INTERNET
The Votes and Proceedings for the House of Representatives are available at

Proof and Official Hansards for the House of Representatives,
the Senate and committee hearings are available at

For searching purposes use
http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au

SITTING DAYS—2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>18, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RADIO BROADCASTS
Broadcasts of proceedings of the Parliament can be heard on ABC NewsRadio in the capital cities on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADELAIDE</td>
<td>972AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRISBANE</td>
<td>936AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANBERRA</td>
<td>103.9FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARWIN</td>
<td>102.5FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOBART</td>
<td>747AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELBOURNE</td>
<td>1026AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERTH</td>
<td>585AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDNEY</td>
<td>630AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For information regarding frequencies in other locations please visit
http://www.abc.net.au/newsradio/listen/frequencies.htm
FORTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION—FIRST PERIOD

Governor-General
His Excellency General the Hon. Sir Peter Cosgrove AK, MC (Retd)

House of Representatives Office Holders
Speaker—Hon. Anthony David Hawthorn Smith MP
Deputy Speaker—Mr Mark Maclean Coulton MP
Second Deputy Speaker—Mr Robert George Mitchell MP
Members of the Speaker's Panel—Mr Steven Georganas MP, Mr Ian Reginald Goodenough MP, Mr Andrew William Hastie MP, Mr Kevin John Hogan MP and Ms Maria Vamvakinou MP

Leader of the House—Hon. Christopher Pyne MP
Deputy Leader of the House—Hon. Darren Chester MP
Manager of Opposition Business—Hon. Anthony Stephen Burke MP
Deputy Manager of Opposition Business—Hon. Mark Dreyfus QC MP

Party Leaders and Whips
Liberal Party of Australia
Leader—Hon. Malcolm Bligh Turnbull MP
Deputy Leader—Hon. Julie Isabel Bishop MP
Chief Government Whip—Ms Nola Bethwyn Marino MP
Government Whips—Mr Albertus Johannes van Manen MP and Mr Rowan Eric Ramsey MP

The Nationals
Leader—Hon. Barnaby Thomas Gerard Joyce MP
Deputy Leader—Senator the Hon Fiona Nash
Chief Whip—Mr George Robert Christenson MP
Deputy Whip—Ms Michelle Leanne Landry MP

Australian Labor Party
Leader—Hon. William Richard Shorten MP
Deputy Leader—Hon. Tanya Joan Plibersek MP
Chief Opposition Whip—Mr Christopher Patrick Hayes MP
Opposition Whips—Ms Joanne Catherine Ryan MP and Mr Graham Douglas Perrett MP

Printed by authority of the House of Representatives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, Hon. Anthony John</td>
<td>Warringah, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanese, Hon. Anthony Norman</td>
<td>Grayndler, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, Mr John Gilbert, OAM</td>
<td>Bemmelong, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aly, Dr Anne</td>
<td>Cowan, WA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Hon. Karen Lesley</td>
<td>McPherson, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Hon. Kevin James</td>
<td>Menzies, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandt, Mr Adam Paul</td>
<td>Melbourne, VIC</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks, Ms Julia Helen</td>
<td>Chisholm, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird, Hon. Sharon Leah</td>
<td>Cunningham, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Hon. Julie Isabel</td>
<td>Curtin, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen, Hon. Christopher Eyles</td>
<td>McMahon, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad, Mr Andrew John</td>
<td>Mallee, VIC</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadbent, Mr Russell Evan</td>
<td>McMillan, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodtmann, Ms Gai Marie</td>
<td>Canberra, ACT</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchholz, Mr Scott Andrew</td>
<td>Wright, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke, Hon. Anthony Stephen</td>
<td>Watson, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burney, Ms Linda Jean</td>
<td>Barton, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Hon. Mark Christopher</td>
<td>Port Adelaide, SA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Ms Terri Megan</td>
<td>Griffith, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne, Hon. Anthony Michael</td>
<td>Holt, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers, Dr James Edward</td>
<td>Rankin, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion, Mr Nicholas David</td>
<td>Wakefield, SA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, Hon. Darren Jeffrey</td>
<td>Gippsland, VIC</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesters, Ms Lisa Marie</td>
<td>Bendigo, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, Mr George Robert</td>
<td>Dawson, QLD</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciobo, Hon. Steven Michele</td>
<td>Moncrieff, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare, Hon. Jason Dean</td>
<td>Blaxland, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claydon, Ms Sharon Catherine</td>
<td>Newcastle, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, Mr David Bernard</td>
<td>Banks, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Hon. Julie Maree</td>
<td>Franklin, TAS</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroy, Mr Patrick Martin</td>
<td>Shortland, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulton, Mr Mark Maclean</td>
<td>Parkes, NSW</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewther, Mr Christopher John</td>
<td>Dunkley, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danby, Hon. Michael David</td>
<td>Melbourne Ports, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick, Mr Dugald Milton</td>
<td>Oxley, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreyfus, Hon. Mark Alfred, QC</td>
<td>Isacs, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum, Hon. Damian Kevin</td>
<td>Murray, VIC</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton, Hon. Peter Craig</td>
<td>Dickson, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot, Hon. Maria Justine</td>
<td>Richmond, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, Hon. Katherine Margaret</td>
<td>Adelaide, SA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entsch, Hon. Warren George</td>
<td>Leichhardt, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Mr Trevor Mark</td>
<td>Brisbane, QLD</td>
<td>LNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falinski, Mr Jason George</td>
<td>Mackellar, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeney, Hon. David</td>
<td>Batman, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgibbon, Hon. Joel Andrew</td>
<td>Hunter, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, Hon. Paul William</td>
<td>Bradfield, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint, Ms Nicolle Jane</td>
<td>Boothby, SA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelander, Mr Michael Randolph</td>
<td>Macarthur, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Members of the House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frydenberg, Hon. Joshua Anthony</td>
<td>Kooyong, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gee, Mr Andrew Robert</td>
<td>Calare, NSW</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georganas, Mr Steven</td>
<td>Hindmarsh, SA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles, Mr Andrew James</td>
<td>Scullin, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie, Hon. Dr David Arthur</td>
<td>Lyne, NSW</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodenough, Mr Ian Reginald</td>
<td>Moore, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosling, Mr Luke John</td>
<td>Solomon, NT</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, Mr Timothy Jerome</td>
<td>Perth, WA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart, Mr Ross Anthony</td>
<td>Bass, TAS</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsuyker, Hon. Luke</td>
<td>Cowper, NSW</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastie, Mr Andrew William</td>
<td>Canning, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawke, Hon. Alexander George</td>
<td>Mitchell, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, Mr Christopher Patrick</td>
<td>Fowler, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Ms Sarah Moya</td>
<td>Corangamite, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Mr Julian Christopher</td>
<td>Bruce, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, Mr Kevin John</td>
<td>Page, NSW</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howarth, Mr Luke Ronald</td>
<td>Petrie, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Hon. Gregory Andrew</td>
<td>Flinders, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husar, Ms Emma</td>
<td>Lindsay, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husic, Hon. Edham Nurredin</td>
<td>Chifley, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irons, Mr Stephen James</td>
<td>Swan, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Mr Stephen Patrick</td>
<td>Whillam, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce, Hon. Barnaby Thomas Gerard</td>
<td>New England, NSW</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katter, Hon. Robert Carl</td>
<td>Kennedy, QLD</td>
<td>AUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keay, Ms Justine Terri</td>
<td>Braddon, TAS</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keenan, Hon. Michael Fayat</td>
<td>Stirling, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Mr Craig</td>
<td>Hughes, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Mr Michael Joseph</td>
<td>Eden-Monaro</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keogh, Mr Matthew James</td>
<td>Burt, WA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalil, Mr Peter</td>
<td>Wills, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Hon. Catherine Fiona</td>
<td>Ballarat, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Ms Madeleine Mary Harvie</td>
<td>Brand, WA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb, Ms Susan</td>
<td>Longman, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laming, Mr Andrew Charles</td>
<td>Bowman, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landry, Ms Michelle Leanne</td>
<td>Capricornia, QLD</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundy, Hon. Craig Arthur Samuel</td>
<td>Reid, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh, Hon. Dr Andrew Keith</td>
<td>Fraser, ACT</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeser, Mr Julian Martin</td>
<td>Berowra, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley, Hon. Susann Penelope</td>
<td>Farrer, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleproud, Mr David Kelly</td>
<td>Maranoa, QLD</td>
<td>LNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macklin, Hon. Jennifer Louise</td>
<td>Jagajaga, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marino, Ms Nola Bethwyn</td>
<td>Forrest, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marles, Hon. Richard Donald</td>
<td>Corio, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBride, Ms Emma Margaret</td>
<td>Dobell, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormack, Hon. Michael Francis</td>
<td>Riverina, NSW</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGowan, Ms Catherine, AO</td>
<td>Indi, VIC</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVeigh, Hon. Dr John Joseph</td>
<td>Groom, QLD</td>
<td>LNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Mr Brian Keith</td>
<td>Lyons, TAS</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Mr Robert George</td>
<td>McEwen, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, Hon. Scott John</td>
<td>Cook, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, Mr Ben</td>
<td>Tangney, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neumann, Hon. Shayne Kenneth</td>
<td>Blair, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr Llewellyn Stephen</td>
<td>Wide Bay, QLD</td>
<td>LNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Brien, Mr Ted Lynam</td>
<td>Fairfax, QLD</td>
<td>LNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connell, Hon. Brendan Patrick John</td>
<td>Gorton, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Dowd, Mr Kenneth Desmond</td>
<td>Flynn, QLD</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Dwyer, Hon. Ms Kelly Megan</td>
<td>Higgins, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Neil, Ms Clare Ellen</td>
<td>Hotham, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Toole, Ms Catherine Elizabeth</td>
<td>Herbert, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens, Ms Julie Ann</td>
<td>Parramatta, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasin, Mr Antony</td>
<td>Barker, SA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrett, Mr Graham Douglas</td>
<td>Moreton, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt, Hon. Keith John</td>
<td>Hinkler, QLD</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plibersek, Hon. Tanya Joan</td>
<td>Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, Hon. Charles Christian</td>
<td>Pearce, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice, Hon. Jane</td>
<td>Ryan, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Ms Melissa Lee</td>
<td>Durack, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyne, Hon. Christopher Maurice</td>
<td>Sturt, SA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey, Mr Rowan Eric</td>
<td>Grey, SA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishworth, Hon. Amanda Louise</td>
<td>Kingston, SA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert, Hon. Stuart Rowland</td>
<td>Fadden, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland, Ms Michelle Anne</td>
<td>Greenway, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, Ms Joanne Catherine</td>
<td>Lalor, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkie, Ms Rebekha Carina Che</td>
<td>Mayo, SA</td>
<td>NXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorten, Hon. William Richard</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Hon. Anthony David Hawthorn</td>
<td>Casey, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowdon, Hon. Warren Edward</td>
<td>Lingiari, NT</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley, Ms Anne Maree</td>
<td>Werriwa, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudmalis, Ms Ann Elizabeth</td>
<td>Gilmore, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkar, Mr Michael Sven</td>
<td>Deakin, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan, Hon. Wayne Maxwell</td>
<td>Lilley, QLD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanson, Ms Meryll Jane</td>
<td>Paterson, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Hon. Angus James</td>
<td>Hume, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehan, Hon. Daniel Thomas</td>
<td>Wannon, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeman, Ms Susan Raye</td>
<td>Macquarie, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistlethwaite, Hon. Matthew James</td>
<td>Kingsford Smith, NSW</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudge, Hon. Alan Edward</td>
<td>Aston, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull, Hon. Malcolm Bligh</td>
<td>Wentworth, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vamvakinou, Ms Maria</td>
<td>Calwell, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Manen, Mr Albertus Johannes</td>
<td>Forde, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasta, Mr Ross Xavier</td>
<td>Bonner, QLD</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Mr Andrew Bruce</td>
<td>Fisher, QLD</td>
<td>LNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watts, Mr Timothy Graham</td>
<td>Gellibrand, VIC</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks, Mrs Lucy Elizabeth</td>
<td>Robertson, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie, Mr Andrew Damien</td>
<td>Denison, TAS</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Mr Joshua Hamilton</td>
<td>Fremantle, WA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Members of the House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Mr Richard James</td>
<td>O'Connor, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Mr Timothy Robert</td>
<td>Goldstein, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Mr Jason Peter</td>
<td>La Trobe, VIC</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyatt, Hon. Kenneth George, AM</td>
<td>Hasluck, WA</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zappia, Mr Antonio</td>
<td>Makin, SA</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman, Mr Trent Moir</td>
<td>North Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTY ABBREVIATIONS

AG—Australian Greens; ALP—Australian Labor Party; AUS—Katter's Australia Party; IND—Independent; LNP—Liberal National Party; LP—Liberal Party of Australia; NATS—The Nationals; NXT—Nick Xenophon Team

### Heads of Parliamentary Departments

Clerk of the Senate—R Laing  
Clerk of the House of Representatives—D Elder  
Secretary, Department of Parliamentary Services—R Stefani  
Parliamentary Budget Officer—P Bowen
### TURNBULL MINISTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>The Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Nigel Scullion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Thursday, 1 September 2016

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

National Security

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (09:31): by leave—Today I will update the House on our national security. I will outline the actions the government is taking to make Australians and our interests secure at home and abroad. Regrettably, the threats we face are very real and they are evolving, but my message today is one of reassurance. The government, the parliament and our agencies are resolutely committed to ensuring Australians remain safe, secure and free. We are constantly reviewing and strengthening our capabilities to ensure our armed forces and security agencies have all the powers they need, including important new measures that I will detail shortly.

Since the parliament last met in May, the world has witnessed a seemingly constant barrage of terror attacks: Nice, where there were 84 killed and 201 injured; Orlando, where there were 49 killed; a church in Normandy, where a priest was slain by a teenager; 47 killed in Ankara airport and 23 in Dhaka—with both attacks specifically aimed at foreigners. The list goes on. In the last year alone there have been around 40 Islamist terrorist attacks against the West or Western interests. These attacks have resulted in over 700 deaths. Many of these are assessed to have been directed or inspired by Daesh. Daesh's attacks against civilians continue across the Middle East and Africa, resulting in the deaths of thousands, mainly Muslims. In July we saw the deadliest single attack conducted by Daesh in Afghanistan, with around 80 killed and 230 injured by suicide bombers in Kabul.

Reports of attacks inspired, encouraged or instructed by Daesh and other terrorist groups have become a regular feature in our newspapers and news bulletins. Now Daesh and the broader threat from terrorism is not the only security challenge we face. Indeed, today we live in an uncertain and complex strategic environment: from territorial disputes in the South China Sea to Middle Eastern conflicts, tensions on the Korean Peninsula, instability in parts of Africa and broken borders in Europe as well as threats of pandemic disease, financial crisis and climate change. But Daesh is presently the most immediate security challenge that directly affects us all—our military and police, our communities, our youth—and it is therefore my focus today.

We cannot pretend Daesh related terrorism is merely a distant problem, a scourge that threatens people in places less fortunate than our own. In Australia it is now two years since the national terror threat level was elevated to the level now known as 'probable'. This increased threat was largely a consequence of the traction Daesh was getting from a growing number of Australians. Since then there have been three terrorist attacks in Australia and in each case the attacker claimed allegiance to, or was inspired by, Daesh. In those two years, our law enforcement and security agencies have successfully disrupted a further 10 terrorist attacks. Nine of these featured individuals with some form of allegiance to Daesh. In this period, 47 people have been charged as a result of 18 counterterrorism operations around Australia. That is over half of all terrorism related charges since 2001.
In order to defeat this despotic and barbaric movement, we are working closely with our friends and allies to destroy it at its core: its so-called caliphate in Syria and Iraq. Daesh framed its rapid territorial expansion to create the false illusion of inexorable conquest, while its declaration of a caliphate helped it to generate delusions of religious legitimacy and historical grandeur. To promote Australia’s safety, our first objective must be to expel Daesh from its occupied territories and destroy all of its pretensions of statehood. That is why a 400-member Australian Defence Force Air Task Group is conducting air strikes over Daesh strongholds in Iraq and Syria and a similar number of ADF personnel are training and assisting Iraqi ground forces.

In February I updated the House on the coalition’s efforts to halt Daesh’s momentum. I noted that to do more than just stem its advance, and to see an actual turning point, we needed to demonstrate that Daesh was being defeated in the field. Now the tide has turned in the Middle Eastern fight against Daesh. Thanks to the efforts of the Iraqi armed forces and their coalition partners, including the ADF, Daesh has lost close to half of the territory it held in Iraq and up to 20 per cent of the territory it held in Syria. We estimate its numbers of fighters have been cut by about a third. This is no small achievement and it is due, in part, to Australia’s very significant and effective military contribution. The terrorist group’s monthly income has fallen by an estimated 30 per cent since the middle of last year. In June, Daesh suffered its highest net territorial losses in over a year, including key ground near the Turkish border and in the last city it controlled in Iraq’s Anbar province, Fallujah. Iraqi forces raised the Iraqi flag over Fallujah on 17 June and Iraqi military leaders announced the city’s full liberation on 26 June.

This progress is critically important because it demolishes Daesh’s myth of invincibility and inevitable victory. Far from sweeping across Europe to stable its horses in the Vatican, Daesh is now on the defensive, losing territory, resources and lives. Would-be recruits can now see that travelling to Syria and Iraq to fight with Daesh is joining a losing side. They can see it will result in almost certain death on the battlefield. Only yesterday, there were reports that Daesh’s chief propagandist, Abu Muhammad al-Adnani, was killed in Syria, and all indications are that Daesh will lose control of Mosul in the near future.

When Mosul and Al-Raqqa are liberated we can start talking about the final destruction of Daesh’s so-called caliphate. Importantly, however, its destruction will not mark the end of this conflict. It will instead mark the beginning of the next phase—establishing order, maintaining stability, a form of peace—and this could be an even more difficult and protracted struggle. Once the so-called caliphate is destroyed, it is difficult to predict how Daesh’s remnant forces will react and mutate. The experience of al-Qaeda and its offshoots may be instructive. In the last few weeks, Jabhat al-Nusra has restyled itself as Jabhat Fatah al-Sham and announced an amicable split from al-Qaeda in an attempt to gain trust from and become a leading player in the opposition forces which are battling against the Syrian regime. In practice, nothing will change. It will remain committed to the violent ideology of al-Qaeda.

This development shows that terrorist groups continue to adapt to survive. To defeat them, so must we adapt. We cannot take winning the peace and stability for granted. The United States and its allies, including Australia, constitute a formidable war-fighting machine, but we have had mixed success in helping to re-establish political order. That is why I have been so resolute that the right soldiers on the right ground are crucial to giving the Middle East
stability and the best opportunity to succeed. It is not simply the victory but the manner of the victory that is crucial. Daesh needs to be defeated by Iraqis and by Syrians. Our air support, our trainers, our special forces are of vital importance, but it is essential that Syrians and Iraqis take the lead, win the victory and then keep the peace. The retaking of Ramadi and Fallujah are good examples. This is the context in which we expanded the mandate of our building partner-capacity training mission to include Iraqi law enforcement agencies. Iraq's law enforcement agencies will have a key role in defending, holding and stabilising the areas liberated from Daesh.

Helping to train these law enforcement agencies to hold and stabilise territory will assist Iraq to take responsibility for its own security and provide security for Iraq's citizens as they return to their cities. That is why we will be in the Middle East for a while yet. But first we must disrupt, degrade and ultimately defeat Daesh, and to do this we must allow the ADF on the frontline of this fight to have the powers they need. We must target Daesh at its base and with lethal force—no exceptions.

