor's debt, we've got the budget back in control and we've seen the current accounts, for the first time in 40 years, come into surplus. We've seen welfare dependency at a 30-year low, we've seen the biggest tax cuts in more than 20 years, we've seen the first balanced budget in 11 years and we'll see the first surplus budget in 12 years.

The ability to have a disciplined economic approach to get balanced budgets and surplus budgets to pay down Labor's debt also allows the government to spend more on the essential services that people need and deserve, like increasing school and hospital funding by around 60 per cent; fully funding the NDIS to ensure that hundreds of thousands of people will get support; the recent package we announced for aged care—record funding for aged care; and, of course, drought support of more than a billion additional dollars that we have announced since the election. We know that S&P have said that the Australian economy has a sound outlook, we know that Deloittes have said the momentum is picking up, and we know that the Reserve Bank of Australia has said the economy has reached a gentle turning point. With considered and disciplined economic management by this Prime Minister and by members on this side of the House, the Australian people will continue to see more jobs created and lower taxes.

**Asylum Seekers**

Mr MARLES (Corio—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): My question is to the Prime Minister. I refer to Senator Lambie's statement to the Senate that she cut a deal with the government to repeal the medevac legislation—a deal Senator Cormann has denied. Has the
Mr MORRISON (Cook—Prime Minister and Minister for the Public Service) (14:42): I'm not aware of what the member is referring to. I have before me what Senator Lambie's comments were in the Senate on this bill and it makes no mention or reference to that. I can assure you that Senator Lambie today is fully aware of the government's policies and is pleased with those policies, and today she has supported the government's policies by supporting the repeal of the medevac bill, which was supported by the Labor Party a year ago—about this time—and the Labor Party did that because they don't believe in stronger border protection.

One of the biggest myths that exists out there is that the Labor Party has the same policy as the Liberals and the Nationals when it comes to border protection. That is simply untrue. On every test, on every occasion, this Leader of the Opposition and the last Leader of the Opposition have proven themselves to be weak on border protection, and the Australian people know it. They know Labor can't be trusted on border protection, because they know they were the architects the last time and the time before that when we saw these things occur in the way they did—seeking to frustrate the policies of the government on this occasion and on previous occasions, when we have sought to remedy the problems that have been faced on our borders. Labor are weak on border protection. The Australian people know it. This leader of the Labor Party in particular is weak on border protection, and he confirmed that today with his reaction to the repeal of the medevac bill.

Our government policies were supporting people who required medical attention and they were brought to Australia for that medical attention. It was our government that got every single child off Nauru. That was done under my Prime Ministership. We ensured that we delivered that. This mob on that side—this Labor Party—were the Labor Party that sent children to Manus Island. How do I know that? I went there as a shadow immigration minister and I sat with the mothers and children that they sent to Manus Island.

So I will not take lectures from a Labor Party that showed themselves to be involved in the most outrageous treatment of women and children in sending them to Manus Island and then did nothing while we sought to stop the deaths at sea and we got every single child off Manus and off Nauru. The Labor Party's record on this issue is beyond a disgrace and, if this leader of the Labor Party ever got the opportunity to be in charge of border protection, he would set a new low.

Mrs WICKS (Robertson) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Education. Will the minister outline how the Morrison government is building better education standards for Australian schools through its stable and certain budget management?

Mr TEHAN (Wannon—Minister for Education) (14:46): I thank the member for Robertson for her question and for her passion for education and all the students in her electorate. I know she cares deeply about this matter and I know she cares deeply about the $310 billion that we're investing in education—an over 60 per cent increase. Last year we provided $18.7 billion for education. This year it is $19.9 billion. Next year we're providing $21.4 billion and we're providing $22.9 billion the year after. We're doing this because of our
sound economic management: no new taxes over here, no taxing the economy to death over here. We just want to provide the sound economic management which means that we can continue to grow our economy and grow funding for education.

What that means for state schools is that our growth in funding is increasing by 6.4 per cent. When it comes to the non-government sector, it's 4.9 per cent. We've also signed national school reform agreements with every single state and territory and have signed bilateral agreements as well, which means that we can adopt the Gonski reforms. It's the Gonski reforms that will transform the standards that we're currently seeing in our schooling system. As I said yesterday, that is why we need every state and territory on board.

We need to be bold. We need to drive these reforms through. I say to every state and territory education minister: leave the talking points from the unions behind when you come to the meeting next week. We need to implement and we need to be adventurous. And what do we need to do? We have to focus on literacy and numeracy. They are the fundamentals, and that's what we want to do. We want to do that by making sure that every student can map their progression when it comes to literacy and numeracy. But, more importantly, we also want to provide an institute that will give our teachers the expertise they need to drive these improvements in literacy and numeracy. These are important reforms. These are the reforms that David Gonski recommended to us, and we have to make sure the states and territories come on board.

Those opposite seem to think that this was their idea. They had 27 different funding agreements when they were in office. Guess how many states were signed up to their national school reforms. Guess how many states they had. Three. How many have we got? We've got the lot. We need to drive reforms next week, and that is what we'll be doing.

**Member for Chisholm**

Mr MARLES (Corio—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Prime Minister. Today's report 'Gladys Liu linked to donor at centre of cash drop probe' reveals the CEO of the company Brighsun received a million dollars in cash from a heroin trafficker, including half a million in a backpack, and the company donated $105,000 to the Liberals. The company has been subject to a drug-trafficking and money-laundering probe by the Federal Police and Criminal Intelligence Commission. What steps has the Prime Minister taken to investigate links between the health minister, the member for Chisholm and this company?

**The SPEAKER:** I'll just call the Leader of the House and see what he has to say. We might have different problems with the question.

**Mr Porter:** There are multiple problems with the question, but mine is that it is not inside the Prime Minister's portfolio of responsibilities, as broad as they are.

**The SPEAKER:** The Manager of Opposition Business?

**Mr Burke:** Mr Speaker, the part of the question with the initial information has to be there to make sense of the eventual question. When it gets to the question, it is specifically: what steps has the Prime Minister taken? I don't see how what steps the Prime Minister has taken to investigate can be anything other than his responsibility.

**The SPEAKER:** I hear the Manager of Opposition Business, but the problem is, as I have ruled previously on these matters, if it doesn't relate to the Prime Minister's responsibilities
the question's not in order. What I'd say to the Manager of Opposition Business is, where questions have anchored the responsibility to a minister or the Prime Minister, that, indeed, has been their argument about why I should allow them. So, on that question, I'm going to rule it out of order and we'll go to the next question.

**National Security**

Mr PEARCE (Braddon) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Home Affairs. Will the minister outline to the House how the Morrison government is building the resilience of Australia's national security and how this helps to protect Australians from the threat of terrorism?

Mr DUTTON (Dickson—Minister for Home Affairs) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his strong support of the government's policies, which help to keep Australians safe. The Morrison government is absolutely committed to making sure that we can support our agencies at a Commonwealth level—principally, the Australian Federal Police, ASIO, AUSTRAC, the ACIC and others within my portfolio as well as across government. We've done that by providing more funding to help our investigators and analysts disrupt attacks before they happen. We've done it so that they can work with their international counterparts to look at what people are saying offshore and what planning and preparation may be going into a terrorist attack in our country or, indeed, the country of one of our allies or elsewhere.

Over and above that, and very importantly, we've been able to provide now 18 tranches of counterterrorism legislation since 2014, including the temporary exclusion orders act and the assistance and access act. That has gone directly to providing support to ASIO, to the AFP and to our joint counterterrorism teams across the country to keep Australians safe. So we are building the resilience of our agencies and of our country to deal with the very significant threat of those who would seek to do us harm.

I can advise the House today that earlier this morning the Australian Federal Police, along with the joint counterterrorism team, arrested a 21-year-old male following a counterterrorism investigation. It is alleged in relation to that individual that he was undertaking acts in preparation for a terrorist act in addition to other offences. This is one of many investigations, tragically, that are underway, led by the joint counterterrorism team. I praise the New South Wales police and all of those who were involved in that team that works every hour of the day to keep Australians safe. There is much of their work that will never be disclosed to the Australian public, but I can assure you, out of the briefings that I receive, we are absolutely supported by the best people in the world. Their training and expertise is something that all Australians should be very proud of. As we know, in this investigation, as I'm advised by the Commissioner of the Australian Federal Police, the investigators did utilise the new assistance and access legislation and it was a very important part of the investigative technique in relation to this matter.

I note, frankly, with sadness, that Senator Keneally in the Senate is trying to introduce a bill to water down that act, which is quite remarkable. It's a political stunt, similar to those we've seen her involved in before. No wonder the former leader of the Labor Party was trying to dispatch her to foreign shores! But I can tell you that the Labor Party will seek to do damage if they get that bill through the parliament— *(Time expired)*
Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction

Mr BUTLER (Hindmarsh) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction. At 12.45, the minister failed to comply with a Senate order to provide any evidence backing his claim that the fraudulent document he used to attach the Lord Mayor of Sydney was downloaded from the City of Sydney website. Will the minister provide that evidence now?

The SPEAKER: Just before I call the minister, I'm going to say that any questions can be answered, but, as a matter of principle on behalf of all members of the House of Representatives, there is absolutely no obligation to comply with a Senate order. That's an important principle. Indeed, there have been requests in the past that members of this House appear at Senate hearings. Former Prime Minister Keating responded more colourfully than I am now.

And I'm just going to say on behalf of all members of this House: the Senate has no business seeking members of this House to comply with anything they seek to do. As you can tell, my attitude to the first part of the question—

Mr Gosling interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Solomon, if you want to go and be a senator, go for your life. The member for Hindmarsh, on a point of order?

Mr Butler: Thank you for that clarification. I wonder if I could reword the question.

Mr Frydenberg interjecting—

The SPEAKER: No. I'll just say to those opposite, if I were—

Mr Butler: Criticism about hair from the Treasurer!

The SPEAKER: If I were the Treasurer, I wouldn't mention hair at this point in time.

Mr Butler: I'm gobsmacked!

The SPEAKER: Let's just change the topic or we'll all be in trouble. I didn't say that the question was out of order. It was just important, as the Speaker, on behalf of members of this House, to say that we are no more going to comply with Senate orders or appear at Senate committees. There's no compunction. The last part of the question was in order.

Mr TAYLOR (Hume—Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction) (14:57): I'll always cooperate on matters of this sort. I tabled a statement in this House last week. It was a statement from 25 October and, as I have repeatedly told the House, I absolutely reject the scurrilous allegations from those opposite. They are so transparent. They seek to distract from their woes with gossip and smear, because they don't want to talk about how emissions have fallen in the last year and are lower than at any time Labor were in government. They don't want to talk about three consecutive quarters of electricity price reductions.

Workplace Relations

Mr TIM WILSON (Goldstein) (14:58): My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the Attorney outline to the House how the Morrison government's resilient approach to industrial relations is tackling law-breaking, militant unions, particularly in our building and construction sector? Is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?
Mr PORTER (Pearce—Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Leader of the House) (14:58): I thank the member for Goldstein for his question. It is the case that the government today reintroduced the ensuring integrity bill, which seeks to place higher and more reasonable standards on registered organisations. The reason we did that is that, as a government, we will not stand by while a small but dangerous group of militant officials continue to break laws which are designed to protect men and women who just want to do their jobs. As a government, we will not stand by and watch the cost of vital infrastructure projects like schools, roads and hospitals increase by 30 per cent because of the militant activity of a small group of union officials.

In fact, today in this place the Labor Party tried to delay even debating the reintroduced ensuring integrity bill until July 2022. They sought to achieve a 2½-year delay before we would even talk about the issue. If we look at the current rate of offending, that would mean we'd be looking at over 400 more contraventions of industrial laws by the CFMMEU alone before, under Labor's standards, we even got to talk about the problem. And that is not even counting what will, no doubt, be the future breaches of criminal offences. Four hundred more! How many more workers do you say it's okay to be labelled 'scabs' or 'dogs', or bullied or threatened or intimidated, before we get to deal with this problem?

If I can focus on one very important provision in this bill, and that is proposed section 226(3) of the introduced ensuring integrity bill, which would make it an offence—and prevent it from happening—where a union officer has been disqualified but simply goes on for all intents and purposes acting as a union official. At the moment there is nothing that makes that situation unlawful—that is, working as a shadow officer. And some people, I think, would be very, very pleased with not even getting to talk about that type of provision for 2½ years. The reason being that there have been many people that have come out of jail and have been welcomed back with open arms into the union movement into the position of officials—into positions working for all intents and purposes as officials. It is a very common occurrence. John Setka and Craig Johnston—they were the two men who organised a run through by balaclava-wearing union officials which terrorised workers, men and women, including a pregnant woman. Mr Johnston served nine months in prison, and the trade union support committee reportedly issued a statement that said, 'We will be waiting there at the gates when he comes out.' And there is no law presently available to stop that person acting as a shadow official. In fact, July 2022 would be a very convenient date for one Dave Hanna, who's been found guilty of many things—not least of which, recently, was rape—because that would allow him to serve the bulk of his non-parole period, if there's no debate until July 2022—(Time expired)

Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction

Mr BUTLER (Hindmarsh) (15:01): My question is again to the Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction. Have the minister and his office provided data, data logs and metadata to the detectives conducting Strike Force Garrad to substantiate his claim that he downloaded the document directly from the City of Sydney website? If not, why not?

Mr TAYLOR (Hume—Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction) (15:02): As I said, I will always cooperate on matters of this sort. My office has established an administrative point of contact with the New South Wales police, and I don't propose to say more while
police inquiries are continuing. I don't propose to say more while police inquiries are beginning, coming from a referral that came from those opposite.

Defence

Mr HASTIE (Canning) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industry. Will the minister outline to the House how the Morrison government's stable and certain budget management is building resilience in our defence industry, including by creating jobs and opportunities for Australian businesses in global markets?

Ms PRICE (Durack—Minister for Defence Industry) (15:02): I'd like to thank the member for Canning for his question. I'd also like to thank him for his service to our nation in our defence forces and also acknowledge his passion for defence industry. Because of our government's stable and certain approach to economic management, we were able to invest a record $200 billion in our defence capability, and this $200 billion investment is delivering world-class capability for our men and women in uniform. What that includes is 57 Australian-built vessels for our Navy, 211 Boxer CRVs for our Army and 72 Joint Strike Fighter jets for our Air Force. We are building a resilient Defence Force, and at the same time we're building a resilient defence industry.

Along with our world-class capability, our investment is also delivering Australian jobs and new opportunities for small businesses on the global stage. Last night at the Australian Export Awards, Victorian business Marand Precision Engineering took out the Manufacturing and Advanced Materials Award. This is a very, very well-deserved recognition for an Australian business that is a real shining star in our defence industry. I did have the pleasure of visiting Marand's facility in Moorabbin not so long ago, and at this facility Marand manufacture the vertical tails for every F-35 Joint Strike Fighter globally, something that we should be immensely proud of. The Morrison government is well on track to deliver the 5,000 jobs and the $2 billion worth of work for Australian businesses in the F-35 program by 2023. It's an enormous achievement. Recently I also travelled to the US to make the case for greater Australian involvement in the F-35 program for businesses just like Marand.

Our record investment in defence industry, including our Defence Export Strategy, is opening doors for Australian businesses in global markets. We know that trade creates one in five Australian jobs at home, so the more we can help those Australian defence industries open up those opportunities with respect to defence industries overseas, the more jobs we can create. It is a very, very positive story for our defence industry. In the last financial year our government invested some $8.1 billion in our small to medium-sized defence industries, and there was a 30 per cent increase across the board for small and medium-sized businesses in Australia with respect to government departments. That's what our certain and stable budget management allows you to do.

Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction

Mr BUTLER (Hindmarsh) (15:05): My question again is to the Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction, and I'll refer to his previous answers. Public internet archives of the City of Sydney website show the annual report published on the website contain the correct travel figures on 27 March, 20 April, 19 June and 24 October this year. Does the minister seriously expect Australians to believe the report with the correct figures was on the website on each of those dates then was inexplicably replaced with a report with incorrect figures,
which only his office downloaded, and then the report with the correct figures was put back up again for everyone else to see?

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House on a point of order?

Mr Porter: Mr Speaker, there is a high standard around questions that can prejudice an investigation, but it was members opposite who referred this matter—

Opposition members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House can pause. I just want the Leader of the House to repeat his point again. Members on my left will not interject. It's particularly disorderly to interject on a point of order where a question is being contested and I'm expected to rule. I want to hear the Leader of the House.

Mr Porter: It was members opposite who referred this matter, and that investigation—which they, in effect, commenced by their referral—has to be allowed to take its course, and questions—

Ms Plibersek interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House will pause. The member for Sydney will leave under standing order 94(a), and if the Leader of the House can rewind about 15 seconds then I can hear what he had to say.

The member for Sydney then left the chamber.

Mr Porter: Questions like that are either out of order because they prejudice the investigation that members opposite called for—

The SPEAKER: The member for Sydney needs to leave or she'll be named. It looked like you were getting your photograph taken, that's all. The Leader of the House.

Mr Porter: or they are designed to leave the minister in a situation where he has no choice other than to note that the investigation is underway and he can't provide the response to the question, because the response should go to those who are investigating it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Macnamara can leave under 94(a).

The member for Macnamara then left the chamber.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kennedy might notice I'm ruling on a point of order, so he's welcome to stand there, but he might be there for some time. I'm going to hear from the Manager of Opposition Business.

Mr Burke: Just to the point of order raised by the Leader of the House: in the first instance, the references to the sub judice rule in Practice have many precedents that would allow a question of this nature. Secondly, if the Attorney-General did have a view that nothing could be said that proffered a view on the investigation, then a whole lot of what he has said dismissing the investigation would itself have been out of order. The question simply goes to facts of earlier answers as to whether or not the minister for emissions reduction can substantiate what he has claimed to be true given what's on the public record.

The SPEAKER: I thank both the Leader of the House and the Manager of Opposition Business, and I can understand the practical point the Leader of the House is making with respect to the ability to answer questions. However, under the standing orders and the Practice, that doesn't prevent those questions being asked. With respect to the sub judice rule,
without me going through all the precedents in Practice, which itself can be problematic, I
will simply summarise as best I can in saying there is a point, at times, where sub judice
becomes an issue, and I've made sure I'm across that, and we're not at that point. As to the
Leader of the House's second point, even if there were an argument that he's right, that doesn't
prevent the question being asked, even if it might be judged by some that it can't necessarily
be answered. The minister has the call.