In January this year, as we were on our way to visit our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Chief of the Defence Force advised me of a legal anomaly which meant that we were not empowering the ADF, in particular our Air Force, to be as effective as they could be. Under international law, all members of an organised armed group such as Daesh can be targeted with lethal force, subject of course to the ordinary rules of international humanitarian law. This is a reasonable and conventional approach adopted by the armed forces of our key allies across the world. But there is a legal argument that Australia's domestic law is more restrictive than international law. This legal risk posed a major challenge to the effectiveness of our operations. It meant that the ADF’s targeting base in Iraq and Syria was restricted and we could not operate as freely as our coalition partners. So I can announce that the government has reviewed its policy on targeting enemy combatants, and earlier this year made an important decision to ensure our forces are empowered to act against Daesh in Iraq and Syria to the maximum extent allowed by international law. We will move quickly to introduce necessary amendments to the Commonwealth Criminal Code that will bring our domestic laws into line with international norms. This means that ADF personnel will be supported by our domestic laws. They will be able to target Daesh at its core, joining with our coalition partners to target and kill a broader range of Daesh combatants, which is consistent with international law. This will ensure that our efforts in Syria and Iraq are resolute and effective, and our forces are fully empowered to roll back Daesh.

Let me make myself very clear to those who contemplate joining Daesh: take up arms against us and you will join the over 60 Australians and thousands of other combatants who have already been killed in the Iraq and Syria campaign.

In the short term, unfortunately, the risk of terrorist attacks is rising as our battlefield success against Daesh grows. Whether it is Nice, Orlando, Wurzburg, Istanbul, Jakarta or Sydney, Daesh is inspiring, encouraging and directing many more attacks now than when it was expanding its territory in Syria and Iraq. As Daesh loses ground it will try to find new ways to incite fear and division and propagate the illusion of momentum.

Clearly, Daesh's propaganda and the extremist narrative appeals to different people for different reasons. For some, the attraction is ideological: they believe in a narrow and extreme interpretation of Islam where there can not be compromise with anyone—whether Muslim or
non-Muslim—who does not submit to Daesh's will. In many cases Daesh is deliberately and
directly sending operatives to other countries to undertake attacks. In others it is acting
opportunistically by recruiting, radicalising and enabling individuals who are already in-
country and have had no prior history with terrorist organisations. Some of these lone actors
and small groups are not deeply engaged with the Islamist ideology, but are nonetheless—due
to a range of reasons, including mental illness—susceptible to being radicalised rapidly. We
cannot close our eyes to this reality.

In the aftermath of the Nice attack I asked Greg Moriarty, the Commonwealth Counter-
Terrorism Coordinator, to engage with our agencies to examine the challenges posed by so-
called lone attackers and how we are best placed to thwart those attacks. I will receive and
consider the findings of this review shortly.

As Daesh suffers military defeats, it is expanding its networks into Europe and also into
our region. It is quite possible that the next mass casualty attack on Australian victims will be
somewhere in South-East Asia, where Daesh propaganda has galvanised existing networks of
extremists and attracted new recruits. Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Bangladesh
have suffered terrorist attacks over the past year and many are expecting further attacks. I
know that many of these governments are concerned about the implications of returning
terrorist fighters, just as we are alert to the risks posed by returning fighters to Australia. My
ministers and I have been active in reassuring our regional neighbours that Australia will
work with them to further strengthen cooperation to mitigate the risks. We are committed to
working with our regional partners to preserve the security and stability of our region.

The threat is not just confined to the Middle East, Europe or South-East Asia. The
perpetrators who carried out the three recent attacks here at home—the Martin Place siege, the
Endeavour Hills stabbing and the murder of Curtis Cheng—are all dead. But there are still
people outside our country and some within it who hate the freedoms that we enjoy and would
seek to threaten them and undermine them with violence. Around 200 people in Australia are
being investigated for providing support to individuals and groups in the Syria-Iraq conflict.
So, we must not only attack the disease at its source in the Middle East but we must redouble
our efforts at home.

I have often said that strong borders provide a foundation of public trust, upon which our
successful multicultural society depends. The same principles apply with counterterrorism:
our security agencies rely on public trust and strong national cohesion to keep our country
safe. Community trust is becoming even more important as encryption technology enables
terrorists and sympathisers to go dark with their electronic networks. That is why I always
choose my language carefully. We should not be so delicate as to say Daesh and Islamist
terrorism have nothing to do with Islam. There is nothing controversial about this; I have said
it before. It is a self-evident fact that underpins much of our national security efforts at home
and abroad.

We will not hesitate to label Islamist extremism when we see it, but at the same time there
is nothing to be gained by rashly affixing labels and pre-empting the findings of complex
investigations. We all work hard to preserve the mutual respect that makes us one of the most
liberal and diverse multicultural countries in the world. We must not link all Muslims with the
crimes of a terrorist minority—that is precisely what the extremists want us to do. I am
committed to continuing to work closely with Australia's Muslim communities, as I am with
all communities, and I am pleased to report that my agency heads say that we are making considerable headway. But there is work to be done. Other established terrorist groups with longstanding grievances against the West have not disappeared, and there has also been a resurgence of far-right extremism directed against Muslims. In fact, the most recent terrorist attack disrupted in Australia involved a plan by such an extremist.

Australia is better placed than many of our counterparts in dealing with the threat of terrorism. Under the coalition, we have regained control of our borders. The importance of this has been brought home with what I have described as the perfect storm attacking Europe, where Daesh and others have successfully taken advantage of porous borders and uncontrolled humanitarian flows. Our security agencies are among the most professional and vigilant in the world and we have implemented stronger laws to give them the tools that they need, taking five tranches of legislation through the parliament since August 2014. At our international airports, Australian Border Force led counterterrorism unit operations have stopped a number of people and over $3 million dollars reaching Daesh. The government is establishing a $100 million visa risk assessment capability to better detect travellers who might threaten our security long before they set foot on our shores, and we are rigorous in our efforts to ensure the guns are not illegally imported into Australia and our strong gun control laws are strictly enforced.

All of these elements provide strength and reassurance, but we cannot afford for a moment to become complacent. We have to continue to reform our national security laws in this ever-evolving security environment, which is made even more challenging by rapid technological change—and that is what we are doing. I have initiated two important measures to further strengthen our counterterrorism laws and meet the challenges of the evolving threat environment.

First, we are developing a post-sentence preventative detention system to enable a continuing period of detention for high-risk terrorist offenders. It will be a court supervised process similar to the arrangements that apply in a number of jurisdictions for sex offenders and for extremely violent individuals. States and territories have all given in-principle support to this legislation, and I thank them for their constructive engagement. The Attorney-General will introduce this legislation in the next sitting week.

Second, my government has accepted all of the recommendations of the review by the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security into the Counter-Terrorism Legislation Amendment Bill that will be introduced into the Senate in November. Among other measures, this bill will strengthen our control order regime and address the regrettable trend of increasingly younger Australians being susceptible to the lies and propaganda of Daesh and extremist ideology. We will reintroduce the revised bill also in the next sitting week. These two decisive steps are necessary to strengthen and update Australia's counterterrorism laws. They are also proportionate: balancing the need to keep the community safe with concerns for privacy and individual rights.

Also in the next sitting week we will introduce legislation to strengthen penalties for those found guilty of trafficking illegal firearms, a crime that fuels the violence associated with terrorism and poses a threat to the safety and security of all Australians. Together these measures are designed to deter, prevent and reassure. They will provide reassurance that Australians can and should continue going about their daily lives and enjoying their freedom.
because the Australian government and our agencies are doing everything possible to keep them safe.

Daesh is not the only security challenge we face. My government's defence white paper launched earlier this year details how our strategic environment is becoming more crowded and complex, particularly in our part of the Indo-Pacific. The white paper commits us to meeting these strategic challenges by working more closely with the United States and our other defence partners while working more systematically to develop new defence capabilities of our own. Our defence industry plan, in particular our continuous shipbuilding program, is doing just that.

Espionage is also an ever-present national security threat, and our new cybersecurity strategy launched in April addresses the strategic and security challenges that are arising in the cyber domain. Our national security strategy, supported by an appropriately sized defence budget, enables us to play our part in reinforcing the international rules-based system upon which regional stability and prosperity depend. We are positioning ourselves to confront existing threats, proactively mitigate those we can foreshadow and be agile enough to respond to those which are harder to predict.

I have chosen to focus on Daesh related terrorism today because it is currently the most pressing national security threat that our citizens face. We cannot be bystanders. We are all affected. That is why Australia must continue to lead locally, regionally and globally. The Australian Defence Force and our intelligence agencies are making a real difference in the global fight against terrorism and violent extremism. It is my firm commitment as Prime Minister to ensure that our serving troops will continue to have the resources they need and the support they require in this conflict. Similarly, I am just as committed to supporting our veterans of this current conflict and all those that preceded it when they return home.

We must combat all of Daesh, including its financiers and its propagandists. It is why we must give our agencies the powers they need to detect, to disrupt, to arrest and to target. Safety and security at home will always be the government's first priority. Success requires strong laws, modern powers and, importantly, social unity. I believe security and freedom are not mutually exclusive; they are mutually reinforcing.

We cannot be effective if we are creating division, whether by fomenting distrust within the Muslim community or inciting fear of Muslims in broader society. Division begets division; it makes violence more likely, not less. The aim of extremists, including those committing violence through a warped and nihilistic interpretation of religion, is to divide us and to turn our citizens against each other. But we will not let them win. We are stronger when we stand together. We will defeat division and weakness with unity and with strength. I present a copy of my ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: I thank the Prime Minister. I call the honourable Leader of the Opposition to speak in response to the Prime Minister's statement.

Mr SHORTEN (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (09:57): I thank the Prime Minister for updating the House and I thank the Chief of the Defence Force for the briefing provided to me an hour ago on this matter. It is important for our parliament that this chamber continues to be a public forum for discussing matters of significance. The loss of innocent
lives to terrorism has become an all-too-familiar story on the evening news. The toll grows across the world on every continent in nations of all faiths.

I say to the Prime Minister and to all Australians that the cooperative bipartisan approach that Labor took to questions of national security in the 44th Parliament will continue in the 45th Parliament. I wish to acknowledge Prime Minister Abbott's consistency throughout his stewardship in talking to me and the opposition about national security. Under my leadership Labor has consistently sought to be a constructive contributor to Australia's national security effort. Every single member of my caucus engages with this issue in a respectful and thoughtful way.

In the last parliament Labor supported and, indeed, improved and amended four rounds of national security legislation. Members of the Joint Standing Committee on Intelligence and Security, from all parties, worked together to deliver more than 100 amendments to the original legislation, but I wish to acknowledge briefly the painstaking work on this committee of the member for Holt, the quiet achiever. Labor will continue to take the same constructive approach in the 44th Parliament to the measures that the Prime Minister has mentioned this morning.

It is timely to update the House on counterterrorism measures and the impacts here. The opposition notes that the counterterrorism amendment bill has been reviewed by the PJCIS and that the government has accepted the changes recommended by the committee. We understand that this bill will be presented to the parliament in the next sitting week. Further, the opposition awaits further bills about national security and the importation of guns to be presented to the parliament in future weeks.

But, further, as I said at the outset of my response, the Chief of the Defence Force has briefed me about the proposals on targeting, which the Prime Minister's statement dealt with. The view of the CDF and the ADF is that it is necessary to update domestic law to be consistent with international law. International law makes a distinction between civilians and members of terrorist organisations. The domestic law has a narrower definition, which has not been updated to deal with the developments of state-like terrorist organisations, such as Daesh.

Our ADF have a robust targeting policy and protocols. They have implemented their missions and they have degraded the enemy, with no civilian casualties to this point. This reflects very well on the leadership and professionalism of our ADF. What we also recognise, though, is that based on our operations over nearly two years the ADF have been part of a coalition response to degrade ISIS, or Daesh, who have had losses in materials, people and land.

But it must be recognised that Daesh have the capacity to evolve. They are hierarchical in their leadership. They are a state-like organisation without a state to administer and they are committed to promoting warlike and terrorist activities wherever they can. Currently we are able to target their vehicles and their positions, able to go after the *Mad Max* style vehicles which the terrorists use in Iraq. Of course, we have been able to target the infrastructure and headquarter positions. Always our ADF operates proportionately with international laws, the Geneva convention and other such protocols.
But, as I said, it has become clear to our Defence Force that there may be an ambiguity between international law and our domestic laws. When we are dealing with Daesh and the factories where they make this equipment, where they cache their supplies and where they get their fuel trucks and logistical elements, it is important that we deal with this issue to make sure that our ADF, by some quirk or anomaly of domestic law, are not subjected to legal repercussions merely because we did not deal with the issue and update our laws as our ADF are dealing with a difficult and changing environment.

This issue, though, is not just one which Australia has to deal with. It is an issue which all Western nations have been grappling with. Our people in the field make split-second decisions in a dynamic and dangerous environment. We do not want to put them in harm's way because of our inability to review and modernise our laws. This is not an ambiguity by design. As history has evolved, we have not necessarily had to deal with state-like organisations conducting terrorist activities.

Initially, based on what we heard, I certainly think the principle of targeting all members of Daesh is a sound principle. Of course, we will need to see how the law and the drafting works. But, as I said, our CDF has made it clear that he wants to make sure that, when we ask the young men and women in our professional ADF to carry out the missions which Australia deems to be important and in our national interest and the interests of the people of Iraq, we do not set them up to head into a legal minefield. I am confident this can be done in a cooperative and bipartisan way. The safety of Australians but also support for our ADF and the security of our nation are bigger and more important questions than any of the political differences that we perhaps spend more of our time on.

After all, terrorism in all its forms is a crime aimed specifically at the innocent. At its fundamental level, it is motivated by nothing more complex than a cowardly hatred of who we are and the way we live. We live in a remarkably peaceful and prosperous country and all of us here understand our good fortune. We do not just tolerate diversity; we celebrate it and we embrace it. We are a nation constantly striving for equal opportunity. Our citizens are free to be their best and free to be themselves. These are liberties which we admire, rights which we all enjoy. Responsibility, therefore, falls to all of us to ensure that we defend these rights, preserve them and uphold them. That is why, as I have always said, when it comes to fighting terrorism we are all in this together—Labor and Liberal.

In recent weeks many of us have participated in a host of ceremonies commemorating the generations of Australians who made the supreme sacrifice in defence of our nation. In doing that, I am sure all of us thought of Australians currently serving the cause of peace around the world. It is important, as I have said, that we support and recognise the work of our military personnel. As the Prime Minister has indicated, progress is being made. Daesh is losing territory in Iraq that it controlled. Fifty per cent of what it controlled has been taken from it. In Syria, that figure is 20 per cent. Thirty per cent of its resources have been impacted, impacting the ability of Daesh to organise its operations.

There is some confidence that the tide is turning, but I have no doubt there can be complete confidence that Defence personnel from Australia are playing a critical part, along with our international partners. I do believe that our Australian troops are doing valuable and important work assisting the people and government of Iraq—not just our air support, repelling advances and claiming ground from a dangerous and well-armed enemy, but through the
training and instruction building a more sustainable Iraqi army capable of maintaining the integrity of its own borders.

Of course, winning the battle against Daesh demands that we build the infrastructure of peace—not just holding elections but upholding the rule of law, ensuring that schools are open and accessible and that a future free from violence is seen as not just desirable but achievable. But let us not kid ourselves. The progress which has been recorded is real, but the strong threat still remains. Daesh is adaptive. As I said earlier, it evolves constantly and it does have a significant support base. Draining the swamp of terrorism will require more than military means alone. Just as our troops battle violent extremism overseas, our security agencies guard us against the threat at home. We have seen the human cost of extremism on the streets of Sydney and Melbourne. For our agencies, every waking minute and every unseen effort is dedicated to keeping all Australians safe. We know theirs is no easy task.

The propaganda arm of terrorism seeks to reach out through new digital platforms, yet the attacks themselves are more often than not low tech, carried out by lone wolf actors with little direction, using unsophisticated means. Their footprint or profile as a threat may be very difficult to detect. This is an emerging global trend where individuals radicalise quickly and act under a vague sense of broad direction from extreme terrorist groups rather than from specific instruction.

In these circumstances, the traditional threat indicators and the old mindset for identifying risk may not assist us. The individual may not have a history of extreme political ideology or extreme radical pronouncements. There may be only very tenuous links between them and overseas organisations, or no visible connection to broader movements at all. There may not even be evidence of an individual acquiring the components needed for complex weapons. After all, Man Haron Monis, the person who plunged Sydney into the grip of terror and fear, had a history of mental illness, family violence and criminal convictions, and he had written hate-filled, incomprehensible letters to the widows of Australians killed in Afghanistan, but his abuse of women and his history of family violence failed to raise the red flags about his capacity to carry out violence in other silos of criminal behaviour. He was never formally identified as a national security threat in the way in which he emerged.

As the Prime Minister has referred to, it is more important than ever that our national security agencies are working together, are well connected and are sharing all relevant information, including from non-traditional sources. Our national security agencies, our law enforcement agencies, our border protection agencies must all be working as one, preventing both those at home and those outside our borders from seeking to do us harm. We do need to ask ourselves: are the current levels of coordination and cooperation strong enough and fast enough in the age of cyber attacks? We need to ensure that the right information is getting to the right people at the right time and that our prevention and response capabilities are adequate and adaptable.

Recent reports of increased cyber attacks against both government and non-government agencies and institutions should be cause for concern. Protecting sensitive government information and network architecture is critical to maintaining our national security. Continual, and in some cases successful, attacks on Austrade, the Bureau of Meteorology and Defence must force us to ask if the current level of resources is adequate to deal with this evolving threat. In government Labor opened the Cyber Security Operations Centre and
adopted Australia's first comprehensive Cyber Security Strategy, and we are working cooperatively with the government on what more can be done to improve Australia's defences.

This principle of better, faster sharing of information and enhanced cooperation between agencies also needs to extend to our region and our wider world. We must constantly strive for stronger links with our partners in peace. The security threats we face are common, and our responsibility to counter them is shared. As an international community, we need to work together to deprive terrorist organisations of their funds and resources, because the splintering of Daesh in the Middle East poses the risk of demobilising at large in our region an army of extremists armed with new combat skills and equipped with old hatred. As one of the leading foreign policy thinkers in Jakarta has said:

The conflict in Syria has captured the imagination of Indonesian extremists in a way no foreign war has before.

This alarming reality demands Australian leadership, particularly through multilateral institutions. As a key architect of APEC, as a founding member of the East Asia Summit and as the first ASEAN Dialogue Partner, our voice is respected and our example is followed. We need to work together at modernising treaties, conventions and export controls to reflect the fact that we live in a world where people can google bomb—making instructions and 3D printer guns. We need an international framework that recognises radicalism can be downloaded at home and its weapons home made.

In part this regional and international focus is the inevitable product of our confident, outward looking national character. We are people who love to travel, work and live overseas; 9.7 million Australians spend time abroad each year. The reality is that the greatest threat to our citizens comes from being targeted indirectly or directly when they are in a foreign country—New York, Jakarta, Mumbai, Tunis, Nairobi, London. So often when we stand in this House to send our condolences to a friend or an ally we mourn Australians too.

The review by the Australian Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Greg Moriarty, commissioned by the Prime Minister in July following the deadly attack in Nice, will be an important part of considering how we engage with partner nations to defeat lone wolf attacks. But one of the strongest and most important safeguards against the division and fear of terrorism does not wear a uniform or carry a gun; it is a united, cohesive nation. Demonising difference, fostering hate speech, talking about instigating bans and building walls are threats to our national security as well as our national harmony. In particular, our great and generous Muslim community, whose leadership in denouncing crimes of violence as alien and foreign to the ethos of Islam, is so important. I will never forget the advice of former director-general of ASIO, David Irvine, who said:

... the strongest defence against violent extremism lies within the Australian Muslim community itself.

I think our parliament can count itself fortunate that in the member for Cowan we now have amongst us an internationally recognised expert on countering extremism, because this is a differently perceived but equally important form of national security. There can be no tolerance, no apologising for murder in the name of any faith or under any flag, be it religious extremism, be it right-wing or left-wing extremism. And if the lure of extremism for disengaged young people, or those who perhaps are grasped by mental illness, is a sense of power and purpose and identity, we must counter that with a simple message: there is no
honour, no courage, no reward in throwing away your life to claim the lives of others. We must reach out to engage those who are marginalised and feel that mainstream society offers them no solutions.

The greatest argument against everything terrorism represents will not be heard in this chamber; instead, it lives beyond the walls of this building. It is, and always has been, the country we love—free people, an inclusive, diverse, peaceful and equal society. We are proudly a home to all faiths and traditions, but our belief in Australia unites us all. In our kitchens and our lounge rooms can be heard the languages of every nation on earth; but in our love for this country, we speak with one voice. As a parliament, as a people, we will meet the threats and challenges ahead—united, resilient and resolved.

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (10:13): I move:

That the House take note of the document.

Debate adjourned.

Reference to Federation Chamber

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (10:13): I declare that the resumption of the debate on the motion to take note of the Prime Minister's statement on national security is referred to the Federation Chamber.

BILLS

Registration of Deaths Abroad Amendment Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Frydenberg, for Ms Bishop.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr FRYDENBERG (Kooyong—Minister for the Environment and Energy) (10:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Registration of Deaths Abroad Act 1984.

The primary purpose of this bill is to correct an anomaly in the Registration of Deaths Abroad Act 1984. The correction will allow the 'Registrar of Deaths Abroad' to register deaths in prescribed circumstances.

Under current arrangements, applicants can remain in a procedural 'limbo' as they negotiate with state or territory registrars to register an overseas death. By permitting the appointment of a federal Registrar of Deaths Abroad, this bill will simplify the registration of deaths abroad.

This bill will provide the foreign minister with the flexibility to appoint any state or territory registrar as the Registrar of Deaths Abroad.

The bill will also validate the prior appointment of the ACT Registrar-General as the Registrar of Deaths Abroad and any previous registrations of deaths under the act.
The amendments will allow the Registrar of Deaths Abroad to register deaths that could have been registered under the law of a state or territory, where the state or territory concerned has provided notice that it will not register a death.

In order to ensure that only the Registrar of Deaths Abroad can register deaths under the act, the bill removes any references to 'registering officers' from the act.

Debate adjourned.

Industry Research and Development Amendment (Innovation and Science Australia) Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Hunt.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr HUNT (Flinders—Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science) (10:18): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Science and innovation are national priorities for the government and for the country. The advice from the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science drawn from the Productivity Commission is that innovation is responsible for 60 per cent of our national productivity, therefore it drives our new jobs and it drives our job security. Let me be absolutely clear at the outset. Innovation is about new firms but it is equally and fundamentally also about older existing firms and job security for those who are in the workforce already. Building our strength in science accordingly allows us to capture greater opportunities for our people. The National Innovation and Science Agenda is therefore a serious long-term plan to secure Australia's future economic prosperity. In December 2015, the government and the Prime Minister in particular launched our first wave of the National Innovation and Science Agenda and the government is equally if not even more so committed now to pursuing a second wave based on investment attraction and big science, and a third wave built around business simplification and our 2030 science and innovation plan.

Australia is now in its 26th year of uninterrupted economic growth against a background of major structural reforms and global shocks. Today, we have one of the highest rates of economic growth in the advanced world and no other country in the developed world can currently match the fact that we are in our 26th year of economic growth.

But despite this growth, our productivity performance has been lagging for almost a decade against our potential. We need therefore to be serious about our productivity because productivity growth is what will keep us competitive and maintain our standard of living into the future along with sound, sustainable fiscal management of the nation's financial resources. Productivity growth, a balanced budget and economic reform will therefore be essential to help Australia withstand the next and then after that the next economic shock that the world will inevitably face.

Recent history in parts of Europe provides us with a stark example of what can happen when governments ignore productivity growth, a balanced budget and economic reform—the essential ingredients to continuous national prosperity, and maintaining and improving the services to which our citizens aspire.
Innovation is therefore a fundamental and major driving force for productivity growth and it is why we are resolute in our commitment to it. It is why innovation matters. It improves our services. It improves our goods. It improves the quality of life and, it improves and enhances our capacity for economic growth on a sustainable basis.

Australia is an economy which for decades has been continually changing to be more specialised, to be more flexible, to be more service-orientated and to be more in tune with the needs of customers.

As was said yesterday during the course of maiden speeches on this side, we are moving from a case where we simply made finished goods for our own market to being a fundamental part of a global supply chain network. That is the modern Australia advanced manufacturing vision which we must not just aspire to but enable to occur through the majesty of genuine private sector initiative.

The challenge the government is focused on is making sure the policy environment is right for existing and new businesses to succeed as this continues, in a world where knowledge and innovation are becoming the main sources of competitive advantage.

In 2016–17, we are on track to provide $10.1 billion to support research and experimental development. This is an increase of 3.55 per cent on the budget estimate of $9.7 billion for the last financial year.

Over the last decade we have seen a 52 per cent increase in Australian government support for R&D—from over $6.6 billion to over $10.1 billion.

But this is about supporting, through incentives, the creation of new jobs, new activity and other areas of growth, rather than simply providing grants to existing firms that were not being globally competitive. If our firms are not globally competitive, no amount of government funding will allow them to survive. It is about a business environment and operating environment which allows the firms to thrive rather than about a trail of funding from taxpayers which does not succeed in ensuring that firms are prosperous if they are not competitive.

So our challenge is to turn this investment into real benefits for Australians.

Innovation matters to all Australians because it is about job creation. It is about new and improved opportunities to do business, and it underpins a healthy economy.

Innovation is about new and improved goods or services, new processes or new business models. That is what innovation is.

And so it is not just about tech start-ups, although they are fundamental to new job creation. And it is not about existing firms losing business and jobs to new firms. It is also about established businesses doing things better to stay competitive, to improve their competitiveness and to be world class.

Innovation is happening right now on the factory floor, on our farms, at the supermarket checkout and in the office, in addition to the leading-edge research occurring in our science laboratories. It's about turning ideas into commercial opportunity. And our job as a government is not to pretend that we create the jobs, but we can help create the environment which allows those jobs, which allows the fundamental investment to be more easily delivered—or we can make the mistakes which have been made in the past, which impede
that process. So good government is about an enabling environment. It is also about ensuring we do not put in place impediments to genuine initiative, imagination and, therefore, the development which comes from that.

As a word, 'innovation' may have a renewed popularity around the world, but the idea resonates with our very history as a nation.

From the stump-jump plough and the Hills hoist to the modern miracle of the cervical cancer vaccine, Australians have rightly developed a reputation for identifying problems and applying insight, intellect and determination to solve these problems to improve the very human condition.

And we continue to innovate. Dulux, in Melbourne, a 100-year-old paint manufacturer, has over 60 scientists at its R&D centre in Clayton. In Sydney, on the other hand, Tyro, a relatively new FinTec firm, is now employing 300 people and challenging the major banks in delivering EFTPOS services. That is the key to the banking sector: genuine competitiveness which puts the pressure, through innovation, on the existing incumbents.

But we can't afford to be complacent, particularly as our competitors drive their own innovation agendas. We must be responsive and forward looking as a nation.

Australia must be competitive globally. While the Australian economy has shown resilience, there are increasing risks to the global economic outlook, which therefore present their challenges for Australia

Leading innovative countries such as the UK and Sweden have established institutions like Innovate UK and Vinnova that manage coherent, coordinated, national strategies for innovation. These institutions support high levels of public sector research translation for economic and social benefit.

This bill therefore creates a new Innovation and Science Australia board.

The new board will replace the current Innovation Australia board and redefine the activities. It will continue to be chaired by Mr Bill Ferris AC, an active, brilliant and thoroughly persuasive advocate for innovation to successive Australian governments. The bill also creates a new board position of deputy chair, which will be filled by Dr Alan Finkel AO during his term as Australia's Chief Scientist. And I have to say to be able to work with Bill Ferris and Alan Finkel is a daily insight into genius in action.

Innovation and Science Australia will help us complete the first wave of the National Innovation and Science Agenda and to pursue the second wave, based on investment attraction and big science, and the 2030 strategic plan, which will guide our third wave, also focused on business simplification.

In the last month I have had the opportunity to lay out three key framework speeches on science, innovation and industry, highlighting the importance of these three pillars to the government's economic agenda and the role of Innovation and Science Australia. I have also announced nine key measures under the National Innovation and Science Agenda, including a new $500 million Biomedical Translation Fund and new grant rounds for cooperative research centre projects, the CSIRO SME Connect program, the global linkages priming grants and, in particular and of extreme personal importance, women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics grants. As somebody said to me, a football team will not play to
their best if they leave half their people in the shed, and it is exactly the same as a nation if only one in 10 engineering graduates are women. We have to do better, and we will.

Beyond these measures, Innovation and Science Australia will work across the government—providing guidance around our $10.1 billion annual investment in innovation, science and research. It will directly engage international, business and community sectors to improve the national innovation system's overall performance. And Innovation and Science Australia will help in fostering Australia's innovation ecosystem.

It's about linking our investment and our programs to create something more.

The composition of the board will continue for Innovation and Science Australia. The members include some of the finest minds in this space in Australia today. The talent on this board represents innovators and entrepreneurs with proven records of success. It will continue the good work of Innovation Australia before it but will gain more strategic advisory responsibilities. There is an ambitious work plan for the first 12 months of its operation and this legislation will help them to take it forward.

The work of Innovation and Science Australia will involve undertaking periodic audits of Australia's science, research and innovation system to assess and make recommendations on alignment with government priorities. The board will identify gaps. They will better understand the activity in the science, research and innovation system and will draw together the different strands of government activity to increase our impact on the ability of people to invest, to create jobs and to improve prosperity.

A further key activity for the new board will be to develop, for the government's consideration, a long-term, 2030 strategic plan, to be informed by the audit I have just mentioned. This plan will identify science, research and innovation investment priorities and specific areas for policy and program reform.

Innovation and Science Australia will review the adequacy, capacity and condition of Australia's innovation system on a regular basis. These reviews will inform any updates to the strategic plan.

As part of promoting public discussion, Innovation and Science Australia will be able to commission and publish research, including publishing the board's advice to government when the board wishes to do so. I want this to be a transparent body which is not afraid of challenging government and giving fearless and frank advice.

Innovation and Science Australia will also promote investment in industry, innovation, science and research in Australia including showcasing successful innovators, entrepreneurs and researchers.

Similar to other Commonwealth statutory bodies, the board will develop a statement of intent in response to the government's statement of expectations. It is government practice for ministers to issue a statement of expectations to a statutory body to provide greater clarity about the government policies and priorities it is expected to observe in conducting its operations. This is exactly what I am doing with the CSIRO, and that too will be published. The statement of expectations and the statement of intent for Innovation and Science Australia will recognise the independence of Innovation and Science Australia's statutory functions.
This bill will mean that ISA will have the flexibility, capability and capacity to provide advice on all industry, innovation, science and research matters. It will help improve the outcomes of the Australian government's substantial investment in this space, and that means benefits for all Australians.

Aside from establishing Innovation and Science Australia, the bill also provides a transparent and accountable mechanism for implementing Commonwealth spending decisions on industry, innovation, science and research activities through legislative instruments. This mechanism has been structured to support collaboration across the whole of government on these activities.

The ability for the Commonwealth to prescribe programs and identify operational elements of spending activities in subordinate legislation in this way provides a level of flexibility for the government to be in itself agile and to meet changing demands whilst ensuring its activities and programs are effective, robust, sustainable, and subject to parliamentary oversight.

To conclude, the story of Australia has been a story of innovation.

We have shown we are a nation that can harness its ingenuity to create real opportunity and real prosperity.

But our future prosperity depends on our continued ability to innovate. We need innovation, economic reform and budget repair such as the Treasurer is delivering, despite opposition from the other side, to drive productivity and to help Australia address any future global economic shocks. The government will continue to play its part, getting the settings right to encourage existing firms to grow and new firms to start, creating new opportunities and driving jobs and prosperity.

Ultimately, this bill allows us to bring Australia's leading minds to bear—from business, commercialisation and research—to make our investments perform better for all Australians and to attract new investments from within Australia and from overseas. It will point the way for turning today's investments to tomorrow's innovations, to the jobs of the future.

For that reason, I thoroughly commend this bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.
The actions contained in this bill will provide the encouragement needed for Australian businesses to grow and create jobs.

The amendments contained within this bill provide much needed support to businesses by:

- immediately reducing the tax rate to 27.5% for 870,000 businesses with turnover of up to $10 million and who employ 3.4 million Australians;
- reducing the company tax rate for all businesses to 25 per cent by 2026-27;
- increasing the unincorporated tax discount for small businesses from five per cent to 16 per cent by 2026-27; and
- increasing turnover thresholds so that more businesses can access lower tax rates.

These amendments will enable Australian businesses to reinvest more of their earnings in employing more Australians and growing their businesses—this will benefit all Australians.

This will drive investment, allowing us to keep our living standards high and improve wages.

Since 2001, Australia has gone from having one of the lowest corporate tax rates in the world to now offering one of the highest. There are only five advanced countries with higher corporate tax rates than Australia, I am advised.

This bill therefore is an important step for Australia—it will allow Australian businesses to once again be globally competitive on tax. It will assist our businesses to succeed both at home and internationally. And it will encourage businesses to remain in, or relocate to, Australia.

We are improving the tax system for business and better aligning it with a culture of business investment and development to foster jobs and growth.

As productivity rises, more than half the economic benefits of a lower company tax rate will go to workers in the form of higher real wages.

Complementary government initiatives will ensure businesses are not able to avoid paying tax and are required to pay their fair share. Whilst the government is keen to support businesses with lower taxes, those businesses which seek to pay no tax will be caught and punished. Initiatives that include tougher rules for multinationals that shift profits offshore, enhancing the ATO's enforcement capabilities and changes to improve corporate transparency are all designed for this purpose.

We are also making sure that small businesses most importantly, that is 96 per cent of all businesses in Australia, improve their cash flow and reinvest in their business, should they choose to do so. And that is what small businesses do: they reinvest their earnings from their efforts back into their businesses to make them bigger businesses and to realise the dreams that they have for their business.

Small and medium businesses are the prime drivers of jobs and growth in our economy. They are also overwhelmingly Australian owned and more likely to reinvest their earnings in future growth as they seek to build their businesses. That is why we are starting there.

A tax on their business is a tax on their enterprise, which ends up being a tax on the jobs that they create. A national economic plan for jobs and growth that was outlined in the budget this year backs these businesses with these measures. When they invest and grow, we all win.
These are some of the businesses I have been visiting during the recent election campaign, since the budget, talking to them about these measures and the benefits:

- The precision engineering business in Adelaide that is successfully transitioning from the decline in the automotive industry to new clients in the electrical industry.
- The chocolatier in Emu Plains, the cheesemaker on the Mornington Peninsula and the honey producer in Launceston—they are all small- and medium-sized businesses and they are expanding them into new Asian markets.
- The engineering company in Berwick and the circuit board manufacturer in Queanbeyan who form part of the national defence industry supply chain will not only benefit from this measure but from the defence industry plan that has been put forward and is being implemented by the government, most notably through the Minister for Defence Industry.
- The electrical contracting business from Seven Hills started by migrants from Eastern Europe and Lebanon, during a recession in the nineties, now employing a young refugee from Nepal, who came through our formal humanitarian program.
- The truck repair business in Burnie and the tyre retailer and auto repairer in the Adelaide Hills that want to take on new apprentices.
- The sports floor manufacturer from Somersby on the Central Coast who built the courts for the Netball World Cup is building them for the Commonwealth Games and rebuilt the floors and staging here at the National Press Club.
- The Bridgestone Select Tyre & Auto franchisee in Perth bought less than a year ago but their turnover is already $2 million. They are all small, family businesses. They are all growing and looking to employ more Australians.

Our economic plan, which this bill is part of, does not punish these businesses for growing. Indeed, the reverse.

We do not believe that they become multinationals when their turnover increases to more than $2 million and neither do they. The prize for their growth should not be a higher tax rate, which it would be now if this bill is not passed.

That is why this government supports the introduction of this bill to bring down taxes for Australian businesses, particularly immediately for small- and medium-sized businesses.

I will now turn to the specifics of the bill.

Schedule 1 to this bill amends the Tax Rates Act 1986 to reduce the company tax rate.

In the 2016-17 income year, businesses with turnover below $10 million will face a tax rate of 27.5 per cent. The turnover threshold to qualify for the lower tax rate will be raised to $25 million in 2017-18, $50 million in 2018-19, $100 million in 2019-20, $250 million in 2020-21, $500 million in 2021-22, $1 billion in 2022-23 and removed entirely in 2023-24.

The corporate tax rate for all companies will then be progressively cut to 27 per cent in 2024-25 and by one percentage point in each subsequent year until the corporate tax rate reaches 25 per cent in 2026-27. That is our pathway to lower taxes in this country over the next decade.
Schedule 4 to this bill amends the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 to align the maximum rate for the distribution of franking credits to be consistent with the rate of tax faced by the company making the distribution.

Schedule 5 to this bill makes consequential amendments to the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936 and the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 to reflect the reduction in the corporate tax rate.

Schedule 2 to this bill increases the small business unincorporated income tax discount to 16 per cent from the 2026-27 income year. In the 2025-26 income year and earlier income years, a lower rate will apply.

For the 2016-17 to 2023-24 income years, the unincorporated tax discount will be eight per cent.

For the 2024-25 income year, the discount will be 10 per cent. For the 2025-26 income year, the discount will be 13 per cent.

The tax discount will continue to be capped at $1,000 per year.

Providing unincorporated small businesses with a reduced rate of tax improves their cash flow and enables them to retain more earnings, which can be reinvested into their business. It also ensures that small businesses benefit from a reduced rate of tax regardless of whether they are operated, importantly, as companies, sole traders, partnerships or trusts.

Schedule 3 to this bill amends the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 to increase the aggregated turnover threshold for access to many small business tax concessions to $10 million—long overdue.

The aggregated turnover threshold for access to the unincorporated small business income tax discount will be increased to $5 million, and the current aggregated turnover threshold of $2 million will be retained for the small business capital gains tax concessions.

More than 90,000 additional small businesses will be able to access a range of small business concessions. These include simplified trading stock rules, a simplified method of calculating pay-as-you-go instalments by the Australian Taxation Office and the option to account for GST on a cash basis and pay GST instalments as calculated by the tax office.

On average, smaller businesses face higher costs of complying with their regulatory obligations as a proportion of their turnover and income, compared to larger businesses.

Eligible businesses can use the small business concessions to reduce their tax liability and compliance costs and improve their cash flow.

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

This bill delivers on the promise we made to the Australian people in the budget—the budget we took to an election and, as I reminded the House yesterday, the election we won as a government. And we won on the strength of our economic plan; an endorsement of that economic plan. This bill forms a key component of that economic plan to drive jobs and growth.