Mr TAYLOR (Hume—Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction) (15:10): I made a
statement on this, which I have tabled in the House. Whilst there are ongoing police inquiries
as a result of a referral from those opposite, I have nothing more to add.

eSafety Commissioner

Dr MARTIN (Reid) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Communications, Cyber
Safety and the Arts. Will the minister outline how the Morrison government is building
Australia's resilience to online harm through the work of the eSafety Commissioner?

Mr FLETCHER (Bradfield—Minister for Communications, Cyber Safety and the Arts)
(15:10): I thank the member for Reid for her question. As a child psychologist, she certainly
understands the importance of helping to keep children and adults safe against harm they can
face online and the importance of children and adults being resilient. Australia has been at the
forefront of taking action to keep people safe online. As a world first, we established the
Children's eSafety Commissioner in 2015. Since then its responsibilities have been expanded
to become the eSafety Commissioner. The Prime Minister, earlier this year, secured a
commitment from G20 governments that we expect the internet industry to do more to protect
citizens against terrorism and violent extremism online.

The eSafety Commissioner is promoting online safety with $100 million for initiatives over
the next four years. There's a national online eSafety hub—eSafety.gov.au—and I say to any
young person, any parent or any educator who has concerns about online safety to please go
to eSafety.gov.au. The eSafety Commissioner is preventing online harm, for example, by
developing safety by design principles, which are getting significant traction in the tech
sector. Of course, our government acted very rapidly following the atrocious Christchurch
attack, where the murder of more than 50 people was live streamed online. We legislated
tough new laws about abhorrent violent material online, and the eSafety Commissioner has
acted to block access to fringe websites which were hosting this appalling video.

The eSafety Commissioner is protecting Australians with practical tools to deal with
cyberbullying material directed at Australian children, to deal with intimate images being
shared without consent online and to deal with prohibited and illegal material. The eSafety
Commissioner administers schemes to deal with various kinds of material and has resolved
more than 1,500 cyberbullying complaints in the last four years and is sometimes able to get
that material down within as little as 30 minutes.

The internet is a wonderful resource of information, of entertainment and of social
connection, but it must be safe for users. That is why the Morrison government has
articulated, on behalf of the Australian community, our very clear expectations of the internet
industry, and we are backing those expectations with the force of law.
The SPEAKER: I was going to point something out. The member for Sydney, as members know, has been excluded for an hour and was just in the gallery. I remind members that the standing order applies to the chamber and the galleries.

Mr Robert interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Prime Minister—again, if he could let me speak without interruption, even if he seeks to interrupt others. I'm just pointing that out to members, and I'm certainly aware of members who've been named for that.

Mr Robert interjecting—

The SPEAKER: It was you interjecting, was it? Let me say, even though the standing order's there, unless I consider it wilful, I wouldn't act, but I just thought it timely to warn people.

Mr Morrison: I ask that further questions be placed on the Notice Paper.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr KATTER (Kennedy) (15:14): I seek to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Kennedy claim to have been misrepresented?

Mr KATTER: Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kennedy may proceed.

Mr KATTER: I was accused in the House and on national television of having achieved nothing by way of dams. Prime Minister Scott Morrison has said work is to be starting on the Hughenden irrigation project, the Big Rocks Weir and the engineering plans for Hell's Gate Dam in the life of this parliament. Either the minister is wrong or the Prime Minister is lying. In the same period of time, the last six years, the NAIF and the national water fund, under this minister, were allocated $5,000 million and $540 million respectively. In six years, under this minister, only $38.5 million of the NAIF's $5,000 million has been spent, and in six years not a single dam, not even a small weir, has been built. In six years not even a single dam engineering plan has been drawn up.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S SPEECH

Address-in-Reply

The SPEAKER (15:15): I remind those who are still present that the address-in-reply will be returned to His Excellency the Governor-General at Government House at 5 pm today, so I'd be glad if the mover and seconder, together with other honourable members, would accompany me. In practical terms that means I will suspend the House at the conclusion of the MPI, being round about 4.20, and, when we get back, have the bells rung at an appropriate time, in consultation with the Leader of the House, but normally that would be around 6 pm.

DOCUMENTS

Presentation

Mr PORTER (Pearce—Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Leader of the House) (15:16): Documents are tabled in accordance with the list circulated to honourable members earlier today. Full details of the documents will be recorded in the Votes and Proceedings.
AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS

Report No. 16 of 2019-20


Document made a parliamentary paper in accordance with the resolution agreed to on 28 March 2018.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Politics

The SPEAKER (15:16): I have received a letter from the honourable member for Warringah proposing that a definite matter of public importance be submitted to the House for discussion, namely:

The Australian public's declining trust in politicians and in the political process.

I call upon those honourable members who approve of the proposed discussion to rise in their places.

More than the number of members required by the standing orders having risen in their places—

Ms STEGGALL (Warringah) (15:17): 'The Australian Public's declining trust in politicians and in the political process'—How good is this topic, today of all days! On this day, when there are claims and counterclaims, secret deals to pass legislation, allegations in the media of foreign interference in our political system and ongoing concerns about parliamentarians' standards, it is timely to talk about the topic of this matter of public importance: the declining trust of Australians in their elected representatives and their political institutions. We live in a country with a democratic record that on the whole is to be envied. We have since Federation enjoyed regular, peaceful changes of government through open and transparent elections, and the rule of law is embedded into our political system.

But, while Australians are rightly proud of our democracy, the evidence is clear that they are becoming less likely to trust their elected representatives and our political system and are not all that inclined to engage with it. The 2016 Australian election study conducted by the ANU found that public satisfaction with our democratic processes and public trust in the politicians they elect are at some of the lowest levels ever recorded. This is a wake-up call to Australia's political leadership that Australia is not immune from the problems facing democracy in Europe and the US. The parliament of Australia is the people's house, the highest authority in our nation and the place where many aspects of how we live our lives are determined. It should be a place that all Australians respect and are inspired to contribute to, directly or indirectly. Members of the federal government have the opportunity for nepotism and favouritism in appointments and the granting of contracts, misuse of confidential information, conflicts of interest, misuse of entitlements, decisions that favour political donors and crossover appointments between industry lobbyists and parliament, yet there is no criminal sanction for any of these actions. Currently such conduct is self-regulated by parliament and rarely results in real action and investigations.

Public confidence in our political system is undermined by the absence of transparent accountability systems for dealing with allegations of corruption, claims of secret deals over
legislation and ongoing reports of foreign interference. Australians have an expectation that the Australian parliament and Public Service meet the highest standards of integrity. They expect that politicians need to be held to greater account so that the parliamentary process is more honest, productive and inspiring than it has been in the recent past.

There are six things that we need to address. One is establishing a national anticorruption body that has real teeth. This must include an independent referral pathway and discretion to hold public hearings. The public must know of this. There must be accountability. We cannot have MPs and their staff held to a weaker standard than others within Australia. We need to restore the Westminster principle of ministerial responsibility. We need to return to an impartial Public Service that provides advice without fear or favour. We need fixed four-year terms of parliament. We need to establish a parliamentary fact-finding office and we need to legislate for truth in political advertising.

I would like to focus on truth in political advertising in particular because that is the starting point of how we all find ourselves in this place. There is an urgent need for this government and this parliament to address this problem. False or misleading claims propagated during recent elections have generated a great deal of public interest, and safeguarding the integrity of our political system must be a priority. According to a national ReachTEL poll conducted following the 2019 federal election, a majority of Australian voters want tougher truth-in-political-advertising laws, with 87.7 per cent of respondents calling for change. This is a critically important issue as the potential impact of misleading and false statements made in the course of electioneering is undoubtedly plentiful. Misleading and dishonest campaigns have an adverse effect on the public interest. They divert attention from substantive issues and may even distort electoral outcomes. To make matters even worse, corrective advertising seeking to clarify matters is often ineffectual, disseminated less widely and ultimately ignored.

The Electoral Act does not require truth in electoral advertising. This comes as a shock to most constituents. They can't believe that that is how low our standard is. The Australian Electoral Commission is unable to act to stop misleading and deceptive conduct during elections. The AEC can only act in relation to conduct which affects the process of casting a vote. In addition, through a number of decisions the High Court has recognised an implied right of political communication in the Constitution.

The question of whether the Australian parliament should enact truth-in-political-advertising laws is not a new one. In fact, the Commonwealth parliament considered the idea back in the 1980s, and until 2002 FreeTV Australia heard complaints against and did not permit misleading political advertising under the Trade Practices Act. Since then Australians have been subject to particularly insidious scare campaigns from both sides of the House. We've had the 'Mediscare' campaign and we've had the death duties campaign, to name just two. These campaigns have sought political profit at the expense of truth and the integrity of our political system.

Australians should be casting their vote based on genuine and factual information. Whilst we can debate competing definitions of truth, everyone can agree to an objective fact-checker, and a minimum factual basis can elevate the national conversation concerning issues that matter to Australians and cut through the fake news, fake advertising and fake political campaigning that demeans us all. South Australia already has adopted political advertising
laws without major issue. It is an offence in South Australia to authorise or cause to be
published electoral advertisements that are materially inaccurate or misleading. Although the
Electoral Commission of South Australia is at times uncomfortable with its role as an
adjudicator of the truth, the South Australian example proves that factual-accuracy-in-
political-advertising laws are possible.

New Zealand, too, has a national regulation of truth in political advertising, in its case
conducted with its advertising standards body. The system has been in existence for decades
and over this time has successfully dealt with complicated questions of truth with nuance and
transparency. The UK and Canada both have similar provisions. At a time when the
confidence of Australians in our political system is at a critically low level, we must take
decisive action to defend the integrity of the democracy in our country and act with the moral
determination and courage that Australian people expect of us.

In 2002 the Senate finance and public administration committee recommended that some
mechanism should be in place to address concerns about improper practices during election
campaigns. All sectors of the economy which relate to consumers are bound by strict laws in
terms of product quality and product advertising. There should also be constraints on similar
activities of candidates, groups and parties in the electoral process. It's unacceptable that
misleading customers is against the law but misleading voters is at best a legal grey space and
at worst not considered at all. In order to help combat the confidence deficit in our
democracy, taking a clear stand against misinformation is critical.

Whilst the South Australian example gives us a good indication as to what's possible,
provision in favour of truth in political advertising must balance concerns relating to freedom
of speech, and Commonwealth law must be designed so as to ensure it doesn't breach
constitutionally implied freedom of political communication. We need to create safeguards
against any legislation ensuring truth in political advertising being wielded as a political tool
to shut down debate and undermine candidates and parties following due process.

Whilst finding the balance is not an easy task, as it stands today there is little to no
protection for voters. This is a time when we need a robust debate concerning the country's
future more than ever, a conversation grounded in facts and genuine dialogue, not political
grandstanding, slogans and chronic misinformation campaigns. Technology is rapidly
developing, and it allows people to literally put words into other people's mouths and
promulgate, on social media, videos that are false and misleading, before anyone can correct
the record. Given this, it's important that we create a legal framework for dealing with this
now. This cannot delay.

I share the expectations of the Australian people that the Australian parliament and the
Public Service should meet the highest standard of integrity. It's been quite astounding to me,
having sat through the events of the last couple of weeks and the conduct that I've seen in this
place, how the priorities that the Australian people face and the things that are going on are
superseded by events that we've seen—secret deals when it comes to legislation— (Time
expired)

Mr MORTON (Tangney—Assistant Minister to the Prime Minister and Cabinet) (15:27):
When I think about trust in politics, I think about governments doing exactly what they said
they would do when they sought election. When I think about trust in relation to the last
election, I'm reminded about Prime Minister Morrison specifically raising the issue of trust on
the day that he visited the Governor-General and called the election. In fact, as reported in
*The Canberra Times*:

Mr Morrison declared the election to be about "trust" and the economic record of the Liberals and
Nationals in power in contrast to the higher taxes proposed by Opposition Leader Bill Shorten.

I specifically reviewed the interview transcript today, and I quote the Prime Minister:

… who do you trust to deliver that strong economy which your essential services rely on?

In relation to trust, we can use this opportunity to outline exactly what this government's
priorities are and how we're delivering exactly on what we took to the Australian people. It's
very interesting that the honourable member referenced today's successful repeal of Labor's
medevac law in an argument against trust. This was one of the issues that this government
took to the election. This is one of those pieces of legislation that we said we would repeal,
and today that repeal has occurred in the Senate. That is how we deliver on trust to the
Australian people—by saying what we're going to do and delivering upon that.

This government's priority is to build an even stronger economy. It's about building
resilience and rewarding aspiration. It's about lower taxes so Australians can keep more of
what they earn. It's about reducing the costs to businesses. It's about equipping Australians
with the skills that they need and making sure that we create the employees that Australian
businesses need. It's about expanding our trade. It's about building infrastructure. It's about
keeping the budget strong. The reason why these priorities are important is that this is exactly
what we said to the Australian people we would do, and we're delivering upon that. The
government has returned the budget to surplus. The budget, for the first time in 11 years, is in
balance. Again, we are delivering upon the commitment that we made to the Australian
people, unlike Labor, who hadn't delivered a surplus since 1989.

One of the key things we said at the election was that we would continue to build on our
record of working with businesses to create jobs in our economy. In 2019 alone, to October,
202,700 new jobs have been added to the Australian economy, with 251,800 jobs added over
the past year. Since 2013, more than 1.4 million more Australians are in jobs, and 55 per cent
of those jobs have been full time. That's how we're developing trust in democracy—by doing
exactly what we said we would do.

One of the first things that we did—and it was not easy to pass through this House and the
Senate with the usual political games that you would expect from those opposite—was deliver
tax reform and deliver a further $158 billion of tax relief, building on our already legislated
Personal Income Tax Plan. It was the biggest simplification of the personal income tax system
since the early 1990s, abolishing an entire tax bracket and making income tax lower, fairer
and simpler. We're lowering the 32.5 per cent rate to 30 per cent in 2024-25, ensuring a
projected 94 per cent of taxpayers will face a marginal tax rate of no more than 30 per cent.
We said we would do it, and we've done it, and we will continue to do the things we said we
would do.

We told the Australian people that we would take action in relation to the cost of
electricity. They put their trust in this government to take that action. ABS data shows that
national electricity prices have dropped around three per cent since December.

We said that we would take action in relation to Australia's emissions, and we've done that.
In the year to June 2019, economy-wide emissions fell 0.1 per cent, or 400,000 tonnes to 532
We said we would invest in infrastructure. We said we would build on our $100 billion infrastructure investments and that we would keep the economy strong so that we can deliver the essential services Australians rely on. More recently, we announced a bring forward of $3.8 billion of infrastructure investment to help strengthen the economy, to drive jobs and to get people home sooner. That's how we develop trust in our democracy—by doing what we said we would do and by delivering.

Through our strong budget management, we've also been able to support our farmers and drought-affected communities when they need us the most. Since the last election, we have announced over $1 billion of additional support. We've made changes to the farm household allowance to make it easier to apply for and more accessible, including the introduction of a new special drought relief payment for farmers and graziers that have exhausted their four years of farm household allowance.

At the last election we said to the Australian people that a strong economy is central to everything; only with a strong economy can we deliver on the essential services that Australians rely on. They put their trust in us and, because we can manage the economy, we were able to deliver this additional support for farmers and those drought-affected communities.

We're backing our farmers with the establishment of the $5 billion Future Drought Fund. It will improve the resilience of rural and regional communities. Importantly, we said that we would pass legislation to protect farmers from activists who trespass on their land. We said that we would protect farmers from activists that seek to trespass and to get in the way of hardworking, honest Australians that are working on the land and in farms. That legislation was passed. We're going to get a lecture from the Greens, no doubt, in relation to trust in our democracy, from a party that didn't support the mandate that this government had in order to pass that legislation in this House. They're going to talk about a whole range of other issues about trust, but they fail to maintain the trust that the people expect of governments and to build that trust by allowing governments to get on with it and do what they said they would. They voted against that. If the Australian government took to the people a commitment to protect Australian farmers from activists, the Australian people's trust in our democracy will be strengthened when the government can get on with it and deliver exactly what they said they would do.

This is a government that is delivering record school funding. This is a government that's delivering record health funding. This is a government that has, this year, made 334 new and extended PBS listings, providing new treatment options for many conditions, including cystic fibrosis, asthma, skin cancer, leukaemia and lung cancer, amongst many more. That is benefitting hundreds of thousands of Australians who now have access to life-saving and improved treatment options. More than half a million Australians are accessing cheaper medicines as a result of mandated price reductions on 15 common medicines sold as 175 medicine brands, saving Australians $390 million a year. That's how we develop trust in our democracy—delivering for Australians in very practical ways that make their lives easier, by putting more money in their pockets and delivering on the concerns that they have.
I'm one who likes to talk up our democracy. We live in a democracy that we should be very proud of. When a government takes a commitment to the Australian people to make practical and real improvements in the lives of hardworking and aspirational Australians, delivering on those commitments strengthens the trust that Australians have in our democracy. Deputy Speaker, you're going to hear a lot from people who are going to talk down our system of democracy. I'm very proud and humbled to be a member of this parliament. I take my role as representing not only my constituency of Tangney but also the people of Western Australia and the people of Australia, in my role as an assistant minister to the Prime Minister, very seriously, as I know all members of this place do. We have a responsibility as members of parliament to talk up the strength of our democracy. We live in one of the finest democracies in the world. It is a democracy that is strengthened when governments have the ability to deliver on exactly what they said they would deliver when they took their positions to an election and were re-elected as a result.

Mr BANDT (Melbourne) (15:37): People in Australia like democracy, but they're worried that our parliament has been captured by big corporate interests and that too many decisions are made by this government for the benefit of private interests, not the public interest. There are four important things that the government could do within a matter of days to turn around the decline in trust that people have in this place and restore people's confidence in democracy. We need to restore confidence in democracy because we have seen what happens around the world when people disengage from the democratic system. It opens the door to demagogues, and we want to make sure that never happens in Australia.

The first thing that we could do is put in place a national anticorruption watchdog before Christmas, and we could have one before Christmas if the government wanted to. Why could we have one? Because the Senate has actually passed a bill to establish a national ICAC. I was proud to be the first member to introduce a national anticorruption watchdog bill into the House. That was then improved on by the previous member for Indi, Cathy McGowan, and worked on by a number of others. Suggestions were taken on board and a bill that probably had the support of the whole crossbench passed the Senate, because it had the support of the Labor Party as well. It found its way to the House, where the government kicked it off into the long grass. The government are prepared to come in here time after time and say, 'We need an integrity bill for unions,' but they're not prepared to bring in an integrity bill that covers politicians. If you want to restore trust in this place, put in place a national ICAC, a federal integrity commission, because we are seeing at the state level, day after day, what happens when developers and big corporates get politicians from both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party in their pockets. And if you believe that, somehow, corruption only happens within state borders and stops at state borders and doesn't come to Canberra then I've got a bridge to sell you. I think the Australian public know that there is a case for a federal ICAC. The government should listen to the public and pass it—pick it up off the Notice Paper, pass it tomorrow and we'd have a federal ICAC before Christmas.

The second thing that the government could do to restore trust and confidence is get the big money out of politics. Let's limit donations to $1,000 a year, across the board, from everyone. And let's say there are some people and some kinds of corporate interests that we don't want making donations to politics at all—like developers and the tobacco industry and so on—because they corrupt the process. While we're there, let's also limit the amount that can be
spent at election time. People get sick of the amount that is spent across the board by political parties at election time and we saw, just last election, Clive Palmer buy an election by spending $60 million on an election campaign. If you limited the amount of spending then that would reduce the incentive to start getting these donations in the first place, and it would mean this place could start acting in the public interest—not for private interests.

The third thing that we could do is run a public-interest test over every decision that gets made here. And, when it comes to handing out money and giving subsidies, we could ask: is this actually in the public interest? We have big corporations—Gina Rinehart's mining companies, for example—who go and put diesel in their trucks and they pay a bit of tax then, and, at the end of the year, they get a cheque back, courtesy of the Australian taxpayer, as a refund for all of that tax that they pay on their diesel fuel! When every other Australian goes and puts petrol in their car, they pay 40-odd cents a litre in tax—when Gina Rinehart does the same, she gets the tax back, courtesy of the Australian people. We don't need to be giving subsidies to the very rich and powerful at the same time as we've got people who are homeless, people who can't even afford to get into their first home and people who are finding it hard to get a decent job, and power bills are going through the roof. Let's run a public-interest test over the decisions that are made here, not a vested-interest test.

The fourth thing that this government could do, if it wants to restore some trust, is start protecting people from the impacts of climate change. People want action on climate change. This government gets up and beats its chest about national security: the government is fond of saying that the first duty of any government is to protect its people. If that's right then protect people from the impact of climate change. People want action on climate change. Three-quarters of people under 34 now know that there is a link between the recent and current fires and climate, and they want action. What is standing in the way? The government is on the coal-company teat and won't take the action that's required. Take action on climate change and you'll start restoring a bit of trust in this place.

Mr GEE (Calare—Assistant Minister to the Deputy Prime Minister) (15:42): I would like to thank the member for Warringah for bringing this matter of public importance to the House. It is a very important issue that we need to be discussing. I believe that what restores faith in the political system is delivering those policies, services and infrastructure that make life better for the people that we represent. That includes reforms like the Commonwealth Integrity Commission, which our hard-working Attorney has indicated is on the way. There is draft legislation which will be coming out soon.

Deputy Speaker, as you know, I am from the country and, as far as our communities are concerned, there is no greater challenge and no greater issue, no issue more pressing, than that of drought. This drought has devastated our country communities. It's been devastating on the farm and at the farm gate but also right through to our country villages, towns and cities. And the drought marches on. There doesn't seem to be any relief in sight. Every day I get calls from our farmers and from constituents involved in farm related businesses, and they are struggling. There's no question about it: they are struggling. These are hard, resilient, tough farmers that call me, and you can hear the anguish and the strain in their voices. They're worried about how they're going to get through. These are the good operators who have prepared and made the sacrifices, but they are under enormous pressure. I have farm related businesses contacting me saying: 'Andrew, I just don't know how long I can keep the doors
open. I just don't know how long I can do it; I'll keep going as long as I can.' I was with the Deputy Prime Minister at a rural supply store in Wellington recently. The owner of that store is a friend of mine. He's got two staff members and he just won't let them go because he is loyal to them. He's burning through his retirement savings just to keep the doors open.

What this government does in this place is vitally important. If you look at the measures that have been put in place to help our country communities get through drought, it is policies like these which build faith and restore faith in the political system. Policies like extending the farm household allowance from three years to four years, and after you come off the allowance being eligible for the cash payments of $7,500 for singles and $13,000 for couples, lifting the cap on the FHA to just over $100,000. The Drought Communities Programme is giving our local councils in drought-affected communities badly needed funds to stimulate local economic activity. A great example is the Dubbo Regional Council which has given Stuart Town about $560,000 to sink community bores, connect their community facilities to bore water for the first time and put in new water tanks. For the first time the hall at Stuart Town is going to be connected to the bore water. The amenities block at the park will be connected to reticulated water.

Just a week or so ago I opened a new deck on the Blayney Golf Club. I sang a little Slim Dusty 'Lights on the Hill' to help them christen that deck. It provided hardworking builders and tradies with badly needed work—

An honourable member interjecting—

Mr GEE: I'll take the interjection. It is on my Facebook page if you do want to check it out. The Drought Communities Programme has made a real difference. The Roads to Recovery funding boost is allowing our local councils to build that important infrastructure and, again, stimulate our local economy. It is policies like these and programs like these that people respect. When you can deliver them, as this government has, it does restore faith in the political system.

As this drought marches on, drought relief will have to be ramped up. I've said that all along. As conditions worsen, and they will, the relief will have to be ramped up—for a long time possibly, because as we head into this long, hot, dry summer our country communities are going to be tested like they have never been tested before. All levels of government and all our community members are all going to have to come together and support each other, and together we will get through it. It's policies like this that are important for restoring the integrity to the Australian political system.

Dr HAINES (Indi) (15:47): The news is in. According to the ABC's Australia Talks survey results released last week, politicians rank amongst the least trusted professions, beaten to the wooden spoon by the celebrities. This dismal finding is repeated year after year in reputable surveys both in Australia and around the world. But why? On paper, in theory it should be the opposite. Parliament, the legislature, is the fundamental pillar of our democracy. We each represent the voices of hundreds of thousands of people. It should be a respected institution. But that's not what people see. Yes, they may see some policies delivered and, yes, they may see some programs delivered, that's the bottom line. But what they really see—and what I've seen as a new member of parliament, as someone who was an outsider and is now an insider—are these things: bad behaviour, accusations and counteraccusations, debate shutdowns, mudslinging, obtuse political donations and a lack of transparency. And it is quite
shocking as a member of parliament to see those things here on the floor of parliament. I am now one of the people who's ranked as one of the least trusted professions in the world. It is not a nice feeling.

All of this comes at a cost. It comes at the cost of seeing secret deals done—secret deals that none of us in the House can understand when a vote is passed through the Senate, for example. This comes at a cost, and not in the way a sudden financial emergency affects our bottom line but in a slow, incremental way, eroding the authority of our institutions and damaging the rule of law.

As I said in my first speech, so many Australians want change desperately, but equally they are scared of change when it comes to trusting the political system to bring it about. Let's work to improve this. There is a way. It's complex, but we can navigate it. We can do difficult things in this House; I'm sure we can. We need a robust federal integrity commission to help restore the trust that so many Australians have lost in their elected representatives. As an independent MP, I, like my other crossbenchers, have been a clear and consistent voice for the establishment of this institution. It was in response to this pressure that last year the government announced plans for its own Commonwealth Integrity Commission. The former member for Indi, Cathy McGowan, and her suite of integrity legislation was pivotal in preparing the ground for this announcement, as was the work of the member for Melbourne preceding that. It sets the standard for how we can move forward.

Any federal integrity commission should include public hearings. At the very least, that's what our people want—and discretion to initiate investigations, open referrals from concerned members of the public and, importantly, whistleblower protections to prevent retaliation. I encourage the government, I encourage all of my MP colleagues, to aim for this standard.

Alongside this, this House needs a code of conduct and the creation of two independent positions to offer confidential advice to members and ministers, including the Prime Minister. These changes are critical. Under our current system, integrity issues within the parliament and the executive are dealt with by the parliament, the Prime Minister and the Special Minister of State. These institutions, tasked with upholding political, ministerial and parliamentary integrity and honesty, are also primarily political institutions. Advice from independent bodies would overcome this inherent and very obvious conflict. The code of conduct would require that a parliamentarian ensures that their conduct as a parliamentarian does not bring discredit upon this parliament. This code would include provisions about dealing with conflicts of interest, using position for profit, outside employment, accepting gifts or hospitality, using influence and using public resources. By placing them in a code of conduct we declare to the Australian public the standards that they can and should judge us by.

Some will say that the current system works well enough. Yet how can this be, when the research shows us that 90 per cent of citizens have a negative view of the standards of honesty and integrity held by politicians? Democracy 2025 reports that if nothing is done and current trends continue then fewer than 10 per cent of Australians will trust their politicians and political institutions, resulting in ineffective and illegitimate government and declining social and economic wellbeing. Some will say that an integrity commission will be politicised, resulting in vexatious referrals, which will destroy the careers of honest people. Well, I ask that we set about doing this work to stop the vexatious referrals and mudslinging that happens.
in this House. As elected representatives in the highest offices of the land, we should be held to the highest—(Time expired)

Mr SHARMA (Wentworth) (15:52): Thank you to the member for Warringah for putting this issue on the agenda. I do believe that it is an important issue to be discussing—the declining trust in politicians and in the political process. A few weeks back I was at an event held here in Parliament House with the member for Indi and the member for Sydney. The event was to discuss a report to which the member for Indi just referred—Democracy 2025. It is a report from the Museum of Australian Democracy at Old Parliament House, from December 2018.

Some of the findings of that report are worth repeating here. According to the report, 41 per cent of Australians are currently satisfied with the way democracy works in Australia, which is down from a high of 86 per cent in 2007. This low level of satisfaction was particularly pronounced among young people. Generation X were the least satisfied, at around 31 per cent, and baby boomers were the most satisfied, at around 50 per cent. The report also shows that this decline in trust is not limited to the political class or political institutions. It mirrors the general decline in the trust in institutions and authority figures, be they law enforcement, the courts, journalists, the press et cetera. It also, interestingly, mirrors a decline in social trust, or the expectation that your neighbours will behave honourably and help you out in a crisis. So, what we're dealing with here I think goes beyond just the political class and political institutions, and we shouldn't limit our concerns to only that.

A couple of interesting findings came out of the report. Those born overseas tend to be more satisfied with the Australian political system than those born here in Australia. There were a number of other bright spots. Three particular features of Australian democracy were singled out in that report that those surveyed liked the most. They agreed with the statement that Australia's been able to provide good education, health, welfare and other public services to its citizens. They agree with the view that Australia has a good economy and lifestyle. They also agreed with the view that Australian elections are free and fair.

When looking at this issue, I don't believe that we can look at Australia in isolation. This is obviously part of a broader global trend that is underway. In that context, I highlight a report published by the Pew Research Center in October 2017, which surveyed 38 nations, all of them democracies of varying degrees and colours. While more than half the populations in each of those 38 nations polled considered representative democracy—our system of government—to be a good way to govern the country, in all of those countries these attitudes coexisted with an openness to non-democratic forms of government, including rule by a strong leader, rule by the military or rule by experts. Again, this was especially pronounced amongst millennials, those aged from 18 to 29. While Australia is not immune to this, we fare okay by world standards. In both the UK and the US, for instance, support for the idea that rule by the military or by a strong leader would be a good way to govern the country is higher than in Australia.

To sum up, this is a global phenomenon, I think. I don't believe we have any cause for complacency here in Australia but, generally speaking, in Australia levels of trust are higher. Interestingly in Australia this problem, by and large, dates from 2007 and is particularly concentrated amongst those who have come of age politically since that time.
Explaining this—the causes of what is an obvious malaise—is difficult, and I'd offer a few ideas. Firstly, the end of the Cold War has a part to play. There's no longer an alternative political system that strives for universal application or is a credible threat to our own, which means there's a degree of complacency about our own political system. This is borne out in the differing views and levels of support between migrants and the native born that I highlighted before.

One of the people interviewed for the *Trust in Democracy in Australia* report was quoted as saying:

> What does Australian democracy mean to me? It means a second chance for a peaceful life for my family. We will always be grateful for this opportunity. I don't think Australians know how lucky they are. But I guess they don't know. You only know how good something is when you haven't got it.

That's a generation X, urban new Australian quoted in that report.

There's also been a high degree of political turmoil in Australia since that time—I acknowledge that. Two of the biggest reasons though—and the previous speakers have focused on this—are that politicians are not accountable for broken promises and they don't deal with the issues that really matter. I can't speak to what's gone on in the past, but I can assure this House and you, Mr Deputy Speaker Hogan, that this government is focusing on the issues that matter and is committed to meeting all the promises we made at the election. Thank you.

Mr WILKIE (Clark) (15:58): I do not agree with the member for Wentworth when he argues that Australia is travelling relatively well—although I must commend the member for Wentworth for being the first government speaker during this debate to actually stand up and do a good job of exploring what we both agree is a very, very important issue. It is absolutely astounding that his two predecessors made light of this debate and instead gave presentations that were thick with denial and distraction. That was not in the public interest.

The undeniable fact is that regard for the political class in this country is at an all-time low. In fact, many members of the community hold politicians in complete contempt and disdain. They lampoon us at every opportunity, and that's entirely warranted. There have been so many episodes which help to explain the collapse in public confidence in politicians in this country, and there was another episode just today in the Senate. It wasn't just that there was a lack of integrity that the parliament has overturned medevac but that it was underpinned by a secret deal, because the public is held to not be responsible or worthy enough to know what this secret deal is. The fact is that the secret deal has been covered up by someone in the Senate. Not everyone can be right in the Senate. Senator Lambie says there is a deal; Senator Cormann says there is no deal. Well, they can't both be right. One of them has to be misleading us. No wonder the public is sick and tired of politics, politicians and some of the political parties.

It is a great shame that not all of the government members are in here, like the crossbench are, talking about how we can reclaim the public's trust. Surely, if there were just a few measures we could grab and implement, or at least talk about today, wouldn't the top thing on the list be the establishment of a federal integrity commission? That, more than anything, would go a long way towards reclaiming the public's trust because for once they would see we have an interest in integrity in this place; for once we would be prepared to put in place effective measures to restore integrity. We don't need this dodgy integrity commission that the
government is talking about currently. We need a strong body, a body that can look at corruption in all its forms, including non-criminal corruption—things that should be criminal, like nepotism, cronyism and rorting of allowances. We need an integrity commission that could have public hearings so that the public can go in there, or at least watch it on television, see what's going on and see that something is being done about the collapse of integrity in the political class. We need an integrity commission that could take referrals from the public and from whistleblowers. We need an integrity commission that can make findings of guilt. That's what this country needs right now, not the dodgy construct that has been proposed by the government.

If there were another thing on a short list that we could just grab quickly to do something about strongly to help restore the public's faith in the political class, it's donation reform. It is an undeniable fact that no person or company—or government, I might add—hands over a large sum of money without expecting some sort of return on that investment. There are people and companies handing over hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars and, over time, tens of millions of dollars; how can we believe anything other than that they want a return on that investment?

If we could grab a few things quickly and implement them within months, how about better laws to protect media freedom and better laws to protect whistleblowers? If we aren't going to tidy up our act, then at least others can shine a light on us and shine a light on the misconduct that some people in this place are undeniably guilty of. But what's the government doing? It's doing everything it can to not bring about effective media protections. It's doing everything it can to ignore the fact that our current Public Interest Disclosure Act is woefully inadequate. For a start, security officials, parliamentarians and their staff are explicitly excluded from the whistleblower act. Doesn't that alone say an awful lot about us in this place? It says that we will do everything in our power to protect ourselves and ignore the disdain held by the community for the political class in this country. We're a laughing stock. We're lampooned at every opportunity. We should be in here debating, discussing and progressing ways to remedy that as soon as possible.

Ms HAMMOND (Curtin) (16:03): I thank the member for Warringah for putting this matter forward. Like the member for Warringah, I came to this place only six months ago, after pursuing a career in a completely different field for a number of decades. There are about 27 or 28 of us that joined at that time, roughly six months ago. I wonder, when they reflect on those six months, what they have been surprised about, because I've found there to be a number of surprises. Some of them have been very pleasant surprises, like the genuine endeavours in committees, joint party efforts, to look into issues of concern that cut across partisan politics; and the genuine desire of most people in this place, regardless of their political background, to actually serve and make a difference. There have, of course, been some surprises that have been less than pleasant, such as the waste of time and the playing of games, and the noise in this place, the shouting in this place. I have three teenage sons and I have never encountered that sort of noise, even when they've had 15 of their friends over. There is the feigned melodrama, the feigned hurt, the feigned outrage at certain times—and I'm not pointing my finger at anyone in particular; I think it's across the board.

Like the member for Warringah, I am concerned that there is declining trust in politicians and the political process, because, notwithstanding all its faults, our form of government, a
democracy, is the best way to ensure that all people are able to live their best lives. If people lose trust in this system, what will we get in its place? The system is not perfect. This place is not perfect. But it is incumbent on all of us to do the best with it in the best interests of our country and the people who live within it.

Under the leadership of our Prime Minister, when you put aside the noise, when you put aside the theatrics, when you put aside the chatter, this government is getting on with the job. We are delivering on the promises that we made. People may not like those promises and people can attack those promises, hold us to account, criticise them and try to put up different ideas. That's absolutely what we've built this place for. But we are delivering on the promises that we made. We have been delivering tax cuts. We've been expanding our trade borders to access more markets. We have been investing in infrastructure. We have been supporting small businesses. We've been listing more medicines on the PBS. We've been investing more in aged care, an area which is of concern to every single person in this place. Aged care is being reviewed in a royal commission at the moment, and some awful, horrifying and absolutely unacceptable stories are coming to light. We have to address it, and this government is committed to addressing it. It's making changes at the moment and it is also saying it will make changes when the full report comes down and it can consider it.

As I said at the outset, our system isn't perfect, but the democratic system of representative government, having a professional and independent judiciary, having a free media and having an active civil society are absolutely critical to Australia. It's actually incumbent on everybody within this place to do their bit to make sure that the trust in the system is not eroded through our actions. So how do we do that? We all run electorate offices. We have our doors, emails and phones open. We respond to our constituents. We listen to their problems. We help them to try to navigate sometimes very complex systems. We work and we listen to the people we represent. We may be politicians or 'the political class'—whatever that is—but the finest, most critical point is that we are members elected to represent the people in our electorates, and so we must listen, we must engage with them and we must act on their behalf. That is what we can do to try to make sure that this system, for all its faults, is retained, not thrown out because of a lack of trust.