Debate adjourned.
Treasury Laws Amendment (Income Tax Relief) Bill 2016

First Reading
Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Morrison.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading
Mr MORRISON (Cook—Treasurer) (10:45): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.

The Turnbull government is committed to reducing taxes for working Australians.
This bill amends the Income Tax Rates Act 1986 to provide a personal income tax cut to hardworking Australians to support them to work, save and invest.

By extending the upper bound of the third income tax bracket, this bill delivers on the government's commitment to bring down personal income taxes for Australians and reduce disincentives to work and take enterprising risks.

This is an important step in the process of modernising our tax system.

As a result of the cuts to income tax contained within this bill, 500,000 Australian taxpayers will be kept out of the 37 per cent tax bracket in 2016-17.

Further, around 3.1 million taxpayers will receive a modest annual tax cut in 2016-17 and beyond.

Australians want a tax system that does not limit opportunity or punish those that are working hard or taking risks in business.

It is crucial that we have a modern tax system that allows people to work more and take more risks without facing the pressure of a growing tax burden that suffocates hard work, innovation and enterprise.

Australians understand that the tax system which this government inherited is outdated, hindering growth and hampering small business.

That is why this government announced in the 2016-17 budget a suite of measures aimed at boosting the economy and making a start on personal income tax relief.

Australians knows that our future, our jobs and those of our children depend on how well we continue to grow our economy.

That is why the economic plan laid out in the budget will back in Australians to seize their opportunities.

A strong economy means a mum whose kids are now at school and who wants to work a few more days, or work full time, will have the opportunity to do so without being penalised with such high rates.

A strong economy means that young men and women who have left school and are looking for a job will find an employer who is hiring and happy to give them a start.

Under existing law a marginal tax rate of 32.5 per cent applies to taxable incomes between $37,001 and $80,000. Incomes above $80,001 then have a marginal rate of 37 cents, not including the two per cent Medicare Levy.
This bill will extend the 32.5 per cent marginal tax rate from $80,000 to $87,000, from 1 July 2016, benefitting around 3.1 million Australian taxpayers.

Once this bill enacting the personal income tax cuts has been introduced to parliament and the Commissioner of Taxation has confidence that the legislation will pass, he will make the new withholding schedules giving effect to these tax cuts.

The government is committed to delivering personal income tax cuts that are affordable.

As a down payment towards further tax relief for working Australians this bill will particularly assist those earning average full-time ordinary wages in Australia by preventing them from going into the second highest tax bracket of 37 cents in the dollar in 2016-17.

These mum and dad workers, these middle-income Australians, are bearing a growing burden under our tax system. This bill will provide modest but genuine relief, demonstrating the government's commitment to action on reducing that burden.

The bill will reward these hardworking Australians for doing more overtime, picking up more shifts, taking a promotion or getting a second or better job.

This is a step towards the modern tax system that Australians want and need, a system that will encourage Australians to work not punish them for having a go or taking risks.

As the government works to improve Australia's fiscal settings, it will look for opportunities to extend further tax relief to working Australians.

Full details of the measures in this bill are contained in the explanatory memorandum.

Debate adjourned.

**International Tax Agreements Amendment Bill 2016**

**First Reading**

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Ms O'Dwyer.

Bill read a first time.

**Second Reading**

Ms O'DWYER (Higgins—Minister for Revenue and Financial Services) (10:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will amend the International Tax Agreements Act 1953 to give the force of law to the new tax treaty signed by Australia and Germany on 12 November 2015. The tax treaty is known as the Agreement between Australia and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Elimination of Double Taxation with respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion and Avoidance, and its protocol (the new agreement).

International trade and investment creates opportunities for Australia through the provision of goods and services and the injection of foreign capital.

As our economy transitions to broad based growth it is important that we continue to attract foreign investment. But we need the right policy environment for trade and investment in order to take advantage of these opportunities.

That is why the government has modernised its existing bilateral tax treaty with Germany to reflect changes arising from international developments.
Australians are increasingly concerned about the actions of multinational companies and high-wealth individuals who avoid paying the right amount of tax. This new agreement replaces the old agreement which was signed in 1972, bringing bilateral tax arrangements into the 21st century.

Importantly, the new agreement is Australia's first tax treaty that has incorporated the integrity provisions of the G20/OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting project, known as BEPS. These provisions are designed to minimise tax avoidance opportunities and ensure that multinational corporations pay the right amount of tax.

This new agreement includes the BEPS minimum standards for protecting against treaty shopping, to counter the channelling of investments through conduit companies to exploit treaty protections and avoid Australian tax.

The new agreement will:
- strengthen the integrity of Australia's tax system and help detect and prevent tax evasion by authorising the revenue authorities of Australia and Germany to exchange taxpayer information on all taxes imposed in either country.
- enable mutual assistance in the collection of outstanding tax debts.

This is an important landmark in the fight against multinational tax avoidance and strengthens the government's already tough tax anti-avoidance laws.

The new agreement will also improve tax certainty for business by introducing new anti-discrimination and arbitration rules, as well as a range of rules to prevent potential double taxation.

From a trade perspective, the new agreement will create new opportunities for Australian businesses by reducing withholding tax rates, helping to create a more favourable bilateral investment environment and making it cheaper for Australian business to access German capital and technology.

The new agreement will also expand treaty benefits for income received by Australian managed investment trusts and certain German collective investment vehicles, and establish source country taxation of pensions in limited circumstances.

The new agreement will enter into force following the enactment of this bill.

This new agreement will further enforce the already strong economic ties between Australia and Germany and will encourage trade and investment that will support Australian businesses and our economy.

Debate adjourned.

Corporations Amendment (Auditor Registration) Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Ms O'Dwyer.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms O'DWYER (Higgins—Minister for Revenue and Financial Services) (10:54): I move: That this bill be now read a second time.

CHAMBER
Today I introduce a bill which will ensure the ongoing validity of certain auditor registrations from December 2005. Government regulation of company auditors requires minimum standards of both competence and integrity to help protect investors and other users of financial reports. This is an important part of a robust financial reporting and auditing framework.

Audit quality and independence is important to ensuring the integrity of financial statements. Transparent and credible financial reporting coupled with an effective audit regime underpins confidence in our financial system and is essential for sound and sustainable economic growth.

The bill remedies the legal uncertainties surrounding the Australian Securities and Investments Commission's approval in November 2004 of an auditing competency standard produced by CPA Australia and the Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia, now known as Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand.

In November 2004 certain administrative requirements, which legislation required to be followed in relation to ASIC's approval, were not met. After 1 December 2005, the legal validity of auditors registered in reliance on that standard has been uncertain.

The bill remedies this uncertainty by retrospectively validating the registration of auditors registered under the relevant auditing standard. It provides a clear and permanent legislative solution to an issue which has so far been dealt with through a solution which must be periodically renewed. In doing so, it reduces compliance costs and increases certainty for business.

The retrospective effect of the amendments will not add any new regulatory requirement. Rather, the retrospective effect of the amendments is necessary to ensure that decisions and actions taken by auditors, ASIC and business, which relied upon the enforceability and integrity of the approval, are valid. The retrospective operation of the bill provide certainty for those past decisions and actions.

The bill will commence the day after the bill receives royal assent.

Finally, the Legislative and Governance Forum for Corporations was consulted in relation to the amendments and has approved them, as required under the Corporations Agreement 2002.

Debate adjourned.

Broadcasting Legislation Amendment (Media Reform) Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Fletcher.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr FLETCHER (Bradfield—Minister for Urban Infrastructure) (10:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Broadcasting Legislation Amendment (Media Reform) Bill 2016 will amend media control and ownership rules in the Broadcasting Services Act 1992 and establish new local television programming obligations for regional commercial broadcasters.
These reforms will allow media businesses to gain the scale necessary to compete in an increasingly fragmented and global media environment while ensuring that Australians continue to have access to a diversity of sources of news and information.

Much of the legislative framework governing the Australian media was developed in the analog era when the industry was dominated by the three established media platforms: commercial television, commercial radio and associated newspapers. This structure allowed the development of predictable numerical tests as a proxy for media diversity.

The modern media environment is significantly different, and some of these tests have lost their relevance. While traditional commercial television and radio platforms are still well loved by Australians, they are not the only sources of video, audio and news content. Australians are increasingly using new sources of news and entertainment content, including subscription and online platforms, which are not subject to regulations restricting their investment decisions and operating structure.

Australia's domestic media businesses are placed at risk by their constrained ability to compete, and elements of the regulatory framework originally designed to protect media diversity are now impeding the capacity of local businesses to deal with the change underway in the industry and continue to provide quality professional journalism and reporting.

This bill seeks to repeal two control and ownership rules that no longer make sense in the digital media environment: the '75 per cent audience reach rule' and the 'two out of three cross-media control rule'. These rules are antiquated and do little to support media diversity. Their removal will allow regulated media companies to achieve greater scale in their operations and, subject to the general law, to structure their businesses to make the most of opportunities as they emerge.

The '75 per cent audience reach rule' prohibits a person, either in their own right or as a director of one or more companies, from controlling commercial television broadcasting licences whose combined reach exceeds 75 per cent of the Australian population. This rule effectively prevents any major commercial television network (Seven, Nine or Ten) from merging with or acquiring the regional television networks of Prime, WIN and Southern Cross, or vice versa.

In the digital media environment, the '75 per cent audience reach rule' is irrelevant. Online platforms allow content to be accessed by viewers all over Australia and the world. In practical terms, the rule acts as a barrier to commercial television broadcasters competing with scale in this environment. The rule also does little to further media diversity.

- Viewers in regional areas already receive the same number of commercial television services, and the same commercial television programming, as their metropolitan counterparts due to affiliation agreements, including many news services.
- Two of the three metropolitan commercial networks now provide streamed versions of their services which are available in regional markets across Australia.
- Any merger between metropolitan and regional commercial television broadcasters—should this occur—would generally involve the replacement of one television 'voice' with another, due to the fact that the metropolitan and regional networks generally operate in separate licence areas.
The 'two out of three rule' is also redundant. This rule prevents mergers or changes in control that involve more than two of the three regulated media platforms in any commercial radio licence area. Online media is no longer viewed as something distinct from the more traditional media platforms. Audiences in Australia and overseas now discover and access news from multiple sources across a range of media platforms, including online, social media, television, radio and newspapers. It is no longer appropriate that commercial television, commercial radio and associated newspapers be restricted by this rule when unregulated platforms are free to consolidate and adapt their businesses as much as they see fit, subject to wider considerations like competition rules.

Like the '75 per cent reach rule', the 'two out of three rule' is also not significantly contributing to media diversity. In most of the licence areas around Australia, the 'two out of three rule' is not in play as these licence areas do not include operations from all three regulated platforms: commercial television, commercial radio and associated newspapers. The removal of the rule would therefore have no bearing on cross-media ownership in these markets.

In around a third of the remaining areas, further media transactions of any sort will be prohibited because they are all at or below the 'diversity floor' of a minimum of four 'voices' under the five-four rule, which provides that at least five independent media groups must at all times be present in metropolitan commercial radio licence areas and four such groups in regional commercial radio licence areas.

Any consolidation that may arise from the removal of the rule would therefore be limited to the metropolitan and larger regional markets, where diversity issues are unlikely to arise given the greater numbers of media outlets in operation.

Together, the repeal of the '75 per cent reach rule' and 'two out of three rule' will reduce regulatory burden on the media industry, allow media businesses to operate more flexibly in the market, and help ensure they can continue to provide high-quality news and entertainment services to Australians.

The government has carefully listened to stakeholders and parliamentary colleagues who have expressed their concern that television sector consolidation could lead to reductions in local programming. The bill therefore includes a package of measures which will ensure the availability of local content in most regional areas and strengthen links between local content and the communities it is broadcast to.

Communities in regional Australia have told the government how important it is to maintain locally relevant news and information in their areas. Not only is local news and commentary valued, but local content also supports jobs and investment in regional communities where such programming is produced locally. While there are clear benefits associated with services that provide local television content, there are also significant costs and investment outlays associated with it, and market forces alone may not ensure that local content is provided at optimal levels.

Additionally, regional commercial broadcasters are under increasing pressure from new and emerging services, and from internet streaming of metropolitan broadcasts into regional areas. In the absence of regulation, the high costs of local content production and the structural changes underway in the media more broadly will create incentives for broadcasters.
to achieve efficiencies, placing pressure on the continued supply of local programming at current levels.

Currently, the Broadcasting Services Act requires regional commercial television licensees in certain types of markets to provide local content—termed material of local significance in the act—within specified areas. The framework for allocating commercial free-to-air television broadcasting licences divides Australia into various commercial television broadcasting licence areas that broadly reflect population distribution. Licence areas are then divided into local areas, however in some cases the local area is equal to the licence area.

Under the current arrangements, regional commercial television licensees in aggregated markets and Tasmania are required to provide approximately 120 points of material of local significance per week to local areas within the licence areas. Material of local significance is material that is broadcast to a local area and relates directly to either the local area or the licence area. The aggregated markets include the following licence areas: northern New South Wales, southern New South Wales, regional Victoria and regional Queensland.

Currently there are no local content obligations in non-aggregated markets, which include Darwin, the major regional population centres in South Australia and Western Australia, and parts of western New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland.

The bill will extend and increase local content obligations for regional commercial television licensees. The new obligations will apply to regional commercial television broadcasting licences which, as a result of a change in control (called a 'trigger event'), become part of a group of commercial television broadcasting licences whose combined licence area populations exceed 75 per cent of the Australian population. The additional local content obligations will commence six months after the bill receives royal assent.

The requirement for the licensee to be part of a commercial television group that reaches over 75 per cent of the population ensures that the additional local content obligations are only 'triggered' after the licensee is in a position to benefit from the additional scale and efficiency that the media reforms will allow.

Under the Broadcasting Services Act, currently local programming targets are expressed as 'points' where each minute of material of local significance is worth one point, and each minute of news that relates directly to the local area is worth two points.

Where a trigger event takes place the bill will:

• increase local programming requirements for regional commercial television licensees in aggregated markets and Tasmania that are subject to a trigger event by 30 points per week; and

• introduce new local programming requirements for regional commercial television licences in non-aggregated markets that are subject to a trigger event. These include smaller regional licence areas in Mildura and Griffith, where currently no local programming is provided, and regional licence areas in Darwin, Broken Hill, Spencer Gulf, Riverland, Mount Gambier, Geraldton, Kalgoorlie and South West and Great Southern Western Australia where some local programming is provided. The bill will require licensees to provide approximately 60 points of material of local significance per week to each local area, with a minimum of 45 points each week.
The additional local content obligations will take effect for each licensee six months after the trigger event. This will allow the licensee sufficient time to implement the necessary business and investment decisions in order to broadcast the required amount of local programming.

The additional obligations are aimed at ensuring that there is local content in nearly all regional licence areas following a change in control, including those where there is none currently. However, broadcasts to remote areas of Australia, predominantly in Western and Central Australia, will be excluded given the large geography and lack of large population centres.

Licences allocated under sections 38A and 38B of the Broadcasting Services Act will also be excluded. These licences are allocated by the Australian Communications and Media Authority to existing licensees to ensure that regional audiences receive all three main television networks, where there are less than three broadcasters in the licence area. To place local programming obligations on section 38A and 38B licences would represent an unrealistic financial burden on the original 'parent' broadcaster in each regional licence area.

To maximise the relevance of local content to served markets, this bill includes an incentive for local news to be filmed in the local area. To achieve this the bill introduces a new three-point category under the local programming points system for licences affected by a trigger event. Under the revised points system, each minute of local news programming that depicts people, places or things in the relevant local area will be allocated three points. The local programming points system will otherwise replicate the current material of local significance points system under the Broadcasting Services (Additional Television Licence Condition) Notice 2014.

The bill will require the Australian Communications and Media Authority to make a new local programming determination which would identify the local areas for the purposes of the local programming obligations. The delayed introduction of the additional local programming obligations in the bill by six months will allow the Australian Communications and Media Authority sufficient time to make the local programming determination before the commencement of the new obligations.

The bill will require licensees to provide the Australian Communications and Media Authority with two reports detailing their compliance with the obligations from 12 months after their new obligation commences and another a year later.

In order to evaluate the extent to which the bill achieves its objective, the Australian Communications and Media Authority will review the operation of the new local programming provisions within two years following the commencement of the additional obligations.

Prior to the commencement of schedules 1 and 2, it is the government's expectation that prospective changes to the law should not be relevant to the Australian Communications and Media Authority's consideration of any prior approval applications made under sections 67, 61AJ and 61AMC of the Broadcasting Services Act. The government considers that the Australian Communications and Media Authority would continue to consider applications for prior approval of temporary breaches of the control and ownership rules without reference to these proposed amendments (in other words, to consider such applications on the law as it was prior to the enactment of these amendments).
stands at the time). This will avoid any party gaining a 'first mover advantage' in pursuing transactions that may be permitted only once schedules 1 or 2 have commenced.

A previous incarnation of the Media Reform bill was introduced into the former parliament in March 2016. The Senate referred the bill to the Senate Environment and Communications Legislation Committee for inquiry and report. Public hearings were held in Canberra on 31 March 2016 and in Melbourne on 29 April 2016.

On 5 May 2016, the committee released its report which made two recommendations. Recommendation 1 was that the government consider amending the 'trigger event' provision in schedule 3 to the Media Reform bill. The definition of a 'trigger event' did not cover changes in control where a regional broadcaster came to be in a position to control a metropolitan broadcaster, and as a result the proposed additional local programming obligations would not apply. Recommendation 2 was that the Media Reform bill be passed.

The government thanks the committee for its report and agrees with the committee's recommendations. The government has made the suggested amendment to the 'trigger event' provision in the Media Reform bill.

The Turnbull government is committed to reforming legislation in areas where archaic regulation is holding Australian businesses back. This bill is yet another step in removing restrictive and redundant regulation, and ensuring independent sources of news, current affairs and similar programming continue to be available to all Australians, particularly those in regional areas.

Debate adjourned.

Statute Law Revision (Spring 2016) Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Hunt, for Mr Keenan.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr HUNT (Flinders—Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science) (11:17): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statute Law Revision (Spring 2016) Bill 2016 continues the work of maintaining and improving the quality of the Commonwealth statute book. The bill corrects technical errors that have occurred in acts as a result of drafting and clerical mistakes, improves and streamlines references to ministers and departments, and repeals obsolete provisions and acts.

Schedules 1 and 2 correct technical errors, remove redundant text, modernise language and fix incorrect references in principal and amending acts. These corrections and updates improve the usability and accuracy of the law.

Schedule 3 amends the Public Lending Right Act 1985 by inserting generic references to ministers and departments. This will reduce the need for substituted reference orders made under sections 19B and 19BA of the Acts Interpretation Act 1901.

Schedules 4 and 5 repeal spent and obsolete provisions and acts, removing redundant material from the statute book. For example, parts 3 and 4 of the International Labour Organisation (Compliance with Conventions) Act 1992 were spent once the amendments that
they made to the Migration Act 1958 and the Navigation Act 1912 had been incorporated into those acts. Item 1 of schedule 4 repeals those parts.

These corrections and updates are important to ensure the ongoing accuracy, currency and usability of Commonwealth legislation. For students of legislative drafting, I can think of no higher priority than to examine the way in which this legislation has been prepared. I commend this bill, with great enthusiasm, to the House and the chamber.

Debate adjourned.