Ms SHARKIE (Mayo) (16:08): Earlier this year Mr Kenneth Hayne AC, QC attended Parliament House to present the Accountability Round Table Integrity Awards. The awards focus on individual commitment to integrity, and both the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the former member for Indi, Cathy McGowan, were rightly acknowledged for conducting themselves in a manner that deserved recognition. In congratulating the award recipients, Mr Hayne addressed the room on the importance of integrity. While I encourage all members to read his speech, here is an excerpt that I think is particularly important today:

"Personal integrity is guided by standards of eloquent simplicity: honesty and courage. The words are simple, yet point to basic truths. That personal integrity demands honesty is self-evident. And honesty demands courage. It demands courage because compromise, in pursuit of some apparent immediate advantage, always beckons. It demands courage because ends may be thought to justify the means used to achieve those ends."
In public life, as in private life, an individual’s reputation for acting with integrity, once lost, will seldom be recovered. … And so it is, I think, in almost all forms of human interaction, private and public, honesty is rightly expected. Fail to meet it and trust is lost.

And trust is lost in this place. Today we lost just a little bit more. We had Senator Lambie saying that she's done a deal with government, but she can't tell us what it is. We had the government saying: 'Nothing to see here. There's been no deal.' There's only one version of the truth.

Research conducted by the Museum of Australian Democracy has said that by 2025 they only expect 10 per cent of Australians to trust politicians—one in 10 trust us and what we do in this place. That's disgraceful. We are now at a stage where public trust is so low that parliament is now effectively forced to outsource policy deliberations to royal commissions.

How do we regain public trust? How do we act with honesty and courage? The first and obvious step is to create a national integrity commission—one that's well funded, can refer matters itself and doesn't decide that members of this place should be excluded from that process. It must be more than a tokenistic gesture designed to placate a baying public.

The design and implementation of a robust integrity commission should, at the very least, include the ability to self-initiate. As I said, anything less will merely invite cynicism and further mistrust from the community. However, the integrity commission is not a panacea for the challenges facing this parliament. To that end, I've introduced a couple of private members’ bills into this place around political donations to lower the disclosure threshold to $1,000 and to promote transparency and accountability by having real-time disclosure. It can't be that on 1 January this year we have people making donations and no-one in this place knows—and not in February the following year but February the year after that. What a mockery that is. What an absolute mockery. No wonder people think that we're in this for ourselves in this place. This place is absolutely awash with money. It comes in from the gambling lobby. Both sides do this.

The National Party still accept donations from big tobacco. It doesn't matter how many Australians are dying from lung disease; they'll still take those cheques. Big tobacco donated $96,000 to political parties in the last annual return, and it's a secret state in this place. Paladin—no-one got to see that tender, did they? And there was the Great Barrier Reef Foundation. Closed tenders in this place mean that we have no idea. We have water deals done in this place where we don't get to find out from government exactly what is spent, because it's all commercial-in-confidence long after the deal is done. What a mockery it makes of this place. We stand in here, hand on heart, saying that we need to be so careful with taxpayers' money and yet it is a secret state. We have no idea.

We have bills in this place that weren't even disclosed. How much of taxpayers' money is going to be spent on the implementation of those bills? I go to the plan for government to drug test welfare recipients. We have profits shifting to the Cayman Islands. (Time expired)

Mr DRUM (Nicholls—Chief Nationals Whip) (16:13): I commend the member for Warringah for putting this matter of public importance on the agenda this afternoon. I think it's a fantastic debate that we need to have. Every time that somebody in the political system or in public life does something wrong, it diminishes the public standing of those people—just like the games that have been played in here by the Labor Party today. When the broader public of Australia look at the federal parliament today, look at the games that have been
played and look at the time that has been wasted, they won't determine whether it was one side or the other, it'll just be a stain on all of our careers. The Independents are just as guilty as anyone. There's a whole raft of people at fault with what happens in this place.

I spent 14 years, before I came here, in the Victorian parliament, where I had to spend most of that time in opposition to the Labor Party. The Labor Party had a minister who was found guilty of putting his dogs into a car and telling the driver to drive halfway around Victoria. He thought this was a good use of taxpayers' money in Victoria. But eventually he got found out and he lost his job. We also had key figures in the Victorian Labor Party who deliberately changed their address. They had a caravan more than 80 kilometres away from the parliament in Melbourne, which they had listed as their primary address. That entitled them to somewhere between $20,000 and $30,000, which they picked up every pay for about two years—completely deceitful! But eventually they were found out and they lost their jobs. We also had the red shirt brigade in Victoria with the Labor Party. They worked out a very devious plan to take taxpayer money and use it for their own political campaign to employ workers to hit the streets, hit the phones and, in a paid manner, do the work for which a political party normally needs volunteers. Daniel Andrews and John Lenders devised this plan beautifully so they could take over $300,000 of taxpayer money. They then used that $300,000, which they stole from the Victorian taxpayer, on the campaigns of 20 or 30 members of the Victorian parliament. Many of those Victorian parliamentarians are still in power now because of the money that was spent on the red shirt campaign.

We have just found out now that during this time some developer chap in eastern Victoria had a very close relationship with the Premier of Victoria. This was never brought out into the open until just recently. Just like the people who put in the false claims as to where they live, the guy who put the dogs in the chauffeured van and the red shirts campaign, eventually you get caught. That's the good thing about politics in Australia. If you do the wrong thing, you do so in the knowledge that eventually the systems we have in place now will catch you out, and when they do, you will lose your job and your reputation. You probably did it for $200 or $2,000, some ridiculous amount of money. If you do the wrong thing in Australia in public life, you must understand that you'll get caught. Can we improve on it? We probably can, but with the Morrison government now we have a Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister who are open, calm and delivering on their promises. This is what the people of Australia want. They want you to do what you say you are going to do. My interjection was that Daniel Andrews, in amongst all the corruption and everything they did wrong, is able to point to some level-crossing removals and say, 'At least we delivered on this.' Support our drought affected farmers; governments have to continue to do what they say they're going to do; and everybody in public life has to keep their noses clean.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hogan): The discussion has concluded.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL’S SPEECH

Address-in-Reply

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hogan) (16:18): I suspend the sitting until the ringing of the bells in order that the Speaker may present the address-in-reply to His Excellency the Governor-General at Government House.

Sitting suspended from 16:18 to 18:05

CHAMBER
GOVERNOR-GENERAL’S SPEECH

Address-in-Reply

The SPEAKER (18:05): I'd like to inform the House that, accompanied by honourable members, I waited today upon His Excellency the Governor-General at Government House and presented to him the address-in-reply to His Excellency's speech on the opening of the first session of the 46th Parliament, agreed to by the House on 28 November 2019. His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

Mr Speaker:

Thank you for your address-in-reply.

It will be my pleasure and my duty to convey to Her Majesty the Queen the message of loyalty from the House of Representatives, to which the Address gives expression.

BILLS

Counter-Terrorism Legislation Amendment (2019 Measures No. 1) Bill 2019

First Reading

Bill received from the Senate and read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:06): I present the explanatory memorandum to this bill and move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Australians have been shocked and saddened by the despicable terrorist acts on innocent members of the public in London on Friday. Australia's deepest sympathies are with the victims and all of their families. While the Counter-Terrorism Legislation Amendment (2019 Measures No. 1) Bill 2019 predates this tragic event, sadly, this event once again demonstrates the need for our government to act very swiftly and strongly to counter the threat of terrorism on our shores. The Australian government's first priority is to keep our communities safe from those who seek to do us harm.

This bill continues this important work by ensuring that there is a presumption against bail and parole for all terrorists and their supporters. It will make two changes to improve the operation of the continuing detention order (CDO) scheme for high-risk terrorist offenders.

Schedule 1—Restrictions on bail and parole

Schedule 1 introduces new restrictions on the existing arrangements for bail and parole and ensures there is a presumption against bail and parole for persons who have demonstrated support for, or have links to, terrorist activity, which is consistent with the agreement reached by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG).

In line with the COAG agreement, this bill expands the Commonwealth's existing presumptions to include those offenders who are the subject of a control order, or have links with, or have shown support for, terrorist activities. The new presumption against parole similarly covers all of these terrorism-related offenders. This means that offenders who have links with, or have shown support for, terrorist activities will not be released on bail or parole unless they can show that there are exceptional circumstances that would justify their release into our communities.
The bill also addresses issues raised by the Independent National Security Legislation Monitor's (Monitor) inquiry and report into the prosecution and sentencing of children for Commonwealth terrorism offences by ensuring that the rights of children who are being prosecuted and sentenced for terrorist offences are also taken into account.

**Schedule 2—Amendments relating to continuing detention orders**

Schedule 2 contains two measures to improve the operation of the Commonwealth's CDO scheme for high-risk terrorist offenders.

The first measure will amend the CDO scheme that will ensure that jailed terrorist offenders who are also serving time for non-terrorism offences remain eligible for consideration for a CDO at the conclusion of their time in prison. This will ensure that the community can be protected from terrorist offenders who pose an unacceptable risk to the community of committing a serious terrorism offence, if released from prison, regardless of whether the terrorist offender's final day of detention is for a terrorist offence or for another offence.

The second measure brings the option for the protection of national security information contained in an application for a CDO into line with the protections available in other proceedings. Under the current scheme, a complete copy of a CDO application must be provided to the terrorist offender. This proposed amendment will provide that the information given to the terrorist offender is subject to any orders that the court makes for the protection of national security information. It is the courts that oversee the protection of the sensitivity of this information and the courts will retain ultimate decision-making powers to determine the appropriate orders to protect sensitive information and the impact of any orders on the fairness of proceedings.

On 1 August 2019 the bill was referred to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security for inquiry and report. The committee's advisory report was tabled in this House on 14 October 2019. The committee unanimously recommended passage of the bill, subject to recommendation regarding the operation of public interest immunity in relation to CDO applications, which the government has agreed to and amended the bill accordingly. The government appreciates the committee's consideration for the proposal of this legislation. The bill demonstrates the government's ongoing commitment to keeping our communities safe from terrorists.

Leave granted for second reading debate to continue immediately.

**Mr DREYFUS** (Isaacs—Deputy Manager of Opposition Business) (18:11): Labor of course joins with the government in expressing our sympathies to the victims of the recent terror attack in London. The Counter-Terrorism Legislation Amendment (2019 Measures No. 1) Bill 2019 would make a number of amendments to the Crimes Act 1914 and the Commonwealth Criminal Code. The bill is consistent with the principles that were agreed by the Council of Australian Governments on 5 October 2017. In particular, it is consistent with the principle of the presumption against bail, and parole should apply to categories of persons who have demonstrated support for, or links to, terrorist activity. The bill would also address a gap in the continuing detention order regime.

The bill was referred to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security for inquiry and report. Labor and Liberal members of the committee made one recommendation...
to improve the bill. The government accepted that recommendation and amended the bill accordingly. There was one area of disagreement between Labor and Liberal members of the intelligence committee. The nature of that disagreement is detailed in an additional comment to the report by the intelligence and security committee. I encourage those who are interested in this bill and interested in Australia's obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child to read that document. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:13): There are no other speakers, so I will sum up. I thank parliamentary colleagues for their contribution to the debate. Australians were shocked and saddened by the despicable terrorist attacks on innocent members of the public in London on Friday afternoon. Australia's deepest sympathies lie with the victims and all of their families. While the bill predicates this tragic event, sadly, this event once again demonstrates the need for legislative measures in this bill which are aimed at protecting Australian communities from terrorist offenders.

Since September 2014 Australia's national terrorism threat level has been set at probable. This means that there's credible intelligence assessed by our security agents indicating that individuals or groups continue to pose the intent and capability to conduct a terrorist act here in Australia. In the prevailing threat environment, it is critical that Australia's counterterrorism legislative framework remains effective and responsive to the evolving threat of terrorism. The measure in the bill strengthens the tool that law enforcement and intelligence agencies have to protect the public from the threat of terrorism.

I thank the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security for its detailed considerations of this bill. The work of the committee was invaluable in ensuring that the measures contained in the bill are necessary, reasonable and proportionate. The bill reflects the government's ongoing commitment to protecting the Australian community from terrorism and ensures that our law enforcement and security agencies have the powers they need to respond to the evolving threat of terrorism. I commend this bill to the House.

Question agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:15): by leave—I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Question agreed to.

Bill read a third time.
whilst not declining to give the bill a second reading, the House notes that the government's patchy approach to sport continues, with three different ministers having had carriage of sports integrity reforms in just two years, resulting in uncertainty for athletes and other parts of the sport sector in relation to sports integrity reform”.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Rob Mitchell) (18:16): The original question was that this bill be now read a second time. To this the honourable member for Shortland has moved as an amendment that all words after 'That' be omitted with a view to substituting other words. The question now is that the amendment be agreed to.

Ms STEGGALL (Warringah) (18:15): Both sides of politics have spoken on the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019. I rise to speak on it as someone with a real understanding of some of the issues this bill is seeking to address. I very much know the importance of sport. It's absolutely been the cornerstone of my life since I was too young really to remember. To me, one of the key aspects of sport and sporting performance is in fact integrity, because winning at all costs is not winning at all; what really matters is how you win. I've had the privilege of representing Australia at four Winter Olympic Games and numerous world championships and World Cup events. I've had the privilege of carrying the Australian flag at medal ceremonies, of standing on the dais listening to our anthem. It is amazing, as an athlete, to stand there representing your country.

So it is incredibly important that we implement the recommendations of the Wood review to safeguard integrity in Australian sport. As a past member of the Court of Arbitration for Sport, I've also been involved when it comes to our fight against doping and the importance of keeping sport clean. There is nothing worse, as an athlete, than knowing that you've given it everything, that you've trained for so many hours but you're not on an even playing field, or to listen to the story of those people who have found themselves in fourth or fifth place and missed out on the privilege of being on the dais because it has then been found that there were drug cheats. I think we all dislike it and despair when those new allegations come out, and we can only really keep progressing our fight against doping in sport.

There is a new scourge in sport, though, and that's gambling. That also is having a huge impact on the integrity of sport and on that faith we have when we watch sport and we encourage our children to watch sport and look up to their sporting heroes. It absolutely needs to be monitored and absolutely controlled and regulated. We need to make sure that with this bill and these measures, in terms of ensuring integrity, the full force of the law comes down on those practices.

What's interesting about sport, though, is that it's not always about winning—and we often miss those moments. It's the greatest acts of courage where often it's not those who have won but those who have displayed integrity, compassion and fair play in the pursuit of excellence. It's not always rewarded by standing on the dais with a medal. It's actually about standing there, maybe with somebody else who has had to pull out of a field, or standing on the side of a race knowing that you gave it everything and that you really stood by your principles.

I do find it slightly ironic that we're here today debating and discussing passing a bill in relation to integrity in sport. The irony of it happening today is I think quite priceless. I look at the efforts and all the lovely words that have been spoken in this place by members in
relation to ensuring integrity in sport—yet, at the same time, there is a complete lack of political will and effort to address the declining trust and integrity in our political systems.

We are here to enact a national integrity commission in relation to sport, but we have no national integrity commission in relation to our politics and in relation to corruption. The only model put forward so far by the government is one where they want to ensure that there be privacy. They are opposing the idea that there be public hearings. I don't hear those same words from anybody in terms of athletes being afforded privacy. For example, an athlete dragged through an integrity hearing would have their reputation dragged through the mud, but they would welcome being cleared and knowing that they're fully accountable to the Australian people. Yet I don't hear many people in this place, especially from the government side, standing up for that same standard to be applied to themselves.

An integrity commission will ensure that sport is held up to that standard we want. As a mother, I want my children to participate in sport, because there are so many skills and it builds character and resilience. You learn to have courage. You learn to give it a go. You learn to do your best and hold yourself up to the best standard you possibly can. It's so important that we hold sport up to that standard, but it is also so important that we hold this place up to a better standard. Why haven't we got an integrity commission like we are asking athletes to have? Why haven't we got more support and a clearer way to address the issues that we have when it comes to our integrity? The hypocrisy absolutely floors me. As someone who is new to this place, I came with a clear intent—I felt the Australian people deserved better. They deserve to know that we are working hard to raise the bar and to make sure that we are holding ourselves up to a better standard. That's what I will urge all the members of this parliament to do. We have to do better. Just as when we look at a national team that's performed below par and there are always plenty of armchair critics who'll say what they should have done and what they could have done, I think there are plenty of armchair critics looking at our performance at the moment and thinking we absolutely must do better.

Think back to only a year ago and the scandal of our cricket team and the reaction around Australia at the idea of our national captain endorsing cheating. The players took it on the chin. They took the consequences. They stood down and took a period of expulsion from the team. They are now back and performing well, and we can respect them for that because they took the consequences of their actions.

What can we say about what happens in this place when we have events like today where decisions are made and people are voting and they don't even know what they're voting on? We know a deal was done, we know people are lying about it, but we don't even know what it was. One of the things that sport actually celebrates is compassion and being your better self. Is that really what we were being today when we were basically saying to people in detention, 'You do not have a right to medical attention; our compassion is so short that we prefer to send you back and leave you indefinitely in detention'?

I have always been extremely proud to be Australian when I've competed internationally. It's always meant a huge amount to me. But I must say today I was absolutely not proud to be a member of this place. If winning is everything, it means nothing. The importance of winning is actually how you win. It's about winning with integrity. I can only urge everyone in this place to think on that and to try to be your better selves. We have to do better, as we're
asking athletes to be better, to wipe out doping in sport and to be held to account with integrity. We have to do the same in this place.

Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:24): If there are no more speakers, the government will sum up. Australians have no tolerance for the corruption of sport. It damages the confidence participants and viewers have in the games that they hold close to their hearts. In order to effectively identify and react to the escalating integrity risks in sport, it's essential a cohesive and well-resourced national-level capability is in place. The government is responding to these risks by cohesively drawing together existing sporting integrity capabilities to establish Sports Integrity Australia with a focus on policy and program delivery, education, outreach and antidoping monitoring coupled with intelligence. Sports Integrity Australia will be well placed to assist the sporting community to prevent, address and identify integrity threats in sports.

I note that Australian sports are cherished by many Australians, and this government is committed to comprehensively protecting the integrity of Australian sport for the benefit of the entire Australian community for generations to come. I thank members for their contribution to the debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER: The original question was that this bill be now read a second time. To this the honourable member for Shortland has moved as an amendment that all words after 'That' be omitted with a view to substituting other words, so the immediate question is that the amendment moved by the member for Shortland be agreed to.

The House divided. [18:29]
(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes .................61
Noes .................75
Majority .............14

AYES

Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burney, LJ
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Freelander, MR (teller)
Giles, AJ
Gosling, LJ
Hill, JC
Jones, SP
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Leigh, AK
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
Murphy, PJ
O'Connor, BPJ

Aly, A
Burke, AS
Burns, J
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Coker, EA
Conroy, PM
Dreyfus, MA
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georganas, S
Gorman, P
Hayes, CP
Hasic, EN
Kearney, G
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Mulino, D
Neumann, SK
O'Neil, CE

CHAMBER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owens, JA</td>
<td>Payne, AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrett, GD</td>
<td>Rishworth, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland, MA</td>
<td>Smith, DPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley, AM (teller)</td>
<td>Swanson, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeman, SR</td>
<td>Thistlethwaite, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thwaites, KL</td>
<td>Vamvakinou, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watts, TG</td>
<td>Wells, AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, AD</td>
<td>Wilson, JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zappia, A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, JG</td>
<td>Allen, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, KJ</td>
<td>Andrews, KL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer, BK</td>
<td>Bell, AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadbent, RE</td>
<td>Buchholz, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, D</td>
<td>Christensen, GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaghan, PJ</td>
<td>Connelly, V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulton, M</td>
<td>Drum, DK (teller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton, PC</td>
<td>Entsch, WG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, TM</td>
<td>Falinski, JG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, PW</td>
<td>Flint, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frydenberg, JA</td>
<td>Gee, AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie, DA</td>
<td>Goodenough, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haines, H</td>
<td>Hammond, CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastie, AW</td>
<td>Hawke, AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, KJ</td>
<td>Howarth, LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, GA</td>
<td>Irons, SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce, BT</td>
<td>Kelly, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laming, A</td>
<td>Landry, ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeser, J</td>
<td>Ley, SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleproud, D</td>
<td>Liu, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marino, NB</td>
<td>Martin, FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormack, MF</td>
<td>McIntosh, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVeigh, JJ</td>
<td>Morrison, SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, B</td>
<td>O'Brien, LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, T</td>
<td>Pasin, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce, GB</td>
<td>Porter, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, ML</td>
<td>Ramsey, RE (teller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert, SR</td>
<td>Sharkie, RCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma, DN</td>
<td>Simmonds, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steggall, Z</td>
<td>Stevens, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkar, MS</td>
<td>Taylor, AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehan, DT</td>
<td>Thompson, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudge, AE</td>
<td>van Manen, AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, AB</td>
<td>Webster, AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks, LE</td>
<td>Wilson, RJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, TR</td>
<td>Wood, JP</td>
</tr>
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<td>Young, T</td>
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<td></td>
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</table>

Question negatived.
The SPEAKER (18:33): The question now is that this bill be now read a second time.
Question agreed to.
Bill read a second time.
Message from the Governor-General recommending appropriation announced.

Third Reading

The SPEAKER (18:33): Is leave granted for the third reading to be moved immediately?
Leave not granted.

Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:33): I move:
That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the motion for the third reading being moved without delay.

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (18:34): This government has no integrity, unlike this bill. They should have given the leader 10 minutes.

Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:34): I move:
That the Member be no longer heard.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the member for Shortland be no further heard.
The House divided. [18:38]
(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)
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Alexander, JG
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Question agreed to.
Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:39): I move:

That the question be now put.

The SPEAKER: The assistant minister has moved that the question be put.

The House divided. [18:41]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)
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Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (18:44): The question now is that the motion moved by the minister be agreed to.

The House divided. [18:44]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)
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Question agreed to.

Mr BUCHHOLZ (Wright—Assistant Minister for Road Safety and Freight Transport) (18:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr CONROY (Shortland) (18:44): Labor will be supporting the third reading of this bill because it goes to the integrity of sport. But there are some very important features that we need to discuss. Australia has a long and proud history as a sporting nation. From backyard games to the Boxing Day test to grassroots participation to competition on the national and international stages, sport has played and continues to play an important role in our way of life and our national identity. Whenever we hear good-news stories about sport at any level, they enhance the reputation of Australian sport and our love for it. But when we hear reports of doping in sport, when we hear reports of match fixing, those reports damage and devalue Australia's sports reputation and our relationship with sport.

Labor, in government, was proactive in deploying measures to protect against these and other threats to the integrity of sport in Australia. We recognise the need to evaluate the effectiveness of Australia's sports integrity measures and upgrade and update those measures, when needed, to address changing environments and new threats. In 2012 the Labor federal government established a National Integrity of Sport Unit. In 2013 we passed legislation to strengthen the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority's power. But threats to the integrity of Australian sport continue to evolve, and so must our protective measures. You only have to look at the rise of online gaming—such as the ability, in sports like cricket, to bet on the outcome of individual balls—to know that we need enhanced protection measures for the integrity of sport. The Australian public must have trust in our sporting competitions and our institutions. Otherwise, we'll lose a key feature of Australian life.

In response to these ever-evolving risks, the government announced a review of Australia's sports integrity arrangements in August 2017. The panel that conducted the review was chaired by Justice James Wood, and the review was to become known as the Wood review. The government received the Wood review's report in March 2018 and released its response to the report in February of this year. It is a detailed and extensive review—nearly 300 pages, containing 52 recommendations. One of those recommendations was the establishment of a national sports integrity commission to cohesively draw together and develop existing sports integrity capabilities, knowledge and expertise and to nationally coordinate all elements of the sports integrity threat response, including prevention, monitoring and detection investigation and enforcement.
The Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019 seeks to implement the government's response to that recommendation. This bill would establish a new Australian government agency, to be known as Sport Integrity Australia, designed to protect the integrity of Australian sport. It is proposed that this new agency would bring together a range of sports integrity functions that are currently the responsibility of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority, ASADA; the National Integrity of Sports Unit; and Sports Australia. To paraphrase from the review, a centrally coordinated response to sports integrity issues will help overcome the silo effect that currently exists with multiple bodies, including NSOs and law enforcement and regulatory agencies engaged in protecting sports from threats. The review also noted that difficulties in securing a coordinated response are compounded by our federated system, in which there are often differences in state, territory and federal regulatory and criminal laws.

Protecting Australia's sports integrity is a goal that has bipartisan support. Labor intends to continue the bipartisan approach by supporting the establishment of Sport Integrity Australia through these bills. Labor has engaged with stakeholders across the sports sector and has taken into account their views on the reforms that will be implemented by this bill and the associated Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019. While the majority of the feedback has been supportive, some stakeholders have raised specific concerns regarding certain specific aspects of this bill and the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019.

In relation to this bill, the scrutiny committee is seeking advice from the Minister for Sport as to why it's considered appropriate to provide members of the Sport Integrity Australia Advisory Council with civil immunity so that affected persons have the right to bring an action to enforce their legal rights, limited to situations where lack of good faith is shown. The scrutiny committee has also asked for more-detailed advice as to why it's considered necessary and appropriate for Sport Integrity Australia to be an enforcement body for the purposes of the Privacy Act 1988. Specifically, the committee has noted that considerations of this aspect of the bill would be helped by further explanation of how Sport Integrity Australia enforcement related activities will be undertaken in practice, including the nature of the enforcement powers and who will be exercising the enforcement powers.

These scrutiny committee concerns largely mirror the issues that some stakeholders have raised with Labor. Broadly speaking, those concerns related to appropriate checks and balances and ensuring that, in bolstering Australia's defences against sports integrity threats, the rights of individuals are not inappropriately eroded. In recognition of these concerns, the Senate has referred the bill to the Senate Standing Committees on Community Affairs for a short inquiry to report on 3 February next year. Labor hopes that this process will enable stakeholders that still have concerns to outline those issues and allow them to be appropriately considered before this bill is passed in its final form. The Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Enhancing Australia's Anti-Doping Capability) Bill 2019, which has just passed this House, has been referred to an inquiry with the same time frame, given its deep connection with this bill.

Given the great value of sport to Australians, our society and economy, protecting the integrity of Australian sport is something that Labor supports. Integrity in all things, I think, is
essential. What we've witnessed today is a complete lack of integrity from the government—a
government that is intent on silencing opposition to any attempt to question its behaviour and
to question its performance. We've seen a lack of integrity from the Minister for Energy and
Emissions Reduction in his use of fraudulent documents to try to smear the Lord Mayor of
Sydney. We've seen the Prime Minister and a retinue of ministers misleading parliament—
again, going to the lack of integrity from this government.

This is a government that's only six months into its third term but lacks completely an
agenda and is pursuing that lack of agenda without any integrity, so, while it's very important
to have integrity in sports, we should also have it in politics. That's why a commitment to a
truly genuine national integrity commission, one with true powers, is essential. That's Labor's
policy as well—something, again, that the government professed to support but backtracked
on when they won government again. Integrity matters. The Minister for Energy and
Emissions Reduction is a classic case of someone who lacks integrity. This is a man who
misled parliament in his first speech. While I'll criticise him for many things, I can't criticise
him for a lack of consistency. He has been consistent in his contempt for parliament, his lack
of integrity—

Mr Giles: Start as you mean to continue.

Mr CONROY: Start as he means to continue—his contempt for parliament, his ability to
mislead parliament.

Mr van Manen: I appreciate what the member for Shortland is trying to do, but the point
of order is to bring him back to the substance of the bill and to cease reflecting on—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Wicks): Relevance? I'm sorry; I was speaking with the
Clerk at the time. I will just remind the member for Shortland to be relevant to the question
before the House.

Mr CONROY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for your wise ruling. Integrity in
sport is vital. That is why this bill is vital and that's why Labor supports it. As I said before,
the integrity of sport is being challenged in many, many arenas. The ability to bet on
individual balls delivered in cricket matches is a classic example. The ability to bet in the
middle of a sporting game, full stop, is of great concern. The doping allegations that were
levelled against the Essendon Football Club and the Manly Sea Eagles were another example
of the integrity of sport being under attack.

Mr Watts: The Sharks.

Mr CONROY: The Sharks are a classic case, where they rorted the salary cap and were
cought, finally, but there are severe questions about their 2015 grand final. Their only grand
final has been completely tainted because of their lack of integrity and their intent on rorting
the salary cap.

This bill is very essential. That's why Labor supports it. That's why Labor is working
constructively to advance this bill. That's why the Senate committees will report so quickly on
this issue. I wish only that that integrity was shown in all aspects of government. Sadly, we
haven't seen that today, but I applaud the government for moving on sport. This is a
culmination of the Wood review, which was a seminal act in sports administration, and that's
why Labor supports the implementation of this legislation. I commend the bill to the House.
Mr GILES (Scullin) (18:54): I'm pleased to make a contribution in support of the third reading of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019. Again, I make it clear that Labor is supportive of the passage of the bill through the House. As my colleague and friend the shadow minister representing the shadow minister in this place noted, there are a number of issues, which I will briefly touch on, which will be examined through an important though brief Senate inquiry process, which hopefully will go further than the present arrangements, or at least go further in ensuring that we do maintain public confidence and integrity in sport. That is something that is just so important to so many Australians.

When we think about sport, it is so embedded in the Australian ethos. It's a matter of great interest to many Australians, of course, myself included, although I don't share my colleague's interest in rugby league—let me put that on the record in this place for the first time. I hope I don't have to clarify that issue again while I'm here. I hope no-one would suggest that I share his interest in Easts, which I understand is a matter of some concern to many people who would otherwise be good friends with the member for Shortland!

Sport is so important to who we are, but it's also important to how we see ourselves. In the issues that went to the conduct of senior members of the Australian cricket team, I think we saw a deep reflection across our society about how those sportspeople who represent us on the international stage conduct themselves. It was my privilege to be in the House for the contribution from the member for Warringah, who of course has done just that. I think her reflections are particularly apposite in this regard, and they're particularly apposite on this day, in this House, because what we have seen from the government, from members opposite, is an absence of integrity when it comes to the conduct of parliamentary business. We have seen members opposite treat this parliament as if it's their plaything, not a deliberative legislative body.

There is a contrast with this bill, where we have a proper legislative process where stakeholders and concerned members of the community will have an opportunity to test propositions, to test concerns about the regime that is to be established. And what did we see in the other place today? Lawmaking, possibly policymaking, on behalf of the government in the shadows. As Senator Wong said, it's the deal that no-one dares to name. We don't know what happened there on matters that are just so fundamentally important, matters that are more important, I dare say, than sport—how we look after vulnerable human beings; our commitment to ensure that people in our care can access medical support on the basis of medical advice. A government with integrity would have at the very least put all the issues before the Australian people through this parliament. They would have allowed the debate. And it's incredibly disappointing, when we talk about upholding integrity in sport, that we do not see integrity in the legislature or indeed, and more particularly, in the executive government of this country.

The bill before the House is a response to the recommendations of the Wood review, again, as the shadow minister touched upon in his remarks. In essence, it would bring together a new agency of the Australian government, which would be known as Sport Integrity Australia. This was recommended in the following terms by the Wood review:

… establish a National Sports Integrity Commission to cohesively draw together and develop existing sports integrity capabilities, knowledge and expertise, and to nationally coordinate all elements of the
sports integrity threat response including prevention, monitoring and detection, investigation and enforcement.

These are important aspirations, and the Wood review has given us a template to make these aspirations a reality—to build more confidence in the administration of sport and its integrity, and particularly to deal with issues of doping, which I may have time to touch on specifically in the course of my contribution.

But let me be very clear in saying this: Labor supports further strengthening of Australia's sports integrity arrangements so that we can protect against ever-evolving threats, threats in some cases driven by technology, whether it's medical technology or IT technology that facilitates new and often concerning markets when it comes to sports betting, which has proliferated in quite extraordinary ways in recent times across a wide range of sports. Of course, when I talk about how Australians see themselves in their sporting heroes, in our national sporting teams, there's another, definitely darker, aspect to this, because these threats don't appear out of nowhere; they don't appear in a vacuum. They are connected to the operation of the most undesirable elements in our society. There is obviously the spectre of infiltration of sporting codes by organised crime, which is a concern that goes above and beyond the mere fact of corruption of a competition, or the cheating on the part of an individual athlete. These are very, very significant issues.

I think we're all conscious that when we look at these issues, we as lawmakers have responsibilities to have regard to some of the background issues which led to the establishment of the Wood review—shocking issues, particularly those that went to the alleged conduct of the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority in relation to the supplements case connected to the Essendon Football Club. This is something, again, that raises issues that go above and beyond the sporting code. Here we have a group of workers, a group of young men, in a very vulnerable circumstance in connection with their employment, particularly some of the newer players. Who knows the damage that's been done to them, to their life prospects as well as to their careers as footballers, through the injustice done to them? This is such an important aspect of the anti-doping aspect of sports integrity, because it does go above and beyond these issues of basic integrity when it comes to sport. It goes to the wellbeing of individual sportsmen and sportswomen, which must be something that is in the forefront of our minds.

I'm aware that in conducting this debate we're reflecting on the journey that's brought us to the proposed establishment of this body. It would be remiss not to touch on some of the concerns that have been expressed consistently by those on this side of the House going to the administration of these very important portfolio responsibilities over the life of this third-term government, which is now well into its seventh year. Of course, the patchy approach the government has demonstrated towards sport generally has been demonstrated specifically with regard to sports integrity, with three different ministers having carriage of these particular reforms in the past two years. While the reforms appear sensible and well considered, and are based on a very important review, it is of the utmost concern that we haven't had that consistency in executive government. We hear a lot about stability from the government, but that has not been evidenced in executive appointments generally, nor specifically when it comes to issues like this, which are important but also raise a number of technical issues.
The shadow minister also referred to the issues that the Senate Standing Committee for the Scrutiny of Bills raised. These are significant issues, because any question that goes to enforcement obviously enlivens rights as well as obligations of officers with statutory powers. When we consider these questions we have to make sure we get the balance right between affording appropriate powers and providing for effective checks and balances. These are significant concerns raised by the Senate scrutiny of bills committee and they do need to be properly ventilated through the work of the Senate community affairs committee through its inquiry into this bill. These are matters that I'm sure that government members will have regard to, perhaps, in their remarks as we proceed through the third reading stage of this very, very important bill. I know that they recognise, as we do, these integrity issues and these arising issues, whether they were based on technology—be it medical technology or information technology—or were simply the way in which some of these darker elements connected to our sport, or were simply due to people who were desperate to succeed at any cost. As the member for Warringah touched upon in her contribution, we have to make sure that our arrangements line up so that we can meet the threats of today, and, of course, anticipate and be capable of responding to the threats of tomorrow.

Integrity in sport is of the utmost importance. But let's be really, really clear about this today: it pales in comparison to integrity in our politics. What sort of government would be putting forward a Sport Integrity Commission proposal when it's failed to deliver on its commitment to a national integrity commission? That is a contribution that we will continue to prosecute on this side, because we need to restore trust in politics, and that starts with treating this parliament with respect and treating Australians with the courtesy they deserve—being able to participate in proper debate.

Mr WATTS (Gellibrand) (19:04): I acknowledge the contribution to this debate from the member for Scullin, a man known in Victorian politics for his integrity. The contrast between the member for Scullin and the member for Shortland's contributions on this bill and some of the acts of integrity—or the opposite of that—which we've seen from the government this week are striking. I do note earlier this afternoon a tweet from Naomi Wolf asking the Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction to correct the record on his misleading of the parliament in his first speech in this chamber. That's not something I expected to happen this week, to be fair, but that's what we have to deal with when we're dealing with the travails of those opposite when it comes to integrity in this place.

Mr Hawke: A point of order on relevance: members are required to be relevant to the bill before the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Wicks): I would remind the member for Gellibrand to be directly relevant to the legislation.

Mr WATTS: A very good ruling. I endorse it and I thank those opposite for their assistance. Their interest in integrity is noted, and I hope it continues, but this bill deals with sporting integrity. The Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019 responds to a key recommendation of the Review of Australia's Sports Integrity Arrangements, the Wood review, a very significant moment in Australian sporting history, responding to some truly scandalous behaviour that the member for Shortland outlined earlier. This bill would establish a new Australian government agency known as
Sports Integrity Australia. This is in response to a key recommendation of the Wood review. This review recommended the need to establish:

... a National Sports Integrity Commission to cohesively draw together and develop existing sports integrity capabilities, knowledge and expertise, and to nationally coordinate all elements of the sports integrity threat response including prevention, monitoring and detection, investigation and enforcement.