Statute Update Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Hunt, for Mr Keenan.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr HUNT (Flinders—Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science) (11:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statute Update Bill 2016 makes minor and technical changes to the Commonwealth statute book to improve its quality and accuracy.

The amendments in the bill update older Commonwealth provisions to reflect changes in the law and ensure the consistency of those provisions with the legal framework in which they operate.

Schedule 1 updates references to dollar penalties for criminal offences. The amendments remove dollar amounts from penalty provisions and replace them with the appropriate number of penalty units. This ensures that the penalty that appears on the face of a statute is the penalty that actually applies.

Schedules 2, 3 and 4 streamline other aspects of penalty provisions, clarify the evidentiary status of certain certificates and registers, and update references to aircraft registered in accordance with the Civil Aviation Regulations 1988.

These amendments enhance readability, facilitate interpretation and administration, and promote consistency across the Commonwealth statute book.

This bill also provides another gripping examples of legislative development for students of legislative process. I commend this bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Competition and Consumer Amendment (Country of Origin) Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Laundy.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr LAUNDY (Reid—Assistant Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science) (11:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.
It is a pleasure, for the first time in my political career, to stand at this dispatch box and introduce my first bill into this great place. I would like to, at a personal level, thank my senior minister, Minister Hunt, for giving me this opportunity. It is greatly appreciated.

The Competition and Consumer Amendment (Country of Origin) Bill 2016 seeks to simplify and clarify the safe harbour provisions within the Australian consumer law.

This bill forms part of the government's country of origin labelling reform package that was agreed by the states and territories in March this year. A key element of this reform package, the Country of Origin Food Labelling Information Standard 2016, actually commenced in July this year.

Before I detail the specific amendments this bill seeks to make, please allow me to briefly elaborate the objectives of the government's country of origin labelling reform package.

The reforms aim to provide consumers with clear, more meaningful and easier to find country-of-origin information so they can make informed purchasing decisions in line with their personal preferences.

Inquiries and research conducted in recent years show that the current labelling framework is largely ineffective in meeting its objectives.

Ms Rishworth: Hear, hear!

Mr LAUNDY: I note that the member opposite said, 'Hear, hear!' How many times have you stood in front of shelves in supermarkets trying to work out how to do the right thing? If given the opportunity, consumers really do want to support local produce, but with myriad terms and ways to hide this historically has resulted in this needing to be simplified and clarified, which is what this bill very much aims to do. I note again for the member opposite that we have bipartisan support for reforming country-of-origin labelling, because this is an issue that has vexed parliamentarians of all political persuasions for many years—and it is worth noting that these reforms meet a key commitment of the Agricultural competitiveness white paper, released last year.

The government's reform package has benefited from extensive consultations and discussions with businesses, the community and their representatives—as well as state and territory governments, and our overseas trading partners. It is particularly important to note that we have secured broad state and territory support for these reforms throughout this process.

We take this opportunity to thank the thousands of people who took the time and trouble to contribute their views and to work with us during the development of these reforms. Your participation has helped us achieve our goal of providing Australian consumers with country-of-origin labelling, without imposing excessive costs on business. This is a major breakthrough that Australians have long been waiting for.

As part of the reforms, the mandatory country-of-origin-labelling requirements for food will be enhanced and moved from the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code to an information standard under the Australian Consumer Law.

As Australians, we want to know whether the food we buy is from the country we live in, or it comes from somewhere else—and, if it was made or packaged here, we really want to know how much of it was grown here by our farmers.
Under the new information standard, the well-known kangaroo in a triangle symbol will be required on many foods found on Australian retail shelves, identifying those that were grown, produced or made in Australia.

The new labels for food will also include a bar chart and words to indicate the proportion of Australian ingredients in the food. Research has shown that this is the most important piece of country-of-origin information for consumers when it comes to food.

Through this package of reforms, consumers will be able to trust that claims such as 'made in' and 'product of' are applied consistently and in a way that can be easily understood. Businesses will be able to use these terms with greater certainty and will be less inclined to make meaningless origin claims like 'made in Australia from local and imported ingredients'.

These changes will give consumers a clearer understanding about where their food comes from, while ensuring Australian businesses receive the information and support they need as they transition to the new rules.

I am delighted to announce to the House that many Australian companies have already adopted these reforms. I urge all those in the chamber the next time they are in the supermarket to keep an eye out for it. Many of us have started noticing these new labels already in our local supermarkets. Companies such as Maggie Beer Products, which has a wonderful ice-cream that they serve on Qantas every now and again, recently launched the labels for their range of products and are fully supportive of the reforms that clearly indicate where the food we are eating comes from—something Australian consumers have told this government loud and clear is very close to their hearts.

To support the effective implementation of the reforms, the government has provided the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission with additional funding of $4.2 million over five years to undertake compliance and enforcement activities in relation to the new requirements. The government is also funding a $15.2 million information campaign to ensure consumers and businesses understand the revised framework.

Please allow me now to describe some of the detailed amendments that the Competition and Consumer Amendment (Country of Origin) Bill 2016 aims to achieve.

The Australian Consumer Law prohibits false or misleading representations about the origin of goods.

To provide certainty for businesses, the Australian Consumer Law provides 'safe harbour' defences for country-of-origin claims where goods meet certain criteria. If goods satisfy the relevant criteria, the business has not engaged in misleading or deceptive conduct, or made a false or misleading representation.

The proposed changes to the Australian Consumer Law will impact in three main ways: firstly, make it clear that minor processes such as packaging, slicing or canning are not sufficient to justify origin claims like 'made in', consistent with consumer expectations and international norms; secondly, remove unnecessarily burdensome or redundant provisions; and, finally, amend and align remaining provisions with the new information standard.

Inclusion of changes to these safe harbour defences in the package of reforms is broadly supported by all industry sectors. Businesses will find it easier to make reliable country-of-origin representations through a clarified substantial transformation test and the removal of the burdensome and capricious production cost test.
In fact, even a couple of weeks ago, Tindo Solar, a well-known South Australian manufacturer of solar panels, wrote to my colleague Minister Hunt seeking the removal of the exceedingly onerous production cost test so that the company could supply panels certified as Australian-made into the market. Tindo Solar and many other small and innovative businesses will benefit from these amendments.

Consumers will also welcome the change that makes it clear goods cannot be claimed to be made here just because their form or appearance has changed.

Before I conclude, please allow me to acknowledge the detailed and exhaustive consultations undertaken by my department, the department of industry, and the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources during the various stages of this reform development process. I congratulate them for their hard work and effort. I also wish to thank once more the many businesses, peak industry groups and individuals who invested precious time and resources in responding to questionnaires and participating in detailed discussions during the consultation phase.

I would also like to acknowledge the leadership of the former Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Christopher Pyne, who very bluntly told me in the party room on Tuesday that this was all his idea, in seeking to ensure these reforms were implemented as quickly as possible. Finally, I wish to commend my colleague Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce on the commitment he has shown throughout this process, and over many years, to reform in this important area of public policy.

I commend this bill to the chamber.

Debate adjourned.

Mr HUNT (Flinders—Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science) (11:30): On indulgence, I want to pay particular congratulations to the member for Reid and Assistant Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science for taking up the cudgels on the country-of-origin labelling. He has shown incredible zeal. I also want to acknowledge the work of the previous minister, the Leader of the House, as well as the Deputy Prime Minister, for whom this has been a passion. In the spirit of bipartisanship commensurate with the joy felt by all in the new House, I want to acknowledge the work of the member for Kingston, who has long been a campaigner for this as well. So there are many hands in this success.

Social Services Legislation Amendment (Budget Repair) Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Porter. Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr PORTER (Pearce—Minister for Social Services) (11:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will reintroduce four measures previously introduced in the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Budget Repair) Bill 2015, which lapsed on 17 April 2016 due to the prorogation of parliament.
The measures in this bill are designed to improve the fairness and sustainability of the pension system.

These measures include:

- tightening proportionality requirements for age pension recipients;
- ceasing the pensioner education supplement;
- ceasing the education entry payment; and
- pausing the indexation of the income free areas for working age allowances and student payments for three years.

**Tightening proportionality requirements**

With respect to tightening proportionality requirements, the first measure was announced in the 2015 budget. This measure reduces the time that age pension recipients, and a small number of other payments with unlimited portability, can continue to be paid overseas at their basic means-tested rate.

The term 'portability' refers to the continuation of Australian income support payments during a recipient's overseas absence. Portability policy acknowledges that travel is an integral part of modern living. This is particularly true in ethnically diverse societies such as Australia, where almost a quarter of the population is overseas born.

'Proportionality' refers to the adjustment made when certain income support payment recipients have their payment amended so that it is in proportion to their working life residence, defined as the period of time that person has resided in Australia between the ages of 16 and the age pension age.

Under current arrangements, age pension, wife pension, some widow B pension recipients, and disability support pension recipients with unlimited portability and whose continued inability to work occurred overseas rather than in Australia have their rate of pension proportionalised after 26 weeks overseas based on their working life residency in Australia.

From 1 January 2017, this bill will reduce from 26 to six weeks the length of time that the age pension, and a small number of other payments with unlimited portability, will generally be paid at the basic means-tested rate while the person is outside Australia.

After six weeks overseas, payment will be proportionalised according to the pensioner's working life residence.

Pensioners overseas on the implementation date will stay under the current 26-week rule until they return to Australia, but subsequent trips overseas will be under the new six-week rule.

This measure does not impact on the length of the portability period. The age pension, and a limited number of other pensions, will continue to be payable overseas indefinitely. Only the amount a pensioner may receive after the six-week absence period may change.

Pensioners with 35 years or more of Australian working life residence, and those already exempt from the proportional payment rules will not be affected by the changes in this bill.

For example: an age pensioner who has lived in Australia their whole life, who travels overseas for more than six weeks, will not have their basic means-tested pension rate adjusted. In contrast, a pensioner who has only resided in Australia for 10 years of their
working life will have their rate adjusted at six weeks. In such a case they would receive 10/35ths of the basic means-tested pension they would receive if they stayed in Australia.

This measure will affect around 190,000 recipients over the forward estimates budget cycle and is expected to generate net savings of $168.4 million.

There is a fundamental difference between overseas insurance based contributory systems and the Australian social security system. Australia's income support system is residence based and is funded from general taxation revenue. The rate of benefits paid in Australia depends on need as assessed through income and assets tests rather than the length of time or amount that an individual has contributed.

This measure contributes to ensuring that countries share the cost of social support and retirement in the new transnational labour market. This measure will more fairly distribute the retirement costs between countries based on the period of time that people have lived and worked in Australia, and it reflects the principle of shared responsibility—that is, the idea that each country should pay a benefit which reflects a person's association with that country.

It is not considered reasonable for taxpayers to pay pensions indefinitely to people outside Australia, without regard to their period of residence in Australia, for anything other than short absences. This measure will therefore reinforce and strengthen the residence-based nature of the Australian social security system.

**Cessation of the pensioner education supplement and the education entry payment**

With respect to the cessation of the pensioner education supplement and the education entry payment, this bill introduces measures to cease the pensioner education supplement and the education entry payment from 1 January or 1 July after royal assent.

Introduced in 1987, the pensioner education supplement was purposed to assist single parents with the ongoing costs of education. It recognised the difficulties that single parents experienced in obtaining employment after being in receipt of the sole parent pension for up to 16 years.

Since then, eligibility has been extended to people undertaking full-time or part-time study and in receipt of a qualifying income support payment. The pensioner education supplement is $62.40 per fortnight or $31.20 per fortnight depending on the person's study load.

Despite its name, the pensioner education supplement is not available to people receiving the age pension. The most common recipient of the pensioner education supplement is likely to be on a parenting payment (single), followed by a disability support pension and, following that, a carer payment. As at March 2016, there were approximately 33,000 recipients of the pensioner education supplement.

The education entry payment was introduced in 1993 to help remove financial barriers to education by providing assistance to long-term payment recipients with up-front costs of study when they begin approved education courses. In 2014-15, around 83,000 recipients received an education payment worth $208 per year, paid annually as a lump sum.

When they were introduced, both of these payments aimed to assist long-term income support recipients who had been out of the workforce for a long period of time by helping them improve or rebuild skills to be more competitive in the labour market.
However, since the introduction of these payments, individuals wishing to undertake study have access to more targeted support and financial assistance—for example, the HECS-HELP, FEE-HELP and VET FEE-HELP tuition loan programs assist people of all types to access education and training.

Certain income support payments, particularly Youth Allowance (student), Austudy and Abstudy, are also specifically targeted towards people undertaking education and training, taking into account their circumstances and needs. These student payments and supports will continue and are not affected by the removal of the pensioner education supplement or the education entry payment.

The removal of the pensioner education supplement and the education entry payment is also consistent with the simplification of the income support system and the recommendations of the McClure review of the welfare system, _A new system for better employment and social outcomes_.

The removal of the pensioner education supplement and the education entry payment will help to ensure long-term sustainability of the income support system by improving the Commonwealth's fiscal position. The measures will save an indicative $300 million in administered funds in program outlays over the forward estimates.

**Indexation**

This bill also reintroduces two elements of the 2014-15 budget measure to maintain eligibility thresholds for Australian government payments for three years.

The first element is to maintain at the present level for three years the income free areas for all working age allowances, other than student payments, and for parenting payment (single) from the first 1 July after the bill receives royal assent.

A further element is to maintain at the present level for three years the income free areas and other means-tested thresholds for student payments, including the student income bank limits, from the first 1 January after the bill receives royal assent.

Under the current rules, income free areas and means-test thresholds are indexed annually in line with increases in the cost of living as measured by the consumer price index. Not indexing the value of these free areas and thresholds for three years will mean that increases to payments that would have occurred on either 1 July or 1 January of each year of the three-year period will not occur.

Indexation of these thresholds will recommence after three years.

Approximately 220,000 recipients will be affected by these changes in the 2017-18 financial year. The majority of those affected are receiving Austudy, Abstudy, youth allowance, Newstart allowance and parenting payment (partnered). A small number are receiving parenting payment (single), partner allowance, sickness allowance and widow allowance. These recipients will, of course, also be affected. However, people's payments will not be reduced unless their circumstances change.

Pausing indexation is a common lever that has been used by successive governments to realise budget savings. It has the effect of slowing the growth in social security expenditure and is expected to generate, in these measures, savings of $107.4 million over the forward estimates.
Conclusion
Collectively, these changes are expected to generate savings of more than $580 million over the forward estimates. This will help guarantee the long-term sustainability of the payments system, while ensuring Australia has a targeted, means-tested income support system that provides financial assistance to those most in need, while encouraging self-provision.

Reintroducing the amendments in this new bill reflects the government's ongoing commitment to the measures. All of the changes in this bill are important measures necessary to support the sustainability of the social security system and of the nation's budget.

Each of the measures contained in this bill were clearly proposed by the government in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 budgets, and they were previously presented to the parliament. They, of course, were also well known as and a part of coalition election policy.

These measures formed an important part of the government's election costings which were supported by the Australian people. They must be in the best interest of Australia's finances and future generations of taxpayers, and I seek the support of the parliament for their passing.

I commend this bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Social Services Legislation Amendment (Youth Employment) Bill 2016

First Reading
Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Porter.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading
Mr PORTER (Pearce—Minister for Social Services) (11:43): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill reintroduces four measures previously introduced in the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Youth Employment) Bill 2015, which lapsed due to the prorogation of parliament on 15 April 2016.

The measures in this bill are designed to encourage personal responsibility, self-reliance and greater participation in work or study, particularly for young Australians.

Youth unemployment is more than twice as high as the general unemployment rate, at 13.2 per cent compared to 5.8 per cent as at June 2016. In addition, there are more than 100,000 young unemployed Australians who have never worked before.

It is imperative that the income support system provides the right structural incentives for young people to find work as quickly as possible and be self-sufficient where they are able, or, indeed, to undertake further education or training to increase their employability. The measures in this bill are designed to achieve this end.

One-week ordinary waiting period
From 1 January 2017, this bill will make a number of changes to the existing one-week ordinary waiting period to ensure the more consistent, targeted and effective operation of this waiting period.
Waiting periods, including the one-week ordinary waiting period, are applied to ensure that people support themselves in the first instance where they are able to before receiving income support payments. The ordinary waiting period is also designed to discourage people from seeking taxpayer funded support for very short periods—for example, when they are temporarily between jobs.

This one week waiting period is a longstanding feature of the income support payment system: however, it currently only applies to new claimants of Newstart allowance and sickness allowance. Under this measure, the one week ordinary waiting period will be extended to new claimants of youth allowance (other) and parenting payment.

This will ensure that the rules governing access to payment are consistent across similar payment types and better reflect the fundamental principle that people should support themselves before seeking government assistance.

Widow allowance will not be affected by this measure. This recognises that claimants of this payment are likely older women—those born before 1 July 1955—who are recently bereaved or separated and have no recent workforce experience and may have fewer resources to draw upon as a result.

There are a number of exemptions from the ordinary waiting period under current rules and these will continue to be available. Exemptions exist for:

- people who are transferring between payments or returning to payment within 13 weeks, and
- a person undertaking certain activities because they have been assessed as having particular barriers to work.

These include:

- an activity as part of stream (c) of jobactive—stream (c) provides the highest level of support in jobactive for people assessed as having multiple barriers to work, including non-vocational barriers;
- a rehabilitation program is also an exception—this includes people with disability participating in the disability management service stream of Disability Employment Services; and
- an activity as part of the community development program is also an exception if the person would otherwise have been placed in stream (c) or disability management service if they were not in a remote location.

There is also an exemption currently available for people in severe financial hardship. This exemption will be modified to apply to those who are experiencing a personal financial crisis. This will include people who have recently experienced domestic violence or are in severe financial hardship due to reasonable or unavoidable expenditure. This will better target the exemption to those who are most vulnerable and most in need of immediate assistance.

The measure will also ensure that the ordinary waiting period is served after any other waiting periods. This already occurs in many cases, for example, the ordinary waiting period is currently served after the end of a person's liquid assets waiting period. This change will ensure that the ordinary waiting period operates more consistently and effectively in conjunction with all other waiting periods.
Under the changes in this bill, around 270,000 additional ordinary waiting periods will be served by people claiming Newstart allowance, sickness allowance, youth allowance (other) and parenting payment. The changes will only affect new claimants. Existing recipients will not have their current payments reduced or otherwise affected by this measure.

In respect to increase the age of eligibility for Newstart allowance and sickness allowance from 22 to 25 years this bill contains a key measure designed to encourage more young people to pursue further education or training as a pathway to long-term, sustainable employment.

To be at the forefront of innovation, Australia needs a highly educated and skilled workforce. It is important that income support settings incentivise young people to become more skilled, gain new qualifications and be more competitive in the labour market.

From 1 January 2017, the minimum qualifying age for Newstart allowance and sickness allowance will increase from 22 to 25 years. Young people aged between 22 to 24 years will be able to apply for and receive youth allowance (other) instead.

This will align the age qualification requirements for youth allowance (other) with youth allowance (student) and will ensure that young people receive the same rates of payment, irrespective of whether they are studying full time or looking for work. This will remove any perception that there is financial advantage in continuing to receiving unemployment payments rather than pursuing study or training.

Youth allowance provides broader financial incentives for young people to take up paid work where they can. Youth allowance (other) has a more generous income-free area than Newstart allowance or sickness allowance which allows them to retain more of their payment if they are working casually or part time while they look for full-time work.

Youth allowance (student) has an even higher income-free area as well as a student income bank of $10,000 which can offset the student’s income, allowing them to benefit from increasing their working hours during holiday and semester breaks. These arrangements provide further incentives for young people to take up study and to work part time and gain experience while they are studying.