This is worthwhile. Labor supports this initiative. It's important because we need to respond to what is an evolving integrity threat environment when it comes to sports. It's not just the doping that we've, sadly, become familiar with on the sporting field. It's not just the match-fixing or the corruption of competitions. Indeed, one of the most interesting aspects of the Wood review and the challenge when it comes to dealing with sports integrity is dealing with ensuring integrity in new and emerging sports. I want to talk a little bit, on my portfolio responsibilities in communications and cyber security, about the fastest growing sport in the world—that is, eSports. Those in this House may look quite askance at that comment.

Ms Murphy interjecting—

Mr WATTS: I note the comments behind me from some keen squash players who might want to consider the glass house that they are standing in when they are throwing rocks at the despatch box here. However, eSports are the fastest growing sports in Australia. These are enormous competitions—games like Counter-Strike and League of Legends. Indeed, the League of Legends finals attracted a bigger audience in the US than the NBA Finals, the NFL finals and the baseball finals combined. It is an enormously followed game. They play in The Forum in Los Angeles, the home of the Los Angeles Lakers. In Korea they play in front of literally tens of thousands of fans. This is a multimillion dollar business. Many, many hundreds of thousands of people watch eSports from their homes via services like Twitch. There is a burgeoning industry of people who don't just play the games themselves but also watch the games from home.

Unsurprisingly, when there is a lot of money involved and when there are a lot of people engaged, we see the classic sports integrity issues emerge in this sector. Indeed, earlier this year Victoria Police announced that they had arrested six Australians in connection with an investigation into match-fixing in the Counter-Strike: Global Offensive matches. These are the first arrests in Australia in relation to corruption and match-fixing in eSports. An investigation began in March this year after tips from a betting agency around suspicious behaviour, suspicious betting practices, around that tournament. What was going on here, the Victoria Police allege, is that players were arranging to throw matches and were subsequently placing bets on those matches. At least five matches were affected by the activity, and warrants were served on a number of people in relation to this across multiple states. Neil Paterson, the Assistant Commissioner of Victoria Police, noted:

Esports is really an emerging sporting industry and with that will come the demand for betting availability on the outcomes of tournaments and matches.

I don't know much about whether there is an exotic industry that's evolved and whether you can do the equivalent of betting on ball-by-ball behaviour, as the member for Scullin indicated earlier, but there is a lot of money now tied up not just with the prize money but with betting on eSports in Australia.

The Wood review tackled this. One of the complexities with regulating eSports and dealing with integrity arrangements related to them is that governing bodies for eSports look a bit
different to the governing bodies set up for traditional sports, shall we say. It's an emerging sector and an emerging governance framework. Sometimes these bodies are run by the developers and publishers of the games. Riot runs the League of Legends eSports competitions. That creates layers of complexity as well and potential conflicts, too, I would imagine. The Wood review, to be fair, didn't try to solve all of these problems. It didn't try to dictate an answer to these emerging fields where we are seeing the governance arrangements still unfolding. But it's something that we ought to pay attention to.

I think it's fair to say that video games more broadly, not just eSports, are something that deserve more attention in this place. Sales of video games in Australia each year are bigger by revenue than for the film and television industries combined. It's the kind of thing that really deserves recognition in this chamber—the scale of the role that it plays in our culture and in the modern economy today. Video games are no longer things that are played furtively in the rooms of teenage boys staying up past their bedtimes. Gamers come from all walks of life, and there are games designed for people from all walks of life. Indeed, one of the best games to come out of Australian producers last year was a game that won the Apple Worldwide Developers Conference award. That was Florence, a game about two people falling in love in Melbourne. It's a game about the relationship and emerging love. It's not the cliche of spotty teenagers playing on their consoles.

As gaming becomes a mainstream issue and a cultural product consumed by people from all walks of life, issues like integrity and ensuring the probity of eSports tournaments will become mainstream as well. It's an issue that it really is incumbent on all of us in this place to get across. I know it's something that I have discussed with my parliamentary colleagues and Senator Farrell, who has portfolio carriage of this, but also with Michelle Rowland, the Labor shadow minister for communications, who in the past has been a champion for recognition of gaming in Australia. Her predecessor in that championing role, Terri Butler, has had a lot to do in this space as well.

It's an emerging threat, it's an emerging sport and it needs an evolving response from government. It needs all of us to be engaged. As I say, eSports is the fastest growing sport in the world. It deserves the attention of all members of parliament in this House. It's not a triviality. It's big, big money and big, big crowds. The integrity issues are not limited to eSports becoming mainstream sports. This year the other thing that happened was that the Essendon Bombers launched an eSports team. That didn't last long. They've wrapped up now. They folded without an integrity scandal, which is a good effort for the Bombers! But eSports are becoming mainstream. It deserves the attention of all of us. It was recognised in the Wood review. Labor supports ongoing engagement on this issue.

(Quorum formed)

Ms MURPHY (Dunkley) (19:17): I rise today to speak on this bill about integrity in sport, the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority Amendment (Sport Integrity Australia) Bill 2019, as someone who has spent her entire life involved in sport—as an athlete, as a coach and as someone who served on state and national sporting boards. In fact my parents were both PE teachers in public high school, and I grew up in Wagga Wagga, which, in addition to being 'the land of many crows', is the sporting capital of New South Wales.

Mr Conroy: Of Australia!
Ms MURPHY: Of Australia, yes. I take that interjection and I accept it—until you have a look at Frankston, the home that I have moved to and embraced and that has embraced me. My electorate of Dunkley has sport in its veins. Saturday morning is for basketball, cricket, netball and footy. One of the great things about my electorate of Dunkley is the number of parents that give up their time. They're coaches, they're managers and they run the local clubs. To them, sport is more than a competition; sport is their community. It's their family. For many children, particularly in the more disadvantaged suburbs in my electorate, sport is where they find their mentors, learn the lessons of discipline and find people who will support them, teach them and help them through the difficult times. That's why integrity in sport is so important—because it means so much to so many of us.

Sport gave me opportunities that I would never otherwise have had. At the risk of those less educated members of this chamber laughing at me yet again, I'll talk about squash. When I was 12 years old, I was being picked on by some girls and I was really unhappy. I didn't know what to do, so I went to my father. I was sad and I needed something in my life to help me get the confidence to deal with being bullied. My father, being a PE teacher—a very handy sportsman—said: 'My tennis friends said that they need someone to fill in for a squash game. I'm going to go and have a game of squash. I've never played before. Why don't you come with me, Peta, and maybe it's something we can do together?' From the age of 12, I played squash and I found, in that squash club, a community. I played squash against girls and boys, men and women, and I found something that I was good at. I found something that gave me confidence, at various times in my life when things were not necessarily going the way I wanted and I was feeling insecure, that I knew I could go back to. I also found friends that I've got to this very day who mean a lot to me and who I have a shared history with.

If we let sport in this country, let alone anywhere around the world, descend into something that's not much more than an activity for people to make money from, that's not much more than whoever can bend the rules the most can win, and where the gambling companies can make money off people who are vulnerable, then we are losing something very integral to the Australian way of life. We're losing something very important to young people who sometimes just need that thing outside of themselves to give them that confidence to go on in life.

My father went on, after being a PE teacher and a lecturer at university, to be the director of elite sports at the Australian Institute of Sport for many years. He used to come home and talk to me about how that was the most amazing job in the world, because he got to work with all of these young athletes from different sports and from around the country who were training and working hard and sacrificing to try to be elite, to try to represent their country and to try to achieve. That was why, at the AIS, there was such an emphasis on integrity in sport. There was such an emphasis on teaching the swimmers, the athletes, the soccer players and the basketballers why it was important your success is based on how hard you train and what attitude you take, not on performance-enhancing drugs and not on whether or not you can bend the rules the most in order to succeed. It is why we developed such fabulous athletes in Australia.

Integrity in sport is so important, because more and more we are seeing sport as a vehicle for young women and girls to get a sense of pride and achievement. Women have always been good at sport. There's the suggestion from some people, 'Women are getting so good at
sport now and they're getting so much attention,' but women have always been good at sport. The best female athlete that we've ever seen in this country, Heather Mackay, the champion squash player, was also one of the best athletes we've ever seen in this country. We've had world No. 1 squash players. We had Sarah Fitz-Gerald, Michelle Martin and Vicky Cardwell—they've always been great at sport.

A government member interjecting—

Ms MURPHY: I hear 'Dawn Fraser' being yelled out from the other side. Absolutely. We've had Dawn Fraser. Last week I got to meet Melissa Barbieri, former captain of the Matildas. The Diamonds have been role models and leaders in sport for many, many years. Netball is a sport of integrity that some other sports could look up to. Australian women cricketers are the best cricketers in the world, and they are achieving time after time after time, and I am absolutely confident that, when we have the T20 in Australia next year, we will see the Australian women's cricket team achieving yet again. Ash Barty: I dare anyone in this chamber to find a current athlete who we could admire more than Ash Barty for the way she conducts herself, for her achievements—

Honourable members interjecting—

Ms MURPHY: I see that there is bipartisan support. That's why integrity in sport is so important. We need to have a tribunal like the one that's being set up, so that we can look at the successes of our athletes and know that they are successful because of blood, sweat and tears, and hard work—like someone as amazing as Ash Barty.

The Australian women's softball team this year qualified for the 2020 Olympics next year. I think that's the first time they've qualified for the Olympics since the year 2000. There are female athletes around this country working day in, day out to be professionals, to get equal pay with men, to represent their country and to be role models. That's what we want our young girls and our young women to be able to see.

In my electorate of Dunkley just last week the Frankston and District Netball Association received the runner-up for the Good Sports Awards in Victoria.

Mr Tim Wilson: Good on them!

Ms MURPHY: Thank you—good on them, I agree. It's an association that takes its commitments to the community seriously. It not only runs competitions; it talks about reconciliation with our First Nations peoples in our community. It has beautiful murals painted by local high school students at Elisabeth Murdoch College up at the courts as a symbol of respect. It's an association that is part of the local drug strike force that goes out and educates young people about why they should be involved in sport and on healthier ways of living. It's an association that supports girls to go through higher-performance programs so that they can play for the Peninsula Waves and aspire to be part of the Australian team. It's an association that's opened its doors to having men on the committee and on the board, and to boys playing netball with our local girls, because it's about inclusion and equality.

I'm really proud to have been associated with the Frankston and District Netball Association over many years and to be able to stand here and tell the chamber of their success and to hold them up as the sort of club and the sort of sport that is about integrity in sport. It's an example of why it's so important that we protect sport as an integral part of Australian life.
Mr NEUMANN (Blair) (19:27): One of the greatest things that we as local MPs see is the joy on the faces of young people as we give out certificates for those young people and their teams who've got Local Sporting Champions funding. It's a great bipartisan program supported by Labor—and when we were in government we initiated it—and supported by the coalition now. To see the joy in those young girls from Ipswich Force basketball team or in young athletes who have been swimmers as well as taekwondo experts—the young lads from Toogoolawah. It's always been fantastic.

One of the things that really frustrates young people who expect clean, fair sport is when they are disillusioned by their sporting champions. So integrity in sport is absolutely crucial. Think of examples in world sport, for example, when a goalkeeper in a football match deliberately lets the ball go into the goal. Think of a cricketer playing, maybe on the subcontinent, in Australia or in South Africa—an elite athlete—who lets the ball hit the stumps or the pads deliberately to make sure that certain people will win a bet. Think of, for example, a champion cyclist like Lance Armstrong and the way he was revered around the world by so many people only for them to find out that he had cheated his way to success.

This sort of legislation is really important—that's why Labor supports it—to make sure there's integrity in sport; to make sure that those young people that we see who are local sporting champions can grow up and participate in sport at all levels, to represent our cities and to represent our states in national competitions; to make sure they play in fair competitions where there is no doping or cheating; and to make sure that they get a fair go and achieve all they want to achieve in their lives. That's why this sort of legislation is really important.

Debate interrupted.

ADJOURNMENT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Wicks) (19:30): It being 7.30, I propose the question:

That the House do now adjourn.

Chau, Mr Van Kham

Vietnam: Human Rights

Mr HAYES (Fowler—Chief Opposition Whip) (19:30): Last week, along with many members of this House, I attended a rally organised by the Vietnamese Community in Australia NSW Chapter outside Parliament House in support of an Australian citizen, Mr Van Kham Chau, who is currently detained in Vietnam. Mr Chau was arrested in Ho Chi Minh City in January this year while meeting members of the democracy movement as part of a human rights fact-finding mission to Vietnam.

On 11 November this year, Mr Chau was found guilty of terrorism and sentenced to 12 years imprisonment in a Vietnamese court. Human rights groups have called this a 'sham trial': a closed court over a couple of hours—with media prohibited, as well as family and friends—handed down this sentence of 12 years. Mr Paul Nguyen, the president of the VCA NSW Chapter, highlighted the seriousness of this issue when he stated:

We urge the Vietnamese Government to apply the principles of fairness and compassion, to allow Mr Chau to immediately and unconditionally return back to Australia.
I understand that while in detention for almost 10 months Mr Chau was denied access to legal defence counsel until immediately before his trial, and that it was then restricted to three one-hour sessions. Given the gravity of the allegations raised against him, it's without doubt that restricting legal access had an adverse impact on his defence, impairing his ability to have a fair trial.

The fact is Mr Chau is a 70-year-old retired baker who lives in Western Sydney, but he has had a longstanding interest in advancing human rights. Together with his wife and family, Mr Chau has been in Australia for over 30 years and is well-known locally for his contribution to the local community. Some of us had suggested that the verdict calls into question Vietnam’s commitment to advancing human rights, whether it is sustainable economically, and whether security partnerships with Vietnam and Hanoi are at all possible. It is certainly disheartening, if not infuriating, to see that the human rights situation in Vietnam continues to decline.

Those who are brave enough to speak out against the Vietnamese government are being charged under vague national security laws and being thrown into prison without a fair trial and in many cases without access to defence lawyers. On top of this, those who have been jailed are facing very poor conditions in detention, and mistreatment by authorities. The Vietnamese government has shown that they are unwilling to adhere to the rule of law, and are keen to oppress, jail and exile those who simply advocate for the most basic of human rights. I note the view of Human Rights Watch. They say that:

A 12-year prison sentence in a Vietnamese prison, where the conditions are horrible, is the equivalent to a death sentence.

This is particularly true in the case of Mr Chau, who is 70 years old, as I said, is in deteriorating health, and has twice been hospitalised while he has been in detention in Vietnam.

With no evidence presented by the Vietnamese authorities to substantiate Mr Chau’s terrorism charge, it is imperative that the international community continues to place pressure on Vietnam to ensure that it remains accountable for its human rights record and to encourage it to apply due process and uphold the rule of law. I acknowledge the work of DFAT, which has provided continued consular assistance to Mr Chau and his family. I also acknowledge the bipartisan commitment on this matter from members and senators of the Australian parliament. I also acknowledge that the member for Goldstein and I wrote to the Vietnamese government calling on it to honour its commitment to International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In a similar bipartisan spirit, I call on all members of parliament to take all reasonable steps to ensure that Mr Chau can safely return home to Australia. On this note, I take the opportunity of thanking the VCA NSW Chapter for organising the rally outside Parliament House. I commend their state president, Mr Paul Huy Nguyen, and also their national president, Mr Bon Nguyen, for their unceasing human rights advocacy. On this occasion, it is just so imperative that members of the House take whatever steps they can to encourage government to take all reasonable steps to help this family. Once again, I commend the officials at DFAT. They have engaged properly on this matter. I have no complaint with their actions, and they’ve kept me in the loop.
Mr SIMMONDS (Ryan) (19:35): It's a privilege to have such an auspicious audience here to hear this humble speech. I'm not quite sure I'll live up to your expectations, but I'll give it a red-hot crack.

An honourable member interjecting—

Mr SIMMONDS: Thank you very much for the supportive interjections. As we all get to the end of the year and we reflect on the success that it's been, we're also finishing the school year, of course, and reflecting on the significant work of the teachers and the students in our electorate and our local community. In particular, I want to pay tribute this evening to two incredible local teachers who are retiring at the end of this year. They have both been driving forces in the classrooms of my local community in the electorate of Ryan. When you have teachers who have been in the classroom for as long as these two gentlemen, they truly do shape an entire generation within their immediate community.

The first I want to talk about is Mike Senior. Mike Senior will retire as the principal of Ambrose Treacy College in Indooroopilly at the end of the year after a very long and distinguished career at its helm. Ambrose Treacy College was previously Nudgee Junior College. Mike led the transformation from just a junior college to a full P-12 school. That is not an easy task, as I'm sure members in this House would appreciate. He managed the transition absolutely masterfully. He had to deal with some of the hardest issues that a principal faces, such as uniform policy, logos and mottos, not to mention a mass of building work, but he did it with significant success. He loves photography. He was always there supporting his students by taking photos. He always brought a very caring attitude to the job. He promoted his personal values of service and responsibility. In particular, I've always enjoyed attending the service awards of ATC because, every year, they track the volunteer hours of the young boys who come through the college and acknowledge them appropriately. I think that's great form.

Mike was recently asked about what it meant to him to be a teacher and he said, 'I can't remember a definite moment when I thought, "I want to be a teacher." It was more that I never thought I would be anything but a teacher. There's no other profession where you can say you are playing an active part in shaping the future, because you are shaping the future lives of young people. It's the best job in the world—a job that just keeps giving.' With that spirit, members in this House will see why he has been such a tremendous asset to our local community. Clearly it runs in the family, because Mike's daughters have both become teachers themselves. It has been a tremendous privilege, as first a local councillor and now the federal member, to work with Mike and see how he has supported his community. I pay tribute to his brilliant career and wish him all the very best in retirement.

The other teacher that I want to speak about is Mr Dean Pfeffer, who is retiring from Moggill State School. This is my alma mater as a primary school. I was there in the years 1991 to 1997. Mr Pfeffer has been teaching at Moggill State School for 34 years. When I spoke at his assembly, which we held to honour him just recently, I reminded him that 34 years is as long as I have been alive. That is how long he has been teaching at this one school. It made him feel a little bit old, but that was not my intention. I was trying to illustrate to the kids in front of me—the very young children—what a long time 34 years is to be dedicated to a single school and community. Because of that, he has truly shaped a generation of kids in
the Moggill-Bellbowrie region. He is a man of tremendous energy. He used to ride his bike over the Pinjarra Hills to school, hit the handball court with us kids at lunchtime, and then ride all the way back home. He's had a tremendous impact on those around him. He is a devoted family man with very strong values and morals, and he instilled the same into his students—values of responsibility, excellence and respect. You only got an award if you really deserved it. I remember that very distinctly! He has a tremendous memory. He remembers all of his students. But, most importantly, he has the ability to know what his students are capable of before they even know it themselves.