It is important to note that the changes will only affect young people claiming payment on or after 1 January 2017. Those aged 22 to 24 and already receiving Newstart allowance or sickness allowance on 31 December 2016 will be grandfathered and will remain on these payments. This will ensure that existing recipients do not have their current payments reduced or otherwise affected under this measure. Around 23,000 young people will be grandfathered while up to around 70,000 will be affected at any one point in time.

This measure will also ensure that young people with a disability aged 22 to 24 years continue to receive additional support through the youth disability supplement. The youth disability supplement of $121.70 per fortnight is currently paid to youth allowance (other) recipients aged under 22 years who have been assessed as having a partial capacity to work. It recognises the additional costs associated with having a physical, intellectual or psychiatric disability.

The maximum payment rate of youth allowance (other) plus youth disability supplement is set at the basic rate of the Newstart allowance. This means that young people with disability
aged 22 to 24 years and on youth allowance (other) will continue to receive a rate similar to what they would have received on Newstart allowance.

With respect to the four-week waiting period for youth income support, from 1 July 2017, this bill will introduce a new four-week waiting period for job-ready young people aged under 25 years who are claiming youth allowance (other) or special benefit.

This measure is intended to set clear expectations that young people who are job ready should make every effort to look for work and maximise their chances of finding work before receiving income support. Critically, young people will have access to tailored support from their jobactive provider during the waiting period to assist them to look for, find and transition into work.

This measure is targeted to those who have been assessed as having no significant barriers to work and who have consequently been placed in stream (a) of jobactive. Stream (a) job seekers are the most job ready—they are therefore more competitive in the jobs market and more able to readily find and support themselves through work. Typically they have fewer barriers to employment; for example, they may have reasonable language, literacy and numeracy skills, recent work experience and educational qualifications.

Young people who have previously served a four-week waiting period in the past six months and those transferring to youth allowance (other) or special benefit from a non-student income support payment will not be subject to the waiting period. In addition, young people claiming or transferring to a student payment such as youth allowance (student) or ABSTUDY will not be subject to the waiting period for that claim. Young people already serving the waiting period who subsequently take up study or training to build their skills and improve their employment prospects will cease to be subject to the waiting period.

In addition, an extensive range of exemptions will apply to job seekers who are not job ready or who face additional barriers to work or who are in particularly vulnerable circumstances.

For example, some of these exemptions are specified in the bill and include:

- young people referred to particular employment services program—that would include:
  those assessed as being less job ready and placed in stream B or C of jobactive,
  young people with disability participating in disability employment services, and
  those in remote areas undertaking the Community Development Program.
  Also exempted would be:
  - parents with 35 per cent or more care of a dependent child.
  Also exempted would be:
  - young people in state care or who had left state care within the previous 12 months.
  Also exempted would be:
  - jobseekers with a temporary exemption from mutual obligation requirements of 15 days or more—under existing rules, such exemptions may be granted to:
    people experiencing a temporary illness or incapacity,
    pregnant women the six weeks before birth,
people testing their eligibility for disability support pension and receiving youth allowance
(other) pending the outcome of their claim,
people with temporary caring responsibilities, or
those experiencing a major personal crisis, such as domestic violence or homelessness.
The bill provides for additional exemption categories to be specified in a legislative
instrument. As previously announced, these additional exemption categories will include:
• former carers of people with a disability,
• jobseekers recently released from prison or psychiatric facilities,
• young people who are unable to live at home,
• jobseekers affected by domestic violence, and
• humanitarian entrants or other vulnerable migrant youth.
Together the exemption categories to the four-week waiting period specified in the bill and
in the legislative instrument would cover around 83,000 exempted young people—that is,
more people would be exempted than would be subject to the four-week waiting period itself.
Around 85,000 waiting periods are estimated to be served by 75,000 job-ready young
Australians.

The impact of the measure on affected young people will be subject to ongoing monitoring.
The government is also providing around $5 million in additional funding to comprehensively
evaluate the measure in order to assess its impact and allow for any unintended consequences
to be identified and addressed.

It is recognised that some job-ready young people who are serving a waiting period may
find themselves in financial hardship. These young people may be eligible to access
emergency relief funding through the government's network of emergency relief providers.
The government is contributing $8.1 million in additional emergency relief funding to support
any young people who may find themselves in hardship.

Together, the extensive range of exemptions and the additional emergency relief funding
ensure that this measure is targeted only at those who are job ready and able to support
themselves through work while providing some safeguard for those who find themselves in
hardship.

**Implement the rapid activation of young jobseekers subject to the four-week waiting period**

With respect to the implementation of the rapid activation of young jobseekers subject to
the four-week waiting period, under the final measure in this bill, a new program called
RapidConnect Plus will apply to job ready young people serving the four-week waiting
period. RapidConnect Plus will require such young people to undertake pre-benefit activities
during the four-week waiting period. This will include:
• meeting with their jobactive provider;
• agreeing to a job plan;
• developing an up-to-date resume;
• creating a jobseeker profile on the JobSearch website; and
undertaking a job search with up to 20 job applications.

After the four-week waiting period, and subject to the successful completion of RapidConnect Plus activities, income support payments would then commence.

If a young person subject to RapidConnect Plus does not complete their pre-benefit activities within the four-week waiting period without a reasonable excuse, their claim for income support would lapse. This is designed to maximise the opportunities for eligible jobseekers to find a job during the four-week waiting period so that they do not become reliant on income support and avoid slipping into long-term unemployment and welfare dependency, which we know is a statistically high risk.

Once a young person becomes long-term unemployed their chances of successfully finding employment decline drastically. Young long-term unemployed people are only half as likely to get a job as the average young jobseeker.

Requiring jobseekers to undertake activities before they are paid can be effective in preventing people from moving onto income support. New Zealand also has a system of pre-benefit activities which jobseekers must complete before receiving payment. Evidence from New Zealand's Ministry of Social Development shows that in 2012-13 around 40 per cent of jobseekers undertaking pre-benefit activities did not go on to receive the appropriate welfare payments.

RapidConnect Plus will only apply to young people who are subject to the four-week waiting period—that is, job-ready young people who have been assessed as job ready and do not have significant barriers to work.

All the exemption categories that apply to the waiting period for young people who are less job ready or in vulnerable circumstances will also apply to the RapidConnect Plus requirements.

Importantly, young people undertaking RapidConnect Plus pre-benefit activities will receive tailored support from their jobactive provider to assist them to complete these activities and transition successfully into work.

RapidConnect Plus complements the government's measures to create jobs through a strong economy and ensure our young people have the skills, support and incentives to take such jobs.

These measures include the Youth Employment Strategy announced in the 2015-16 budget that includes the Transition to Work service to help young jobseekers to build their employability skills and the Empowering YOUth initiatives to trial projects to help vulnerable young people.

More recently, of course, the government announced as part of the 2016-17 budget that it will invest more than $840 million over four years in the Youth Employment Package to assist up to 120,000 young people to get a job.

At the heart of this package is the Youth Jobs PaTH (Prepare, Trial, Hire) program that will help young jobseekers under 25 to move off welfare and into employment by giving them the employability skills and real work experience they need to get and keep a job, and by providing incentives for employers to take them on.

**Broader initiatives to support young people into work**
With respect to broader initiatives to support young people into work, the measures in this bill are only one part of a broader strategy to incentivise and support young people to transition into sustainable employment.

The strategy also includes a range of new programs and initiatives designed to provide additional targeted support to vulnerable cohorts of young people, including disengaged youth, early school leavers, young parents, young people with mental illness and vulnerable young refugees and migrants.

This includes the new Transition to Work program, Empowering YOUth initiatives, ParentsNext, as well as trials for young people with mental illness through disability employment services and Individual Placement and Support models.

The Try, Test and Learn Fund announced in the 2016-17 budget as part of the Australian Priority Investment Approach to Welfare reform will allow for the design and implementation of new, bold and innovative policies to increase the chances of sustained employment and self-reliance.

These measures are also complemented, of course, by the new Youth Jobs PaTH budget measure, to which I have already made reference. That will provide young people with employability skills training, opportunities to gain valuable work experience through internships and wage subsidies.

Together, the measures in this bill and the broader range of targeted programs and services from the coalition are designed to encourage job-ready young people to seek and find work rather than relying at first instance on welfare payments, and they are designed to provide additional intensive supports for those who are not yet job ready to enable them to become so.

Conclusion

These changes are expected to generate savings of more than $900 million over four years (which is, of course, dependent on the start date). This will help guarantee the long-term sustainability of the payments system, while ensuring Australia has a targeted, means-tested income support system that provides financial assistance to those most in need, while encouraging self-provision.

Reintroducing the amendments in this new bill reflects the government's ongoing commitment to the measures. All of the changes in this bill are important measures to support the sustainability of the social security system and the nation's budget.

Each of the measures contained in this bill were clearly proposed by the government in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 budgets and were previously presented to the parliament.

These measures formed an important, open and transparent part of the government's election costings which were supported by the Australian people. In the best interest of Australia's finances and of future generations of taxpayers, I seek the support of the parliament for the passing of this bill.

Debate adjourned.

Social Services Legislation Amendment (Family Payments Structural Reform and Participation Measures) Bill 2016
First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Porter.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr PORTER (Pearce—Minister for Social Services) (12:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In conjunction with the Family Assistance Legislation Amendment (Jobs for Families Child Care Package) Bill 2016, the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Family Payments Structural Reform and Participation Measures) Bill 2016, introduces a package of reforms that will help Australia support families while encouraging parents' participation in the workforce.

The jobs for families childcare packages funded by this bill introduce major reforms that will provide greater choice for almost one million families by delivering a simpler, more affordable, more flexible and more accessible child care system.

The government tasked, previously, the Productivity Commission to undertake an inquiry into child care and early childhood learning. The inquiry was the largest review of child care since the 1990s and the commission did an excellent job drawing together a wide range of inputs from families, from service providers, from early childhood education professionals, from businesses and from other experts to identify the challenges and potential ways forward.

The commission found what many parents already know to be true, that being that the current childcare system in operation today is unnecessarily complex, inflationary and fails to target support where it can have the most substantial impact on supporting parents to be in jobs, especially mothers.

The government is fully commitment to the jobs for families package, however more than $3 billion in additional funding must be paid for, and the measures in this bill are the government's way of making provision for that payment. The refusal of members opposite to support the passage of the measures in this bill, if that were to pass, in the previous parliament left the government with no choice but to defer the implementation of the main measures of the jobs for families package from July 2017 to July 2018. However, if the savings needed to fund the child care package are passed by parliament—that is, the savings contained in this bill—then the government will implement the jobs for families package as soon as possible.

The government's new childcare package and reforms to the family payments system supports parents as they balance work and family responsibilities, while protecting those most vulnerable, and continuing to ensure a high-quality learning experience in our childcare centres.

While the family payments structural reforms in this bill will pay for the Jobs for Families Child Care Package, they will also simplify the family tax benefit system and provide more money on a fortnightly basis to those families who need it the most.

The government, under the terms of this bill, would be increasing the fortnightly payment rates of family tax benefit part A by $10.08 for each child in a family aged up to 19. This is worth an extra $6,000 over the lifetime of a child. What this means is that around 1.2 million lower income families (including income support families) who receive family tax benefit part A for around 2.2 million children—will now receive higher fortnightly payments from 1 July 2018. The increase in their fortnightly payments will help families better manage their
day-to-day and week-to-week budgets by providing them with timely, regularised assistance when they need it the most.

We will also provide an additional $7.48 per fortnight for under 18 year old youth allowance recipients who are living at home, bringing the payments to the same standard rate as a family tax benefit part A child aged between 13 and 19.

Aligning these two rates of payment, is in itself a much needed part of the reform process to simplify payments where possible. These reforms will avoid confusion for families, and make sure there are no perverse incentives for them to change payments. Just as workforce participation is the key to growing wealth, educational attainment is the key to getting a job. The government understands this and increasing the fortnightly rates of these payments will encourage children to stay in school. This is fundamental to giving children the best start in life so that they become productive, contributing members of the Australian society.

Importantly this alignment reform will also flow on to people who are on a disability support under the age of 18, special benefit and Abstudy. These changes will cost around $1.2 billion over the forward estimates.

These changes are also based squarely on the McClure reform recommendations; they simplify the system, they make it easier for parents and their older children to navigate the system in order to get the assistance appropriate to their circumstances.

This bill will also provide for the phase-out of both the family tax benefit part A end-of-year supplement and the family tax benefit part B end-of-year supplement.

The part A supplement, paid at the end of the entitlement year, would reduce to $602.25 a year in 2016-17, and then reduce to $302.95 a year from 2017-18. The part B supplement would reduce to $302.95 a year in 2016-17 and to $153.30 a year in 2017-18. At which point, both supplements would then be withdrawn from 1 July 2018.

The family tax benefit supplements were announced in 2004 (when there was a budget surplus of over $13 billion) in response to high levels of reconciliation debt experienced by the family tax benefit population. This debt was often due to families not being able to accurately predict changes in income or changes in circumstances such as a return to work. The phasing out of the family tax benefit supplements recognises that the government's investment in service delivery reform such as the Single Touch Payroll system, which will provide real-time verification of families' income, will improve the accuracy of income reporting and significantly reduce the need for supplements to offset potential debts.

Even without the improvements in service delivery like single touch payroll, the family tax benefit supplements were designed to reduce debts that 75 per cent of families just do not accumulate. It is also important to note just how poorly targeted the supplements are. It is common for families on income support and low incomes to receive the exact same amount in supplements as families on much higher incomes.

Phasing out of end-of-year supplements will save $6.3 billion over the forward estimates. This is a sensible reform. It is reform which aligns payments with their intended purpose, it improves targeting and it saves the government money on family tax benefits. It is absolutely necessary in order to fund the jobs for families package, which fundamentally will reform the childcare system.
While we understand families will not necessarily be enthusiastic about losing supplements, replacing a poorly targeted end-of-year payment with increased fortnightly payments and a simpler, fairer and more accessible childcare system will, in the long run, provide increased support for Australian families to meet day-to-day living expenses and will increase workforce participation.

Crucially, the changes are consistent again with the reform recommendations of the McClure review to reduce the number of supplements in the system. McClure emphasised that there are far too many payments and supplements. There are some 20 main payment types, and prior to the coalition coming to government there were 55 different additional supplements and bonuses on top of those 20 main payment types. The government has now reduced unnecessary supplements through the removal of the seniors supplement and the low-income supplement. This measure will further reduce the amount of supplements in the system (as will the associated reform measures in child care).

The bill will introduce a new rate structure for family tax benefit part B, and make other amendments to the rules for part B, from 1 July 2017. Firstly, the standard rate—this is for the family tax benefit part B—will increase by $1,000.10 per year for families with a youngest child aged under one. The new maximum standard rate of family tax benefit B for a family with a youngest child aged under one will increase from $4,055 to $5,055 per annum—a fortnightly increase of around $38. This recognises that families with newborn children have a higher need to stay at home to care for and bond with their child.

The bill retains the current maximum standard rates for just under one million families who have a youngest child aged between one and 13. Families with a youngest child aged between one and five will continue to be eligible for a maximum standard rate of $4,055. During the early childhood years, parents often need to stay at home, or balance work and caring responsibilities.

The maximum standard rate of family tax benefit part B will continue to be reduced to $2,832 when a youngest child turns five and enters compulsory education and primary carers have a greater capacity to move into the workforce or increase their workforce participation.

A new family tax benefit part B rate of up to $1,000.10 per year will then be made available for single parents under the age of 60 with a youngest child aged between 13 and 16. Eligibility for single parent families under the age of 60 will cease from the start of the calendar year their youngest child turns 17.

Single parents aged at least 60 years of age and grandparents and great-grandparents will continue to access family tax benefit B at the current rate until the end of the calendar year their youngest child turns 18.

The government recognises that grandparent carers and single parents who are 60 and over take on a large responsibility when caring for children but also are somewhat less likely to be working and are more likely to be retired. That is why they are exempt from these reforms. The government also acknowledges the unique role that these individuals play in society in raising children in circumstances that none of us would necessarily count as ideal.

For families with older children, family tax benefit part B will be better targeted by encouraging parents with reduced care requirements to move into the workforce or increase their workforce participation.
These reforms are a critical part of efforts to enhance the long-term sustainability of the social security system. This is a government which places fairness and equity at the centre of our social security system. That is why we are taking proactive steps to ensure that the system is sustainable and affordable now and for future generations.

As a share of GDP, government spending on family assistance in Australia has tripled from 0.9 per cent in 1980 to 2.7 per cent in 2012 and higher than the average for OECD countries.

The number of families who receive a family tax benefit has declined over time, down from 1.72 million in 2010-11 to 1.62 million in 2014-15. Yet despite this decline in the number of recipients, the cost continues to rise with expenditure increasing by almost $2 billion over the last five financial years for which full data is available, up from $18 billion in 2010-11 to $19.8 billion in 2014-15.

This year we will spend in excess of $20 billion on family tax benefit part A and B. This represents the second biggest item of expenditure in the social services portfolio and the fourth largest in the Commonwealth budget. Crucially, the 2015 Intergenerational report identified that the number of people of traditional working age—that is, 16 to 64 years old—for every person aged 65 and over has fallen from 7.3 people in 1974-75 to an estimated 4.5 people today. By 2054-55, this is projected to nearly halve again to only 2.7 people. This means that while expenditure has grown over time, the number of taxpayers funding the family tax benefit system has declined and is predicted to continue to decline well into the future.

This bill, in tandem with the Jobs for Families Child Care Package, will improve the sustainability of the family payments system, ensuring we can achieve three important goals:

1. continue to assist families in raising their children over the long term;
2. enable and encourage greater workforce participation; and
3. continue a deservedly needed process of simplifying our social security system.

These measures are sensible, they are practical and they are aimed at ensuring the sustainability of our system, and, ultimately, they guarantee that payments are targeted to those most in need.

The government considers that together the family payments reform and the Jobs for Families Child Care Package represent reasonable and necessary changes that will improve incentives for families to participate in employment, while delivering appropriate support when needed, both now and into the future.

The family payment reform and Jobs for Families Childcare Package have been longstanding government policy. Both pieces of legislation have already been examined by their respective Senate committees. Earlier this year, the Senate Education and Employment Legislation Committee investigated key components of the Jobs for Families Child Care Package and the community affairs legislation committee investigated the family payment reforms outlined in the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Family Payments Structural Reform and Participation Measures) Bill 2016.

The family payments reform and Jobs for Families Child Care Package were presented to, and supported by, the Australian people at the last election and I would encourage the
parliament to support these proposals in the best interests of Australian families and the long-term sustainability of our welfare system. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

**Family Assistance Legislation Amendment (Jobs for Families Child Care Package) Bill 2016**

*First Reading*

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Porter.

Bill read a first time.

*Second Reading*

Mr PORTER (Pearce—Minister for Social Services) (12:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Family Assistance Legislation Amendment (Jobs for Families Child Care Package) Bill 2016 reintroduces major reforms under the government's Jobs for Families Child Care Package.

This package will deliver genuine, much-needed reform for a simpler, more affordable, more accessible and more flexible early education and childcare system and will invest around $40 billion in child care and early childhood education over the next four years, including more than $3 billion in additional funding. This is the single largest investment in early learning and child care that Australia has ever seen.

Almost one million Australian families will benefit as a result of this childcare assistance package. Low- and middle-income families will be the greatest beneficiaries.