As these two gentlemen retire, I give my thanks on behalf of our wider community for helping to shape our community and for their selfless service.

**Australia: Head of State**

Mr HILL (Bruce) (19:40): Like the majority of MPs, I believe our nation should have an Australian as our head of state. I'm passionate about this. I spoke about it in my first speech. Our head of state should be a citizen, not a foreigner. Our head of state should live here, not in Britain. They should be an Australian; they should be one of us.

Now, my personal confessions: when I was first elected it was a confronting moment to take an oath of allegiance to a foreigner. I felt like a cheap traitor. In silent protest, I crossed my fingers and toes, I did! Personally, I cannot stand hereditary monarchies; they're anachronistic—we took centuries to get rid of tyranny. A hereditary monarchy runs against Australian egalitarian values.

I know it's politically correct for republicans to get up here and kowtow to the British royal family. I'm supposed to say: 'I like them. I respect them for their years of service.' Well, I'm not one for political correctness. I don't like the British royal family. I don't especially dislike them most days, though in the last few weeks the true elitist, out-of-touch character of the institution has been revealed. I could not give a hoot about their lives or their incestuous ancestry and traditions. I do not care. They are irrelevant to our national life.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Wicks): Order, the member for Bruce will resume his seat. I call the minister on a point of order.

Mr Hawke: Madam Deputy Speaker, there is a standing order specifically to prevent reflections on Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, the head of state. It is disorderly and it is against the standing orders of this House. I would invite the member for Bruce to not reflect on our head of state—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The minister has made his point and will resume his seat. Member for Bruce, I would ask you to withdraw the last comment that you made.

Mr HILL: I withdraw. None of my prejudices, feelings, likes or dislikes are relevant—and Keating said it best:

… we are all Australians. We share a continent. We share a past, a present and a future. And our Head of State should be one of us.

It's a simple proposition with broad support but devilishly hard to achieve, because republicans are split on the mode of appointment.

Two asides. I don't believe we should have a president; we should stick with the Governor-General—no confusion with the US system or an executive presidency, and don't change...
system of government. And there should be a constitutional ban on any member of parliament becoming Governor-General, and on a Governor-General ever being elected to a parliament. But the way forward is unclear. It is important, though, that we keep debating it and thinking about it. The Labor Party took to the last election a three-stage process: a yes/no plebiscite, choose a model and then put a question. It had merit; it was respectful and deliberative.

But I want to record also my appreciation of a powerful and provocative speech last week by Malcolm Turnbull, with a different idea. It was the old Malcolm. If only he gave that speech when he was Prime Minister! His proposition was two stages: go straight to choosing the model through a year of community debate, then a binding plebiscite: parliamentary appointment or direct election. Then develop the winning model in detail and put it to a referendum. It has a lot going for it, and it's worth seriously considering. It cuts to the chase. And, as Malcolm said, he's had 20 years to reflect on the failure of his '99 referendum, and he believes this is the way forward. It would decrease the risk of failure and division on the threshold question, and I think we can confidently assume broad support, subject to the model. It cuts waste and time, therefore. The education and deliberative phase also maximises the chances of rejection of an Americanisation of our system with direct election: the true—I believe the real—politicians' republic.

There is a risk, though, in what Malcolm proposes, and that's the dangerous assumption that people who vote for the minimalist model in the first ballot would vote for it in the second, and that's risky. The truth is: it's risky. Malcolm says he's an Elizabethan—that is, that this debate must wait until the Queen dies. I'm not an Elizabethan myself; however, I'd float a radical proposition which true Elizabethan republicans would back. This parliament should seriously examine a different and an easier way, which may well be legal.

We should look at amending the act of succession, which currently provides for Her Majesty's heirs and successors to succeed her as head of state. I believe that we should explore amending this so that, when the Queen dies, the current Governor-General simply becomes our head of state, to serve no more than five years, with a successor appointed by the Chief Justice of the High Court on advice of both houses of parliament with a two-thirds vote. In doing so, it should be legislated that there would then be a constitutional convention for the nation to work through carefully the future method of appointment. Direct election, parliamentary appointment or otherwise could be explored with the people in a sober, serious way without disrespecting the current Queen or being lumbered with the nonsense of King Charles III. If we have to, amend the law to make the Governor-General the Queen—put him in drag, if needed!—as long as our head of state is an Australian.

Mr Hawke interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Bruce will resume his seat. I'm going to call the next speaker, but the member for Bruce will withdraw. I call the minister, on a point of order.

Mr Hawke: Standing order 88 makes clear that it is disorderly for members to refer to the Governor-General or the Queen in a disorderly and disrespectful fashion. I ask, again, that the member for Bruce withdraw his slur on the Governor-General.
The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the minister for pointing out the intervention, and I have actually asked the member for Bruce to withdraw. I’m going to ask the member for Bruce to withdraw now. I call the member for Bruce.

Mr HILL: I have read page 518 of Practice, which enables these comments. I’m happy to withdraw, for the convenience of the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Bruce to resume his seat.

Workforce Participation

Mr SHARMA (Wentworth) (19:46): In my first speech here I spoke about the reality of modern family life, with both partners working and having career aspirations and struggling to make this work along with the desire to have a family and raise children. I described the dilemma when one partner is often forced to take a career backseat as not only being frustrating for that partner, who might wish to pursue their professional career, but also being a lost economic opportunity for the country. As a speech by Guy Debelle, the deputy governor of the Reserve Bank, delivered last week makes clear, we have come a long way in reducing the gap between male and female workforce participation in Australia. The share of the population participating in the labour force is at a record high, and the two main groups contributing to this rise in participation are females and older workers. This trend is welcome.

Further, female employment growth in particular has accounted for two-thirds of employment growth over the past year, the female participation rate at its highest rate, and the gap between male and female participation is now the narrowest it has ever been.

Increasing flexibility of work arrangements, the growing availability of child care and policies such as paid parental leave have all helped drive this. And, while this gap has closed somewhat, the gap persists, and it is wider than in a number of other OECD countries. Closing this gap further would be one of the more meaningful reforms we could pursue. It would address one of the three P’s—population, productivity and participation—that ultimately drive economic growth. And the research is clear: the availability and cost of child care is a big factor in whether parents, particularly mothers, participate in the workforce.

I was pleased to help launch a report last month written by Rosalind Dixon, Richard Holden and Melissa Vogt of the University of New South Wales. The report, titled (Un)Taxing child-care: boosting choice and labour supply through subsidised and tax-deductible child-care in Australia, makes a significant research contribution to this policy issue. The report notes that our current childcare subsidy is widely used and accessed, including by low-income families. This subsidy plays an important role in ensuring affordability and accessibility of child care across Australia. Female labour participation has risen in concert with greater availability and affordability of child care.

The cost of the childcare subsidy to the federal government was around $8½ billion in 2017-18, or around 1.7 per cent of total government expenditure, and is forecast to grow. This is a significant sum of money, and we should always be prepared to examine our policy measures to ensure that they are achieving their intended purpose. As I said, we have come a long way in closing the gap between male and female workforce participation, but, according to the Productivity Commission, there are still some 165,000 parents, many of whom are women, who would like to work or would like to work more hours.
Although the gender pay gap has also narrowed over time, the gender pay gap persists, in large part a function of the greater amount of time spent out of the workforce by women than men, on average. As the Productivity Commission has found, at times the interaction of our progressive tax system, high marginal rates and our means-tested childcare subsidy can create disincentives for parents to enter the workforce or to increase their hours of work. The report by Ros Dixon and Richard Holden makes a number of interesting proposals to address these issues, including making work related childcare expenses tax deductible up to a point whilst maintaining the option to remain within the existing system of childcare subsidy such that no family would be worse off. The paper makes the case that the loss in tax revenue that would result from such deductibility would be more than offset by an increase in hours worked. The paper also argues, quite rightly, that we should not be viewing this issue solely through the lens of the progressivity of the tax system. This is a function which is best left to other parts of our tax system. Rather, we should be looking at this issue through the lens of providing incentive and encouraging positive behaviour.

The proposals contained in this paper merit further study and analysis, I believe. Increasing female workforce participation would be one of the most impactful and meaningful economic reforms we could pursue, not only for the economy but for those people, predominantly women, who would prefer not to put their professional careers and ambitions on hold or in the slow lane in order to balance the commitments of family.

This is an issue I will continue to advocate for. I welcome the meaningful contribution made to this policy challenge by this paper and commend the work of Professor Ros Dixon, Professor Richard Holden and Melissa Vogt to this important policy issue.

**Drought**

Mr HUSIC (Chifley) (19:51): In just under seven days time Sydneysiders will be asked to live with tougher water restrictions as dam levels drop faster than expected. And, while they'll do the right thing, Sydneysiders are also right to ask: are they clamping down on water use quicker than they would have to? This terrible drought, which has sorely tested friends in rural and regional Australia, has reached our nation's cities. Sydney's dam levels have steadily been dropping. In over two years they have halved. The Kurnell desalination plant was rebooted in January well ahead of major water restrictions.

I'm absolutely confident residents within Sydney water catchment areas, Sydney and the Illawarra, will do the right thing, their sense of community responsibility will kick in and they will proudly play their part. Many of them will well remember what has now been dubbed the 'millennium drought' where we saw dam levels plummet to 33.8 per cent—levels that some argue hadn't been experienced since around the 1950s. We've lived through water restrictions. We saw residents go to great lengths to save water. We thought bold thoughts: we would do better at saving water, so we could avoid this the next time around, and guess what happened? Governments botched it. Frankly, we should point the finger at both the federal and state coalition governments for repeating past mistakes, because, if residents take responsibility and follow water restrictions, they should rightly ask if they've had to follow them sooner than necessary because governments didn't do their job and think ahead.

At the state level, we needed a much stronger effort on investing in water recycling, especially to benefit residents. In parts of Western Sydney, people promised access to
recycled water are puzzled to see drinking water flowing through pipes meant for a recycled variety, all because Sydney Water didn't invest in delivering recycled water.

The feds have completely vacated the field on urban water infrastructure investment. Remember back in 2007 when former Treasurer Peter Costello declared: 'Meeting the urban water crisis was a job for state governments and not the federal budget.' It took a Rudd-Labor government to form partnerships with the states to help water-thirsty communities—backed up, for example, with a $1.5 billion investment in new urban water. But, as predictably as waiting for the next drought, what happened when the coalition was elected in 2013? Programs—

Mr Wallace interjecting—

Mr HUSIC: Could you keep quiet? Others have listened to you guys quietly. Programs tackling urban water infrastructure were cut. The national water restriction was later abolished. Coincidentally, according to writers Ian Wright and Jason Reynolds, in a piece for theconversation.com:

The level of water stored by Australia's capital cities has steadily fallen over the last six years. They are now collectively at 54.6% of capacity—a decline of 30% from 2013.

Since the election the Morrison government has called on its state counterparts to step up with ideas on infrastructure investment, in part wanting to resuscitate a flagging national economy. Weirdly, New South Wales was notably silent when it came to urban water infrastructure ideas. There was nothing about strengthening the ability to deliver greater levels of desalinated water to more of Sydney's five billion population and there was certainly nothing we could see to invest in better access to recycled water in Sydney's suburbs. It wasn't like they weren't warned. In May this year WaterNSW rang the alarm bell, advising the state government to start planning now for water storage levels falling below 30 per cent.

It's not like the Morrison government won't invest in desalination, having just signed off $100 million to the SA Liberal government to help them with their desalination efforts. So why didn't Premier Berejiklian tap the forehead of her New South Wales Liberal partner Scott Morrison and call for similar support? Sure, Sydney Water is looking to double the capacity at the Kurnell facility, but, while that's happening, why can't they look at areas like the Illawarra that, according to some estimates, may run out of water in about two years at the current rate of depletion. It makes perfect sense to ensure that Wollongong and surrounding suburbs have access to desalinated water or to come up with an idea on urban water recycling.

Australians are rightly concerned the coalition has dragged its feet responding to climate change. They should be concerned that lessons from previous droughts have not been learnt and that we didn't prepare, or we're not prepared now, to invest in ways that will ensure that the water security people rightly should expect would happen. We don't need too little, too late. What we need is the right action right now.

Mr STEVENS (Sturt) (19:56): I've reported to the House in the past about the $100 billion congestion-busting infrastructure fund that this government has. One of the great projects in my electorate of Sturt is the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection—a $90 million upgrade. I was lucky enough to have Minister Tudge visit the site a few weeks ago where we had early contractors undertaking some of the important planning work we need to
do to make that project a reality. We did a little video, as you do these days, for social media, which I thought was going to be very successful in spreading the word. I have to say, we were schooled very, very effectively by the member for Ballarat, shadow Minister for Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Development, Catherine King. After posting this video, she pointed out some very important things to us, which I thought I would share with the House.

Upon this video being put up on Twitter—and I don’t use titles because I’m quoting @CatherineKingMP—she wrote:

In the video is Minister for Cities @AlanTudgeMP and Christopher Pyne's replacement—
I think we can move on from Christopher Pyne—
@James_Stevens.

Gone but not forgotten.
They're talking about work starting on an upgrade to the busy intersection of Magill and Portrush Roads in Adelaide.

But, what are the workers behind them actually up to?
It's pretty obvious if you just watched the video. It goes on:
I had a look online to find out more…

I suppose she googled 'how to build an intersection'. She goes on:
No construction contract has even been awarded.

Exactly. We are the Liberal Party. We are going to have a proper open market based tender and we're going to protect value for money for taxpayers. The business that's the most appropriate and comes in at the lowest cost will be the one that's awarded the contract. It would seem that’s not so with the Labor Party. She goes on:
The Australian Govt actually says it could take until mid-2023 to complete.

Yes. A $98 million intersection, if done correctly, may well take around two years. We're about underpromising and over delivering in the Liberal Party, not the other way around, which is the track record of the Labor Party. But it gets better. She wrote:

So, I asked a friend to pop past and see what all the fuss was about...

She phoned a friend, someone who lived around the corner. This was four days later, when she posted two photographs taken at one of the nearby intersections, and she wrote:

There are some lines on the road and the footpath, but no signs of construction...

Sure. They finished the job four days earlier, because we awarded the contract to an efficient company that was able to do the job very, very quickly and when her friend showed up the job was completed. Next she wrote:

It turns out that the ‘work starting’ is just early planning works, such as identifying where comms, gas, power and water services run.

That's right. Before just firing up the bulldozer and putting it into cruise control we're finding out where all of the underlying infrastructure services go. I might add that this intersection is adjacent to one of the largest power substations in South Australia. Then, on 25 November, she wrote:

A contract has been awarded for planning—
Debate interrupted.

**House adjourned at 20:00**

**NOTICES**

The following notices were given:

**Mr Frydenberg:** To present a Bill for an Act about Commonwealth investment in the Australian Business Growth Fund, and for related purposes. (*Australian Business Growth Fund Bill 2019*)

**Mr Frydenberg:** To present a Bill for an Act to amend the law relating to credit reporting, and for other purposes. (*National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment (Mandatory Credit Reporting and Other Measures) Bill 2019*)

**Mr Porter:** To present a Bill for an Act relating to the Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia, and for other purposes. (*Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia Bill 2019*)

**Mr Porter:** To present a Bill for an Act to deal with consequential and transitional matters in connection with the *Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia Act 2019*, and for related purposes. (*Federal Circuit and Family Court of Australia (Consequential Amendments and Transitional Provisions) Bill 2019*)

**Mr Sukkar:** To present a Bill for an Act to amend the law relating to taxation, corporations, competition, financial services, consumer credit, product grants and benefits, superannuation and legislative and other instruments, and for related purposes. (*Treasury Laws Amendment (2019 Measures No. 3) Bill 2019*)

**Mr Sukkar:** To move—That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: HMAS Watson Redevelopment, Sydney NSW.

**Mr Sukkar:** To move—That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: DFAT- Australian High Commission Property Replacement Project in Tarawa, Kiribati.

**Mr Sukkar:** To move—That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Shoalwater Bay Training Area Remediation Project.

**Mr Sukkar:** To move—That, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1969*, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the committee has duly reported to Parliament: Navy Capability Infrastructure Sub-program: Facilities and Infrastructure to Support New Navy Capabilities.

**REQUEST FOR DETAILED INFORMATION**

**National Broadband Network**

**Mr Keogh** To ask the Speaker—

(1) How many electorate offices use the National Broadband Network (NBN) for data services.

(2) Of the electorate offices located in NBN-ready areas that are not using the NBN, why are they not doing so.
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR DETAILED INFORMATION

Department of Parliamentary Services

Mr Hill To ask the Speaker—in respect of information stored on or accessed using the Department of Parliamentary Services (DPS) network, can the following information be provided:

(1) All departmental briefs or incident reports that reference any concerns or issues regarding specific incidents of ministerial staff downgrading the classification of material on the DPS network, for the purposes of printing, downloading or emailing that material.

(2) All departmental briefs or reports that reference, more broadly, ministerial staff declassifying or seeking to amend the classification of material on the DPS network.

(3) All departmental briefs or incident reports that reference contractors or consultants to government agencies or departments downloading, printing or emailing top secret, secret, confidential or protected material via those agencies' or departments', or the contractors' or consultants' own networks, or other improper use of such material.

(4) All departmental briefs or reports that raise, more broadly, concern with the way contractors or consultants to government agencies or departments are downloading, printing, emailing or otherwise using top secret, secret, confidential or protection material via those agencies' or departments', or the contractors' or consultants' own networks.

The Speaker The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) Ministerial staff would normally conduct their IT activities using the ministerial portfolio agency IT systems which are outside of the management of the Department of Parliamentary Services (DPS). Some Ministerial staff may have accounts on the DPS managed network, however the network provided by DPS to staff of parliamentarians is an Unclassified network and therefore any material on the network would not be classified or be eligible for downgrading or declassification. DPS is not aware of any instances that meet the requested criteria.

(2) DPS is not aware of any instances that meet the requested criteria.