Having been announced in the 2015-16 budget, the Jobs for Families Child Care Package would ideally have already been legislated. The government introduced the Family Assistance Legislation Amendment (Jobs for Families Child Care Package) Bill 2015 to the House last year, but that bill lapsed when parliament was prorogued because members opposite had refused to pass the savings needed to fund our increased childcare expenditure, creating a roadblock in the Senate. They have offered only expensive band-aids, unfortunately, to the current broken system and have failed to clearly support any of the real reform that parents desperately need and that the sector has been crying out for.

As a result of the lapsing of that bill and delay in passing savings measures needed to fund the childcare package, the government was unfortunately left with little choice but to defer implementation of the main measures of the Jobs for Families bill from July 2017 to July 2018. However, if the savings needed to fund our package are passed by parliament—that is, the savings contained in the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Family Payments Structural Reform and Participation Measures) Bill 2016, on which I have just spoken—then we will implement these childcare reforms as soon as possible.

The Family Payments Reform Bill brings forward a set of measures which aim to achieve long-term sustainability of the family payment system while continuing to deliver help to families who need it the most.

Together, these reforms will ensure that, in a fiscally sustainable way, we can achieve three important goals:
1. continue to assist families in raising their children and provide access to quality early learning opportunities over the long-term;
2. enable and encourage greater workforce participation; and
3. simplify our childcare payments and social security systems.

The measures contained in this bill represent an important investment in Australia's future, and they will deliver genuine reform.

The bill reflects extensive consultation and expert analysis, and I give thanks to all those, on behalf of the education minister, who contributed to this process. Unlike members opposite, whose election policies ignored previous consultation, squibbed a responsibility of reform and offered high-income earners windfall childcare subsidies, this government will not falter in its determination to deliver a simpler and more accessible, affordable and flexible childcare system. We absolutely understand how necessary this is, because we have listened to the sector and we have listened to parents, who have repeatedly called for reform.

In 2013 the government tasked the Productivity Commission to undertake an inquiry into child care and early childhood learning. The inquiry was the largest review of child care since the 1990s and the commission drew together the views of families, service providers, early childhood education professionals, businesses and other experts to identify the challenges and devise the path forward.

In the 2015-16 budget the government announced its Jobs for Families Child Care Package in response to the Productivity Commission’s 2014 report and the government's further consultations with the childcare sector and families. The package was further refined during an extensive regulation impact statement consultation process.

The previous versions of both pieces of legislation have already been examined by their respective Senate committees. Earlier this year the Senate Education and Employment Legislation Committee investigated the Family Assistance Legislation Amendment (Jobs for Families Child Care Package) Bill 2015 and the Community Affairs Legislation Committee investigated the family payment reforms outlined in the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Family Payments Structural Reform and Participation Measures) Bill (No. 2) 2015. Both committees recommended that the respective bills be passed.

The government's Jobs for Families Child Care Package strikes the correct balance between targeted childcare support for hardworking families who depend upon it, a generous safety net to protect those most vulnerable in our community, and ongoing support for high-quality early learning. This is further boosted through our $843 million in federal support in 2016 and 2017 for 600 hours of universal preschool access a year for each child in the year before school.

The key elements of the Child Care Reform Package are:

- A new, simpler childcare subsidy, which will improve affordability
- The childcare safety net, which will improve accessibility and comprises three elements:
  - the additional childcare subsidy
  - the Community Child Care Fund
  - the Inclusion Support Program
Reducing red tape for services by removing the minimum hours per day and days per week opening requirements for child care services so they can operate more flexibly to meet family needs.

This bill makes significant amendments to the current A New Tax System (Family Assistance) Act 1999 and A New Tax System (Family Assistance) (Administration) Act 1999 in order to introduce the childcare subsidy, additional childcare subsidy, and new approved provider and service requirements from July 2018. The bill provides for a number of transitional provisions that will commence in July 2017 and for the fast-tracked introduction of some enhanced compliance measures from royal assent.

Together these will give effect to the majority of the government's response to the recommendations from the Productivity Commission inquiry.

Our objective is to help parents who want to work, or who want to work more, while still focusing on early childhood education.

Having two parents in paid employment has become the preferred choice for most families because of the changes in our society and economy over many years. More affordable access to quality child care puts the opportunity of work within far better reach of more families.

The Jobs for Families Child Care Package is designed to support more families, including jobless families, to increase their participation in work, training, study or volunteering. The government's significant investment is targeted to those who need it most—low- and middle-income families who are juggling work and parenting responsibilities.

We want families to choose their child care around their work, rather than limit their work hours to suit their child care. It is estimated that the package will encourage more than 230,000 families to increase their involvement in paid employment.

The package is also designed to place downward pressure on childcare costs for families and to ensure the government's significant investment in child care is more sustainable into the future.

**Childcare subsidy**

The centrepiece of the Jobs for Families Child Care Package is the new childcare subsidy. From July 2018, the childcare subsidy will replace the current childcare benefit and childcare rebate with a single, means-tested subsidy.

The childcare subsidy will be better targeted than current childcare payments, providing more assistance for low- to middle-income families.

This reform is fundamentally fair. Low-income families will receive a childcare subsidy rate of 85 per cent of the actual fee paid (up to an hourly fee cap). That decreases to a 20 per cent subsidy for very high income families who are currently receiving a 50 per cent rebate. The childcare subsidy rate tapers from 85 per cent to 20 per cent to ensure the package is most generous to those who earn the least.

To make child care fairer, the coalition's reforms include abolishing the $7,500 childcare rebate annual cap that currently applies to all families. This will ensure that low- and middle-income families are not limited by a cap on the amount of child care they can access. Families earning more than around $185,000 will also benefit from an increased annual cap of $10,000.
The new childcare subsidy will be paid directly to childcare service providers to make the system simpler for families.

An activity test will ensure that taxpayers' support for child care is targeted to those who depend on child care to work or work additional hours. The three-step activity test will align the hours of subsidised care more closely with the combined hours of work, training, study or other recognised activity undertaken, and provide for up to 100 hours of subsidy per fortnight. The bill provides that at least eight hours of activity a fortnight results in access to 36 hours of subsidised child care a fortnight; more than 16 hours of activity a fortnight results in access to 72 hours of subsidised care a fortnight; and more than 48 hours of activity a fortnight results in the maximum amount of subsidised care of 100 hours a fortnight.

These reforms are fundamentally fair—they provide the greatest hours of support in child care to the families who work the most hours, and the greatest subsidy and financial support to the families who earn the least.

Families whose children are attending a preschool program in a childcare service during the year before school will be exempt from the childcare subsidy activity test for the period of the preschool program. This is meant to complement the federal government's $843 million support for 600 hours of preschool for each child in the year before school.

**Additional childcare subsidy**

We know children from disadvantaged backgrounds benefit most from quality early childhood education and care, and that is why we are providing additional support to those who need it most. The childcare subsidy I have just spoken of will be supplemented by an additional childcare subsidy to provide extra childcare support for disadvantaged and vulnerable children, whether they be children at risk of serious abuse or neglect, families experiencing temporary financial hardship, grandparents on income support with primary carer responsibilities for their grandchildren, or parents seeking to return to work, study or training.

The childcare safety net aims to work alongside other state, territory and federal government payments and programs that are designed to give our most vulnerable children the additional support they need. Amongst other measures, it will provide low-income families who do not meet the activity test up to 24 hours per fortnight of subsidised care—this is equivalent to two weekly six-hour sessions. These 24 hours will be provided at the highest 85 per cent rate of subsidy, which is an increase on the current rate of about 72 per cent.

Getting children into quality child care maximises the early learning opportunities for children who may not be getting all the support they need at home. It also improves a family's ability to break a cycle of poverty and intergenerational welfare dependence by minimising barriers to participation and providing access to early learning.

The Productivity Commission's report identified that existing programs that support disadvantaged and vulnerable families are complex, inefficient, poorly targeted and open to abuse. This is particularly the case in relation to the Community Support Program, special childcare benefit and the jobs, education and training childcare fee assistance payment.

These payments and programs, along with the current Budget Based Funded Program and grandparent childcare benefit, will be replaced by the additional childcare subsidy payments and other elements of the childcare safety net. Together, these will comprise a more integrated
and targeted set of funding programs that leverage the increased Commonwealth investment in child care to provide the best early learning outcomes, particularly for those who need it most.

The new payments will remain linked to immunisation requirements that were strengthened under the very successful No Jab, No Pay policy from 1 January 2016.

**Elements of the Jobs for Families Child Care Package outside the legislation**

The Jobs for Families Child Care Package also includes a number of other important measures that are not formally part of the bill being introduced today. We have already progressed those elements of the package that do not require the passage of legislation:

- the new $543 million Inclusion Support Program, which provides a 25 per cent increase in funding, commenced in July 2016. This program is already providing greater support for children with disability to access child care and early learning opportunities.
- The Nanny Pilot Program, which commenced in January 2016, will continue until implementation of the full measures in this package in July 2018. In response to feedback on the trial so far, we have lifted the maximum per-child subsidy from $5.95 an hour to $8.50 an hour since 1 June 2016.
- $20 million over two years for the Connected Beginnings program, commenced in July 2016. That supports the integration of early childhood, maternal and child health and family support services, with schools in a number of Indigenous communities experiencing disadvantage designed to improve children's preparation for school.

**Strengthened compliance arrangements**

Unfortunately, there are those who seek to use government support to the child care system for personal gain. This government is determined to ensure that its massive investment of around $40 billion over four years is used for fee relief for families, as it was intended.

We know that compliance measures are effective. Last year, we introduced new rules to eliminate the costly abuse of payments through a process known as 'child swapping' in the family day care sector. The Australian government's focus on noncompliance (mainly but not solely focussed on family day care) is showing very clear results. The government's action has resulted in a significant reduction of fraud in the childcare system—indeed, by around $421 million in the last financial year. Between 1 July 2015 and 19 August 2016, the Department of Education and Training imposed sanctions and penalties on 109 services, including suspending and cancelling 65 services' approval to access child care subsidies.

By contrast, under the previous government in the two years to June 2013, there were no cancellations, no suspensions, and only two fines were issued. Compliance checks under Labor actually fell from 763 to 523. This is a paltry effort compared to the present government's 1,300 checks undertaken in 2013-14, 2,900 in 2014-15 and more than 3,100 checks so far in 2015-16.

This government will continue its tough stance on compliance and it is fast-tracking some of the strengthened compliance arrangements in this legislation to ensure they take effect from royal assent.

Currently, once a childcare provider is approved by a state or territory regulator, the Commonwealth has limited grounds for not approving fee assistance for parents using that
service. Compliance measures being brought forward in this legislation will include the power for the minister to make legislative instruments to place a pause on childcare service applications for fee assistance. Such a pause may be made in relation to a particular service type for a defined period.

This measure will help us to address excessive growth within a particular childcare service type, specifically where there are concerns about proven or alleged noncompliance with family assistance law.

**Closure and transitional arrangements for childcare payments**

The bill includes consequential amendments and will provide transitional provisions to support the replacement of existing childcare payments with the childcare subsidy and additional childcare subsidy.

**Review and evaluation**

Given the significant nature of this reform, it is important that its implementation and impact is understood. To that end, there will be ongoing monitoring and review of the package. An integral part of the strategy will be post-implementation review and an impact evaluation.

**Conclusion**

By way of conclusion, this bill, and the Jobs for Families early education and childcare package more generally, will deliver significant and greatly needed reform through a simpler, more affordable, more flexible and more accessible childcare system.

Consistent with being financially responsible, the government is determined to achieve budget repair. The Jobs for Families Child Care Package is to be implemented using savings contained in the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Family Payments Structural Reform and Participation Measures) Bill 2016. The family payment measures are sensible, they are practical and they are aimed at ensuring the sustainability of our system.

The government has clearly outlined its fully funded, long-term reform plan which delivers support for children and families, and a sustainable system for taxpayers. Our early education and childcare reforms have been the subject of extensive consultation and will direct the greatest support to those families working the most hours and earning the least.

In contrast to the unfunded, rehashed election promise of members opposite, the coalition has a fully funded package that strikes the right balance between targeted early education and childcare support for working families who depend upon it, a generous safety net to protect those most vulnerable in our community and ongoing support for high-quality learning.

I congratulate the education minister for his work in delivering this legislation. I urge members to support both bills to ensure the government can support families most in need through a sustainable system that will deliver quality learning experiences for all of our children for the present and into the future. I commend this bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

**Migration Amendment (Family Violence and Other Measures) Bill 2016**

**First Reading**

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Dutton.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr DUTTON (Dickson—Minister for Immigration and Border Protection) (12:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Migration Amendment (Family Violence and Other Measures) Bill 2016 amends the Migration Act 1958 to introduce an assessable sponsorship framework for family sponsored visas.

Under the current arrangements it is a requirement for family visa applicants to be sponsored by an Australian citizen or permanent resident. However, for most of these visas there is no assessment of the character of the sponsor, or responsibility that attaches to their sponsorship.

While full character checks have long been a mandatory requirement for all visa applicants, sponsors are currently only required to provide police checks where a minor is included in the visa application, and even then, the available grounds to refuse a visa for persons with a violent criminal history are limited.

In the sponsored family visa program and in particular, the partner visa category, the lack of focus on sponsors has led to problems with:

- some sponsors being targeted by non-genuine visa applicants, who are focused solely on a permanent visa outcome. The government considers these sponsors to be vulnerable; and
- Australian citizens and permanent residents who have a violent history, including against family members, being able to sponsor noncitizens without having to disclose details of their past to either the department or other parties to the visa application.

The bill being introduced today will change this, and put in place a framework that will require a sponsor of a family stream visa to be assessed and approved before a visa application can be made.

In addition, it will also require sponsors to agree to the results of their character checks to be shared with the person they are sponsoring, so that they can make an informed decision about whether or not to proceed with their application, especially in circumstances where there are children involved in the application.

While the visa application process itself will not change, under these new provisions, a valid family visa application cannot be decided, until a sponsorship approval is in place.

This government has made it very clear that we have strong views on domestic violence. It is not acceptable, under any circumstances.

These important reforms are a very significant first step in protecting potentially vulnerable visa applicants from the risk of domestic violence when participating in the family sponsored visa program.

If people have a history of violence or domestic violence, then that should be taken into account when determining their suitability as a family visa sponsor, and with the changes being introduced today it now will be.
The amendments in this bill support and deliver on important elements of the second action plan in the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children 2010-2022.

The improvements introduced with this bill strengthen the protections for visa applicants by extending the sponsorship framework that currently applies to the temporary work sponsored visa program to the family sponsored visa program as well.

Amongst other things, the introduction of this framework will:

- replace the current unenforceable sponsorship framework insofar as it relates to family sponsored visas;
- place a greater emphasis on the assessment and approval of family sponsors;
- require the approval of persons as family sponsors before any relevant visa applications are made;
- separate the sponsorship assessment from the visa application process. This will ensure that amongst other things, the sponsorship obligations (rather than unenforceable undertakings) are imposed and enforced with civil penalties and administrative sanctions;
- allow the minister to refuse a sponsorship application; and cancel and/or bar a family sponsor where inappropriate use of the program or serious offences are detected, especially those involving family violence; and
- improve the sharing of personal information between parties identified in the sponsorship application and the program more generally.

These requirements will initially apply to partner visas, and will be progressively rolled out across all family sponsored visas under the family stream of the migration program.

The changes we are making in this bill will complement the work being done right across government to reduce the incidence of domestic violence in our community, and I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

Migration Amendment (Character Cancellation Consequential Provisions) Bill 2016

First Reading

Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Dutton.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr DUTTON (Dickson—Minister for Immigration and Border Protection) (12:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Migration Amendment (Character Cancellation Consequential Provisions) Bill 2016 makes a number of amendments to give full effect to the substantive amendments made by the Migration Amendment (Character and General Visa Cancellation) Act 2014.

The character and general visa cancellation act significantly strengthened the character and general visa cancellation provisions in the Migration Act to ensure that non-citizens who
commit crimes in Australia, pose a risk to the Australian community or represent an integrity concern are appropriately considered for visa refusal or cancellation.

The character and general visa cancellation act also introduced:
- mandatory cancellation of visas held by non-citizens in prison who do not pass certain limbs of the character test,
- a revocation power specifically for mandatory cancellation decisions, and
- a new power for the minister to personally set aside, in the national interest, a decision made by his or her delegate or the AAT to revoke a mandatory visa cancellation decision.

The consequential amendments set out in this bill will ensure that the mandatory cancellation-related powers are reflected consistently and comprehensively throughout the Migration Act, according to the original intent of the changes made in late 2014. This will ensure that the government has the capability to proactively and robustly address character and integrity concerns.

In particular, the bill will ensure that confidential information that is critical to decision-making under the new character cancellation provisions is given the same level of protection that is currently afforded to confidential information relating to other character provisions in the Migration Act.

This bill will also give full effect to the policy of mandatory cancellation, by putting beyond doubt that a non-citizen who is the subject of a mandatory character cancellation decision is available for removal from Australia if they do not seek revocation within the relevant time period or are unsuccessful in having their visa reinstated.

Further, the bill seeks to strengthen our ability to identify non-citizens suspected of being of character concern by aligning the definition of 'character concern' in the act with the strengthened 'character test' in section 501.

Consistent with the original intent of the character and cancellation act, this will facilitate the lawful disclosure of non-citizens' identifying information where a non-citizen is suspected of being of character concern.

This bill demonstrates this government's clear and continuing commitment to ensuring that non-citizens who pose a risk to the Australian community are dealt with effectively, efficiently and comprehensively.

I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.

BUSINESS

Standing and Sessional Orders

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House, Minister for Industry and Innovation and Science) (12:43): I ask leave of the House to amend the notice relating to the proposed amendments to the standing orders in the terms as circulated.

Leave granted.

Mr PYNE: I thank the opposition and I move:

That standing orders 34, 55, 133 and 192 be amended, as follows:
### Order of business

The order of business to be followed by the House is shown in figure 2.

**Figure 2. House order of business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement of country</td>
<td>Petitions (to 10.10 am) Committee &amp; delegation business and Divisions and quorums deferred 10 am–12 noon</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of country</td>
<td>9.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td>9.30 am</td>
<td>9.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td>1.30 pm</td>
<td>1.30 pm</td>
<td>1.30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 sec statements</td>
<td>90 sec statements</td>
<td>90 sec statements</td>
<td>90 sec statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 pm</td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Time</td>
<td>Question Time</td>
<td>Question Time</td>
<td>Question Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>approx 3.10 pm</td>
<td>approx 3.10 pm</td>
<td>approx 3.10 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents, Ministerial statements</td>
<td>Documents, MPI, Ministerial statements</td>
<td>Documents, MPI, Ministerial statements</td>
<td>Documents, MPI, Ministerial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx 3.10 pm</td>
<td>approx 4.10 pm</td>
<td>approx 4.10 pm</td>
<td>approx 4.10 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx 4.10 pm</td>
<td>4.30 pm</td>
<td>4.30 pm</td>
<td>5.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisions between 7.30–9.30 pm deferred</td>
<td>Divisions and quorums deferred</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>Adjournment Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30 pm</td>
<td>7.30 pm</td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30 pm</td>
<td>7.30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of quorum

(a) When the attention of the Speaker is drawn to the state of the House and the Speaker observes that a quorum is not present, the Speaker shall count the Members present in accordance with standing order 56.

(b) On Mondays, if any Member draws the attention of the Speaker to the state of the House between 10 am and 12 noon, the Speaker shall announce that he or she will count the House at 12 noon, if the Member then so desires.