(3) The majority of networks under the management of DPS are Unclassified. DPS does maintain a small Protected email enclave, however DPS is unaware of any briefs or incident reports that match the criteria of the request.

(4) DPS is unaware of any briefs or incident reports that meet the criteria for this request in relation to the parliamentary network.
CONSTITUENCY STATEMENTS

North Sydney Electorate: North Sydney Community Awards

Mr ZIMMERMAN (North Sydney) (10:28): Last month I was very pleased to host my fourth North Sydney Community Awards at Norths Leagues Club in Cammeray. True heroes are all around us, often working behind the scenes doing extraordinary things for our community: in our schools and sporting clubs, caring for our environment or in the service of others, often helping people that they have never met but still care very deeply about. These heroes bring true meaning to the words 'community', 'service' and 'achievement'. I am proud to represent a community where this spirit of volunteering is so strong.

At the awards, I was able to recognise the work of over 60 individuals and community organisations. Very big congratulations go to Jennifer Horrigan, who won the North Sydney Citizen of the Year Award this year. Jennifer received this award for her remarkable achievements as the chairman of the national charity Redkite. Redkite is a very special organisation that provides support to children and young people with cancer and their families across Australia. They provide support from diagnosis all the way through to final treatment. Jennifer's personal efforts include running in the New York Marathon to raise money and awareness of Redkite. Her current goal is to raise sufficient funds to support 42 Australian families this year.

Oliver White was awarded the North Sydney Sporting Achievement Award for his dedication in becoming the 2019 Australian cross-country champion for the under-12 and under-14 boys in the three-kilometre race. Oliver showed great determination and grit by adopting a disciplined approach to training and always striving to reach his goal of becoming Australia's best. He is a fine young man.

Stephen Jones received the North Sydney Older Person Award for his outstanding work for the charity he founded, called Kids Like Brett, which supports children with Nezelof syndrome. Stephen's son suffered from this serious condition, and Stephen realised that more life-saving machines were needed and went on to raise more than $1 million for the Sydney Children's Hospital.

Community group of the year was awarded to the Special Olympics dance group. The group does outstanding work by providing children and young adults who have an intellectual disability with the opportunity to dance, perform and put on concerts. This volunteer-run organisation meets every Saturday morning at Lane Cove West and provides the dancers and their families with a chance to catch up with peers, discuss issues and provide support to each other. I've had the opportunity to visit one of their Saturday sessions, and the enthusiasm of the participants and the parents is obvious.

These major category winners were joined by so many others representing our community, from the wonderful Pink Ladies who volunteer at Royal North Shore Hospital to individuals like the oldest winner, John Cran, who, at almost 92, is still playing the bassoon with the...
Willoughby Symphony orchestra. My special thanks go to Sebastian Robertson, chair and co-founder of batyr, who was our special guest and spoke about his important work reducing youth suicide; to Norths club, who hosted the event; and, last but not least, to Josie Ryan and Cammeray Public School Big Band, which provided wonderful music for the ceremony. Many thanks go to all the winners on their work for their community.

**Health Care: Medication Availability**

Dr FREELANDER (Macarthur) (10:31): I rise today to discuss a matter of great importance to many Australians, having recently been contacted by an understandably distressed Macarthur resident about the lack of availability of EpiPen Jr. The lack of EpiPen Jr, a life-saving medication, is greatly distressing to parents who have a child with severe anaphylaxis—including my own son who has a daughter with nut anaphylaxis.

As members of this House ought to be aware, the EpiPen and EpiPen Jr are single-use devices that can be life-saving. Indeed, over the years, I've treated many patients from the Macarthur region who've relied upon the EpiPen in times of mortal danger. I cannot make this more plain to the House: the EpiPen is a life-saving device, and lack of availability of EpiPen Jr for children is greatly distressing to many parents.

On further investigation, I've also noted there are many other medications that are in very short supply in Australia, including Amisulpride, which is an antipsychotic medication; metoprolol, a beta-blocker used for cardiac disease and other problems including migraine; some of the newer statin medications; Isoptin, used to control cardiac arrhythmias; syntocinon, which is used in obstetrics; Lamictal 200mg and 100mg capsules, used to control epilepsy; some antibiotics, including clarithromycin; ranitidine, an anti-acid medication; and some of the vital antiviral medications such as valaciclovir and famciclovir, used to control severe viral encephalitis. There are some medications of which the supply has been described as 'critically important' and which are in critically short supply, including: adrenaline ampoules; metronidazole, an antibiotic used to control gram-negative organisms, sometimes in the worst kinds of sepsis; flucloxacillin, an anti-staphylococcal antibiotic; and meropenem, one of the new antibiotics used for multi-drug-resistant systemic infections. These medications are all in short supply, described as 'critical'. These are life-saving medications.

The Minister for Health is very prone to wanting to politicise the PBS, but we have such severe supply chain difficulties in Australia that we have critically short supplies of many of these life-saving medications, and the minister has done nothing about it. I myself have inquired of the Department of Health about these critically short supplies, and have been previously reassured that all is fine—but, in fact, it's not. We have critically short supplies of vital medications. The health minister is doing nothing.

**Francis, Mr Russell John**

Mr ENTSCH (Leichhardt) (10:34): It's with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to a friend in Cairns, a media personality who recently lost his battle with cancer. Russell Francis was a larrikin, a family man and a well-respected photographer. He had a long and illustrious career with *The Cairns Post* between the 1970s and 1990s. Russell was also a mentor and is known for taking young photographers under his wing to show them the ropes. If there was news that was happening in our region, you could bet your bottom dollar that Russell would be out there catching the images for readers. Russell covered many of the
biggest stories in our region during those years—the glory days, you could say, when print was king.

His images are displayed not only in *The Cairns Post* but also in national and international publications. Russell covered the drama of the Daintree rainforest blockade back in the 1980s, when people chained themselves to trees and buried themselves in the path of bulldozers to prevent construction of the road. It’s pleasing to see that those involved in the protest paid their respects to him on social media after learning of his passing. That just goes to show the high esteem that Russell was held in by all of those he came in contact with. Russell was also there when tree-sitter Manfred Stevens and the anti-sky-rail protesters opposed the construction of the 7.5 kilometre cable between Cairns and Kuranda. Russell was there on 4 February 1987, when the students from Cairns State High School, including my son, were returning from a school camp and the bus they were travelling on crashed down the side of the Gillies Range. Eight students were tragically killed in the crash, which also saw injuries to a further 32 students, two teachers and the driver. Outside of the hard news story photographs, Russell also captured visits to our region by celebrities and royals, including when the Duchess of York, Sarah Ferguson, and her children stayed at Bedarra Island.

Outside of being a newshound, Russell was a keen gardener and a rare and exotic fruit enthusiast. Russell was also an animal lover and was very heavily involved with the Young Animal Protection Society—or YAPS, as it’s commonly known in Cairns. I had the absolute pleasure of knowing Russell when I was a crocodile farmer, many years before I entered into the world of politics. He took numerous photographs of me unloading crocodiles caught up at Pormpuraaw, when I used to do crocodile shows at Wild World. Many of those pictures are displayed in my office in Cairns and here in Canberra.

You could not come across a finer and more respected person than Russell Francis. He might have gone, sadly, but the images he took throughout his career will live on for eternity. Russell is survived by his children, Aaron, Nathan, Brendan and Sarah, and grandchildren, Lillian, Ashton, Ivy and Claudia—the last one born the day before he passed away. Rest in peace, mate.

**Bean Electorate**

**Mr DAVID SMITH** (Bean) (10:37): As we near the end of 2019, I’d like to wish everyone across Bean a safe and happy festive season and a prosperous 2020. The electorate of Bean, stretching from the Canberra Deep Space Communication Complex, in the south, to the National Arboretum—but not forgetting everything in between, or Norfolk Island—is a beautiful electorate. The real beauty, though, is in the people that make our community work, from our schools, workplaces, sports clubs, unions and faith organisations to our community councils, voluntary associations and organisations devoted to care and support. It has been an honour to work with you all in 2019.

Christmas can be a difficult time, in particular for those who are disadvantaged and/or separated from family. Just yesterday my fellow Canberra Labor representatives and I hosted a BBQ to raise money for the work of St Vincent de Paul across our region, and we heard firsthand from volunteers about the pressure on services. The pressures arising from real costs of living outstripping pay and the inadequate level of Newstart are felt here in Bean as they are around the country. I would like to recognise and thank those that work particularly hard over the festive season, from our emergency and care workers to those working in transport,
retail and hospitality. How shameful it is to reintroduce antiworker legislation today, on the cusp of Christmas. How shameful!

The beauty of our natural environment here in Bean and across the country provides a challenge over the hot summer months that is too apparent at the moment. Many families across Bean were affected by the devastating January 2003 bushfires and are conscious of the risk this summer. Already our emergency services have felt the pressures as they have helped their colleagues right across the region. It is critical that our emergency services personnel and the Parks personnel that they work with are properly resourced right across the year.

I would urge all in this Chamber and the House to embrace, across our retail and hospitality sectors, the SDA's No One Deserves a Serve campaign and treat retail and hospitality workers with respect and dignity over this busy period, as they should right across the year.

On behalf of my wonderful team: thank you to all in Bean for everything you have done in 2019 in making our community a much stronger and kinder place. Let's work together for a united Bean in 2020.

Calare Electorate

Mr GEE (Calare—Assistant Minister to the Deputy Prime Minister) (10:40): Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr Burke: Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie): You have the call.

Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (10:40): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

A government member interjecting—

Mr BURKE: That's how he just voted. It's his choice. He opened it up.

Question unresolved.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In accordance with standing order 188, the question will be included in the Federation Chamber's report to the House.

South Australia: Wine Industry

Ms SHARKIE (Mayo) (10:41): Last Friday I attended the 2019 Saint Martin Adelaide Hills Wine Show, held at Bird in Hand winery, which featured talented local winemakers. I would like to acknowledge the many winemakers who were there on the day; in particular, Michael Downer of Murdoch Hill. Murdoch Hill took out 24 trophies, so I congratulate Michael Downer and Murdoch Hill. Their winery is at Oakbank, and they took out top honours in the following categories: best shiraz, best chardonnay, best producer under 100 tonnes, best single vineyard sale, best white wine of the show, best red wine of the show and, finally, best overall wine of the show, for their 2018 chardonnay, known as Rocket.

There are numerous winemakers in the electorate of Mayo who are finding success on both the national and the international stage. Others include Geoff Hardy of Wines by Geoff Hardy, and Don Totino and Christophe Forel of Haselgrove Wines. They were finalists in the 2019 Australian Export Awards. I caught up with Don and Christophe at the awards dinner last night, and I look forward to visiting their cellar door very soon.
For many, success would not be possible without the assistance of Wine Australia’s Export and Regional Wine Support Package. The program is set to come to an end on 30 June 2020, and I urge the government to give some surety and extend the funding. That will ensure that we have another crop of new winemakers able to benefit from the scheme.

South Australia’s wine exports have hit $1.79 billion and now generate over $2 billion in revenue for South Australia. In 2019, South Australia contributed almost 750,000 tonnes of wine-grape crush, the equivalent of almost one-third of the national crush. However, those figures could potentially drop without careful management of biosecurity hazards, such as *Phylloxera*, a tiny insect that destroys grapevines by feeding on their roots. There are no eradication treatments for *Phylloxera*. South Australia is currently *Phylloxera* free, but if we look at the Yarra Valley we see that they have lost an estimated $1 billion in crops. This would be devastating for South Australia, and we need a national plan and national leadership on this issue.

I want to finish on another important issue. The Adelaide Hills wine region is at risk from the state government's potential approval of a goldmine neighbouring Petaluma, Artwine and Bird in Hand. I want the South Australian community and Mayo residents to know that I support our wine industry, because you can farm for generations but you can mine just once.

**Mallee Electorate**

*The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie) (10:44)*: I call the member for Mallee.

*Mr Burke*: Deputy Speaker?

*The DEPUTY SPEAKER*: You have the call.

*Mr Burke (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (10:44)*: Given what just happened in the House of Representatives, I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

*Ms Flint*: She hasn't had an opportunity to speak.

*The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie)*: The member for North Sydney?

*Mr Zimmerman*: On a point of order: the procedure in the House is quite clear that a word has to come out of the speaker's mouth before you can shut them down. We had exactly this circumstance in the chamber, I think last week, from memory. So he's slightly premature, as he often is.

*The DEPUTY SPEAKER*: I call the member for Mallee.

*Dr Webster (Mallee) (10:45)*: I would like—

*Mr Burke*: Deputy Speaker?

*The DEPUTY SPEAKER*: You have the call.

*Mr Burke (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (10:44)*: I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

*Ms Flint*: Question unresolved.

*The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie)*: As the question is unresolved, in accordance with standing order 188 the question will be included in the Federation Chamber's report to the House. I call the next speaker, the member for Fowler.

---

FEDERATION CHAMBER
Mr HAYES (Fowler—Chief Opposition Whip) (10:45): I take the opportunity—

Mr Zimmerman: Mr Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie): Yes, the member for North Sydney?

Mr ZIMMERMAN (North Sydney) (10:46): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

Question unresolved.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie): I think the question is unresolved. In accordance with standing order 188, the question will be included in the Federation Chamber's report to the House. I might just add that this is going to make things very unorderly if we continue in this tit-for-tat manner. I call the member for Swan.

Swan Electorate

Mr IRONS (Swan—Assistant Minister for Vocational Education, Training and Apprenticeships) (10:46): The member for Watson knows he's being ridiculous—absolutely ridiculous!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie): Excuse me, the member for Swan. The Leader of the House?

Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (10:46): Given that the member only moments ago voted for a gag motion, I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

Question unresolved.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie): The question is unresolved. In accordance with standing order 188, the question will be included in the Federation Chamber's report to the House. I might add that I think this is disorderly conduct and, as such, we'll withhold the operations of the chamber for 15 minutes. It will be resumed on return of the chair.

Sitting suspended from 10:47 to 11:02

Newell, Mr Douglas William (Bill), OAM

Mr BOWEN (McMahon) (11:01): Douglas William 'Bill' Newell OAM was a friend of mine, but, more importantly, he was a friend of my community. He died recently, and I want to pay tribute to him in the parliament. He was a veteran of the Royal Australian Air Force, serving during World War II. He then served the community in the New South Wales Police Force, rising to the rank of detective inspector of the major crimes squad. Of course, he continued to give to the community after retirement. Since 1995 he held many positions within the Returned and Services League and served as president of the Smithfield RSL sub-branch for 12 years until 2014, and it's in that capacity that I came to know him. I also want to take the opportunity to say that my predecessor, the Hon. Janice Crosio AM, MBE, was a very good friend of Bill Newell's, and she would want me to pass on her condolences in the House.

Bill was a very, very good man and a good friend of mine, and he continued to live in the community right up until his death. He lived at the Pemulwuy nursing home, and I was very pleased to be able to call in and chat with him from time to time at the nursing home and
recall old times. I remember he told me about the time that, at the police station, somebody arrived to brief him on the latest development in policing: the introduction of a computer. He said some of his colleagues thought it wouldn't take off, but he thought that the computer had some potential both in law enforcement and elsewhere. It was appropriate that he was awarded a Medal of the Order of Australia in 2015 in recognition of his service to veterans and their families, and I was very pleased to be able to write in support of his nomination for a Medal of the Order of Australia.

He was particularly dedicated to the commemoration of Battle for Australia Day. Battle for Australia Day is a day now commemorated in many RSL clubs, but Smithfield RSL was the first in Australia to recognise Battle for Australia Day. It was the idea of another now departed veteran—Mr Alex Peken, who I've previously paid tribute to in this House—but Bill, as president, took it up. Battle for Australia Day at Smithfield RSL is now a very important commemoration and is widely regarded within the RSL community as the third most important commemoration after Anzac Day and Remembrance Day, and it was first commemorated at Smithfield RSL. His drive and enthusiasm made Battle for Australia Day.

He was also very important in the bowls community. In 2009 he was awarded the meritorious service badge by the NSW RSL Lawn Bowls Association as a result of his dedication to the sport, serving as national umpire, secretary and eventually treasurer to the local zone.

I want to pass on my condolences to his widow, Minn, whom I know, of course, very, very well—she was his rock in his final years—and to his extended family. I was pleased to attend his 90th birthday at Smithfield RSL three years ago. I'm sorry he's no longer with us. I miss him every day. Our community misses him. Rest in peace, Bill Newell.

**Ryan Electorate**

Mr SIMMONDS (Ryan) (11:05): Thank you very much—

Mr BRIAN MITCHELL (Lyons) (11:05): I move:

That the Member be no longer heard.

The member opposite voted in the House of Representatives to gag another member. This is just returning the favour.

Question unresolved.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Gillespie):** As the question is unresolved, in accordance with standing order 188 the question will now be included in the Federation Chamber's report to the House. Members must be aware that I've spoken about this tit for tat, serial moving of motions that members no longer be heard. I said it is disorderly. It remains disorderly. Under standing order 187, I now suspend the business of the House and adjourn the Federation Chamber until 10 am on Thursday 5 December.

**Federation Chamber adjourned at 11:06**
QUESTIONS IN WRITING

Consumer Rights
(Question No. 239)

Ms Sharkie asked the Assistant Treasurer, in writing, on 24 October 2019 - In respect of the Government's Mandatory scheme for the sharing of motor vehicle service and repair information consultation paper of February 2019:

1. Will submissions to the consultation be made publicly available; if so, when; if not, why not.
2. How many submissions did the Government receive, organised, if possible, by category of response.
3. Has the Government finalised its response to the consultation process; if not, why not.
4. When will this response be published.
5. What steps will the Government take to implement the mandatory scheme and what form will it take.

Mr Sukkar: The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:


(2) The Government received a total of 53 submissions. This included 16 submissions from industry, eight submissions from independent repairers, 18 submissions from individuals, four submissions from government agencies and seven submissions from other organisations.

(3) No. The February 2019 consultation paper was one part of the consultation process. The Government is continuing to engage with stakeholders to progress the scheme.


(5) The Government intends to progress the scheme through primary legislation.

Questions Without Notice: Workplace Relations

Ms Claressa Surtees  
Clerk of the House of Representatives  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Dear Clerk  

In Question Time today, I provided an answer to a question from the Member for Goldstein. In my answer I incorrectly said the words "they were the two men" when I meant to say "he was the man".

Your sincerely  
The Hon Christian Porter MP  
Attorney-General  
Minister for Industrial Relations  
Leader of the House