(c) On Mondays, if any Member draws the attention of the Speaker to the state of the House between the hours of 7.30 pm and 9.30 pm, the Speaker shall announce that he or she will count the House at 12 noon on Tuesday, if the Member then so desires, notwithstanding that quorums called between 12 noon and 2 pm on Tuesdays are deferred until after the discussion of the matter of public importance.

(d) On Tuesdays, if any Member draws the attention of the Speaker to the state of the House prior to 2 pm, the Speaker shall announce that he or she will count the House after the discussion of the matter of public importance, if the Member then so desires.

(e) On Tuesdays, if any Member draws the attention of the Speaker to the state of the House between the hours of 7.30 pm and 9.30 pm, the Speaker shall announce that he or she will count the House at 9.30 am on Wednesday, if the Member then so desires.

(f) If a quorum is in fact present when a Member draws attention to the state of the House, the Speaker may name the Member in accordance with standing order 94(b) (sanctions against disorderly conduct).

133 Deferred divisions on Mondays and Tuesdays

(a) On Mondays, any division called for between the hours of 10 am and 12 noon shall be deferred until 12 noon, except for a division called on a motion moved by a Minister during this period.

(b) On Mondays, any division called for between the hours of 7.30 pm and 9.30 pm shall be deferred until after the discussion of the matter of public importance on Tuesday, unless leave has been granted for the division to take place immediately.

(c) On Tuesdays, any division called for prior to 2 pm shall be deferred until after the discussion of the matter of public importance, except for a division called on a motion moved by a Minister during this period.

(d) On Tuesdays, any division called for between the hours of 7.30 pm and 9.30 pm shall be deferred until 9.30 am on Wednesday, unless leave has been granted for the division to take place immediately.

(e) The Speaker shall put all questions on which a division has been deferred, successively and without amendment or further debate.
192 Federation Chamber’s indicative order of business

The normal order of business of the Federation Chamber is set out in figure 4.

**Figure 4. Federation Chamber indicative order of business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30 am</td>
<td>3 min constituency statements</td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td>3 min constituency statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 am</td>
<td>Committee &amp; delegation business and private Members’ business</td>
<td>10.30 am</td>
<td>Government Business and/or Committee &amp; delegation business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.30 pm</td>
<td>Adjournment Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 pm</td>
<td>90 sec statements</td>
<td>4.00 pm</td>
<td>If required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45 pm</td>
<td>Government Business and/or Committee &amp; delegation business</td>
<td>4.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00 pm</td>
<td>Grievance Debate</td>
<td>7.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting times of the Federation Chamber are fixed by the Deputy Speaker and are subject to change. Times shown for the start and finish of items of business are approximate. Adjournment debates can occur on days other than Thursdays by agreement between the Whips.
In moving this motion, I might just explain the process and what we are proposing to do with the standing orders. Yesterday we made a number of noncontroversial changes to the standing orders as agreed between the opposition, the crossbenchers and the government and today we are moving another change. Then, when we return on 12 September, there may well be other changes that we can agree between the government, the opposition and the crossbenchers. Of course, where we do not agree we might still pursue those changes, depending on the government's attitude at the time.

Mr Burke: Will it be a good day or a bad day?

Mr Pyne: We will see how we go and how the opposition is behaving. These changes will mean that the divisions and quorums process, which at the moment is suspended between 6.30 pm and 8 pm, will be moved to between 7.30 pm and 9 pm. So there will be no divisions or quorums between 7.30 pm and 9 pm, rather than between 6.30 pm and 8 pm. So it is the same period of time and the same amount of government business can be done. Simply, between 7.30 and nine o'clock there will be no divisions or quorums except when we achieve leave of the opposition. There may be occasions when there does need to be a bill passed, particularly around national security issues. That is often the case when that happens. When we need to do that we will seek leave of the opposition to do so, and by leave a division might be held.

This will mean that between 7.30 and nine o'clock on Mondays and Tuesdays members of parliament will be able to do their committee work, whether it is for standing committees of the House, joint standing committees with the Senate or backbench committees, without interruption. Ministers will be able to hold meetings without interruption for divisions and quorums, as will other members of the House. It makes for a much more sensible way of doing government business—and opposition business, for that matter—and much better management of the House and the parliament. I think it will lead to better outcomes for the government and also for the health of members.

Of course, the 6.30 pm to 8 pm period is usually called the dinner break. I do not know of any members who actually leave the House during that time but I am sure there are some. I do not and I cannot remember the last time I did, quite frankly. It is probably not since before I was first a minister—or shadow minister, for that matter—which is now over 10 years. There was an interregnum. There was the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd interregnum, which I have tried to keep out of my memory bank; that was an unpleasant period. Most people do not use that time for a dinner break, and this will move it to a more sensible time. People who have dinner in the House will be able to do so without being interrupted. So I do commend the change to the standing orders to the House. I think it will be wildly popular with the people who work in this building. And I thank the opposition for their bipartisan support for this change.

Mr Burke (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (12:46): The opposition will be supporting the amendments to standing orders that are in front of us at the moment. They have been the subject of a negotiation. Like the Leader of the House, I have to say that whatever time the dinner break is meant to be is irrelevant to most of us. It makes a difference only to the extent that committee meetings and other things that are organised around the place can be guaranteed to occur without divisions.

The opposition sought a particular change to standing orders, which is included in the amendment. Up until now, during these periods it has been possible for a division to be called...
anyway if a minister came in and simply moved a motion of that nature. This amendment says that can happen only by leave. It means that the capacity that has always been there for government members, in being able to schedule events during that period, will now be available for non-government members as well.

With that, I thank the Leader of the House for what was a constructive negotiation. I will not say it was terse, but there were different moments during the process of the negotiation. There have been a number of different proposals floated for changes to standing orders. Some of them came up in the weekend media and amount to absolute atrocities. They are not in front of us at the moment. We are told that whether or not they will be in the future will depend on the 'mood' of the Leader of the House—which means that at a later date anything could happen. As to what is in front of us at the moment, the opposition will be supporting the amendments.

Question agreed to.

COMMITTEES
Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:49): I move:

That:

(1) in accordance with section 242 of the Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001, matters relating to the powers and proceedings of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services shall be as follows:

(a) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 2 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(b) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(c) the committee elect a:

(i) Government member as its chair; and

(ii) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(d) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(e) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall have a casting vote;

(f) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(g) the committee:
(i) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and

(ii) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(h) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;

(i) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(j) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(k) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:

(i) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;

(ii) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;

(iii) sit in public or in private;

(iv) report from time to time; and

(v) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(l) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the Joint Committees on Corporations and Financial Services and Corporations and Securities appointed during previous Parliaments; and

(m) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(2) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:49): I move:

That:

(1) a Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters be appointed to inquire into and report on such matters relating to electoral laws and practices and their administration as may be referred to it by either House of the Parliament or a Minister;

(2) annual reports of government departments and authorities and reports of the Auditor-General presented to the House shall stand referred to the committee for any inquiry the committee may wish to make and reports shall stand referred to the committee in accordance with a schedule tabled by the Speaker to record the areas of responsibility of each committee, provided that:

(a) any question concerning responsibility for a report or a part of a report shall be determined by the Speaker; and
(b) the period during which an inquiry concerning an annual report may be commenced by a
committee shall end on the day on which the next annual report of that department or authority is
presented to the House;

(3) the committee consist of 10 members, three Members of the House of Representatives to be
nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, two Members of the House of Representatives to be
nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, two
Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, two Senators to be nominated
by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and one Senator to be nominated by any minority group
or independent Senator;

(3A) for the purposes.

(a) shall be taken to be a member of the committee for the purposes.

(b) may participate in hearings of evidence and deliberations of the committee and have all rights of
a committee member except that a participating member may not vote on any question before the
committee;

(4) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the
Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of
Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(6) the committee elect a:

(a) Government member as its chair; and

(b) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time
when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(7) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the
members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(8) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall
have a casting vote;

(9) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a
deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-
Government member of either House;

(10) the committee:

(a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to
any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and

(b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(11) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee,
the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as
chair at that meeting;

(12) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a
deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-
Government member of either House;

(13) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the
proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of
a quorum;

(14) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:

(a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;
(b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;
(c) sit in public or in private;
(d) report from time to time; and
(e) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of
Representatives;

(15) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of:
(a) submissions
(b) the evidence and records of the Joint Committees on Electoral Reform and Electoral Matters
appointed during previous Parliaments;

(16) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have
effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(17) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and
take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:49): I
move:

That:
(1) a Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade be appointed to inquire into
and report on such matters relating to foreign affairs, defence and trade as may be referred to it by either
House of the Parliament or a Minister;

(2) annual reports of government departments and authorities and reports of the Auditor-
General presented to the House shall stand referred to the committee for any inquiry the committee may wish to
make and reports shall stand referred to the committee in accordance with a schedule tabled by the
Speaker to record the areas of responsibility of each committee, provided that:
(a) any question concerning responsibility for a report or a part of a report shall be determined by
the Speaker; and

(b) the period during which an inquiry concerning an annual report may be commenced by a
committee shall end on the day on which the next annual report of that department or authority is
presented to the House;

(3) the committee consist of 32 members, 12 Members of the House of Representatives to be
nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 8 Members of the House of Representatives to be
nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 5
Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 5 Senators to be nominated by
the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 2 Senators to be nominated by any minority group or
independent Senator;

(4) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the
Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of
Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(6) the committee elect a:
(a) Government member as its chair; and
(b) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(7) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(8) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, have a casting vote;

(9) six members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(10) the committee:
(a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine;
(b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only; and
(c) appoint the deputy chair of each subcommittee who shall act as chair of the subcommittee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee and who shall have a casting vote only;

(11) in addition to the members appointed pursuant to paragraph (10), the chair and deputy chair of the committee be ex officio members of each subcommittee appointed;

(12) at any time when the chair and deputy chair of a subcommittee are not present at a meeting of the subcommittee the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;

(13) two members of a subcommittee constitute the quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(14) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(15) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:
(a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;
(b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;
(c) sit in public or in private;
(d) report from time to time;
(e) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and
(f) conduct meetings for the purpose of private briefings at any time;

(16) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the Joint Committees on Foreign Affairs and Defence, and Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, appointed during previous Parliaments;

(17) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(18) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.
Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:50): I move:

That:

(1) in accordance with section 6 of the Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011, matters relating to the powers and proceedings of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights shall be as follows:

(a) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip, 2 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or by any minority group or independent Member, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(b) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(c) the committee elect a:

(i) Government member as its chair; and

(ii) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(d) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(e) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall have a casting vote;

(f) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(g) the committee:

(i) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members, and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and

(ii) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(h) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;

(i) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(j) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(k) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:

(i) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;

(ii) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;

(iii) sit in public or in private;
(iv) report from time to time; and
(v) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives;
(l) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the Joint Committees on Human Rights appointed during the previous Parliaments;
(m) the committee may appoint counsel to advise the committee with the approval of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and
(n) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and
(2) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

Parliamentary Joint Committee on Law Enforcement
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:50): I move:

That:

(1) in accordance with section 5 of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Law Enforcement Act 2010, matters relating to the powers and proceedings of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Law Enforcement shall be as follows:

(a) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 2 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(b) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(c) the committee elect a:

(i) Government member as its chair; and

(ii) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(d) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(e) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall have a casting vote;

(f) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(g) the committee:

(i) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and

(ii) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;
(h) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee the
members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at
that meeting;

(i) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a
deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one
non-Government member of either House;

(j) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the
proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of
a quorum;

(k) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:

(i) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;

(ii) conduct proceedings in any place it sees fit;

(iii) sit in public or in private;

(iv) report from time to time; and

(v) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of
    Representatives;

(l) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and
    records of the Joint Committees on the National Crime Authority, the Australian Crime Commission,
    and Law Enforcement appointed during previous Parliaments;

(m) in carrying out its duties, the committee or any subcommittee ensure that the operational
    methods and results of investigations of law enforcement agencies, as far as possible, be protected from
disclosure where that would be against the public interest; and

(n) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have
    effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(2) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and
take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

Parliamentary Joint Committee on the Australian Commission for Law
Enforcement Integrity

Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:51): I
move:

That:

(1) in accordance with sections 213 and 214 of the Law Enforcement Integrity Commissioner Act
2006, matters relating to the powers and proceedings of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the
Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity shall be as follows:

(a) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be
    nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 2 Members of the House of Representatives to be
    nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 2
    Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators to be nominated by
    the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or
    independent Senator;

(b) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the
    Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;
(c) the committee elect a:
   (i) Government member as its chair; and
   (ii) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any
time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;
(d) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the
members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;
(e) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall
have a casting vote;
(f) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a
deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-
Government member of either House;
(g) the committee:
   (i) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to
any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and
   (ii) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;
(h) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee the
members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at
that meeting;
(i) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a
deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-
Government member of either House;
(j) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the
proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of
a quorum;
(k) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:
   (i) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;
   (ii) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;
   (iii) sit it public or in private;
   (iv) report from time to time;
   (v) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of
Representatives;
(l) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and
records of the Joint Committees on the Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity
appointed during previous Parliaments;
(m) in carrying out its duties, the committee or any subcommittee ensure that the operational
methods and results of investigations of law enforcement agencies, as far as possible, be protected from
disclosure where that would be against the public interest; and
(n) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have
effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and
(2) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and
take action accordingly.
   Question agreed to.
Joint Standing Committee on the Parliamentary Library
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:51): I move:

That:

(1) a Joint Standing Committee on the Parliamentary Library be appointed to:

(a) consider and report to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on any matters relating to the Parliamentary Library referred to it by the President or the Speaker;

(b) provide advice to the President and the Speaker on matters relating to the Parliamentary Library;

(c) provide advice to the President and the Speaker on an annual resource agreement between the Parliamentary Librarian and the Secretary of the Department of Parliamentary Services; and

(d) receive advice and reports, including an annual report, directly from the Parliamentary Librarian on matters relating to the Parliamentary Library;

(2) the Committee consist of 13 members, 4 Members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 3 Members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 3 Senators nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 Senator nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(3) every nomination:

(a) of a member of the committee shall be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(b) from a minority group in the Senate or an independent Senator shall be determined by agreement between them, and, in the absence of agreement duly notified to the President, any question of the representation on the committee shall be determined by the Senate;

(4) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(5) the committee elect two of its members to be joint chairs, one being a Senator or Member, on an alternating basis each Parliament, who is a member of the government parties and one being a Senator or Member, on an alternating basis each Parliament, who is a member of the non-government parties, provided that the joint chairs may not be members of the same House;

(6) the joint chair nominated by the government parties shall chair meetings of the committee, and the joint chair nominated by the non-government parties shall take the chair whenever the other joint chair is not present;

(7) each of the joint chairs shall have a deliberative vote only, regardless of who is chairing the meeting;

(8) when votes on a question before the committee are equally divided, the question shall be resolved in the negative;

(9) three members of the committee shall constitute a quorum of the committee, but in a deliberative meeting a quorum shall include one member of each House of the government parties and one member of either House of the non-government parties;

(10) the committee:

(a) have power to appoint subcommittees, consisting of three or more of its members, and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to consider; and
(b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee, who shall have a deliberative vote only;

(11) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee, the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;

(12) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee;

(13) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee, but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(14) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:
(a) sit in public or private;
(b) report from time to time; and
(c) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(15) the President and the Speaker may attend any meeting of the committee or a subcommittee as they see fit, but shall not be members of the committee or subcommittee and may not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(16) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the former Joint Committees on the Parliamentary Library appointed during previous Parliaments;

(17) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(18) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

Joint Standing Committee on Migration
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:51): I move:

That:

(1) a Joint Standing Committee on Migration be appointed to inquire into and report on:
(a) regulations made or proposed to be made under the Migration Act 1958;
(b) proposed changes to the Migration Act 1958 and any related acts; and
(c) such other matters relating to migration as may be referred to it by the Minister responsible for the administration of the Migration Act 1958, another Minister or either House of the Parliament;

(2) annual reports of government departments and authorities and reports of the Auditor-General presented to the House shall stand referred to the committee for any inquiry the committee may wish to make and reports shall stand referred to the committee in accordance with a schedule tabled by the Speaker to record the areas of responsibility of each committee, provided that:
(a) any question concerning responsibility for a report or a part of a report shall be determined by the Speaker; and
(b) the period during which an inquiry concerning an annual report may be commenced by a committee shall end on the day on which the next annual report of that department or authority is presented to the House;
(3) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 1 Senator to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(4) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(6) the committee elect a:
(a) Government member as its chair; and
(b) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(7) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(8) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, have a casting vote;

(9) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(10) the committee:
(a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and
(b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(11) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;

(12) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(13) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(14) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:
(a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;
(b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;
(c) sit in public or in private;
(d) report from time to time; and
(e) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(15) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the Joint Committees on Migration Regulations and the Joint Standing Committees on Migration appointed during previous Parliaments;
(16) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have
effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and
(17) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and
take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

National Capital and External Territories Committee
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:52): I
move:

That:

(1) a Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories be appointed to
inquire into and report on:

(a) matters coming within the terms of section 5 of the Parliament Act 1974 as may be referred to it by:
   (i) either House of the Parliament; or
   (ii) the Minister responsible for administering the Parliament Act 1974; or
   (iii) the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(b) such other matters relating to the parliamentary zone as may be referred to it by the President of
   the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(c) such amendments to the National Capital Plan as are referred to it by a Minister responsible for
   administering the Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act 1988;

(d) such other matters relating to the National Capital as may be referred to it by:
   (i) either House of the Parliament; or
   (ii) the Minister responsible for administering the Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government)
        Act 1988; and

(e) such matters relating to Australia’s territories as may be referred to it by:
   (i) either House of the Parliament; or
   (ii) the Minister responsible for the administration of the Territory of Cocos (Keeling) Islands; the
        Territory of Christmas Island; the Coral Sea Islands Territory; the Territory of Ashmore and Cartier
        Islands; the Australian Antarctic Territory, and the Territory of Heard Island and McDonald Islands, and
        of Commonwealth responsibilities on Norfolk Island.

(2) annual reports of government departments and authorities and reports of the Auditor-General
presented to the House shall stand referred to the committee for any inquiry the committee may wish to
make and reports shall stand referred to the committee in accordance with a schedule tabled by the
Speaker to record the areas of responsibility of each committee, provided that:

(a) any question concerning responsibility for a report or a part of a report shall be determined by
   the Speaker; and

(b) the period during which an inquiry concerning an annual report may be commenced by a
   committee shall end on the day on which the next annual report of that Department or authority is
   presented to the House;

(3) the committee consist of 12 members, the Deputy Speaker, three Members of the House of
Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, two Members of the House of
Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or
independent Member, the Deputy President and Chairman of Committees, two Senators to be
ominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, two Senators to be nominated by the Leader
of the Opposition in the Senate and one Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent
Senator;

(4) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the
Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of
Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(6) the committee elect a:

(a) Government member as its chair; and

(b) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time
when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(7) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the
members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(8) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair or the deputy chair when acting as chair, have a
casting vote;

(9) three members of the committee (of whom one is the Deputy President or the Deputy Speaker
when matters affecting the parliamentary zone are under consideration) constitute a quorum of the
committee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member
of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(10) the committee:

(a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer
to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and

(b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(11) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee
the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as
chair at that meeting;

(12) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a
deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-
Government member of either House;

(13) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the
proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of
a quorum;

(14) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:

(a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;

(b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;

(c) sit in public or in private;

(d) report from time to time; and

(e) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of
Representatives;

(15) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and
records of the Joint Standing Committees on the National Capital and External Territories, the Joint
Committees on the Australian Capital Territory, the Joint Standing Committees on the New Parliament
House, the Joint Standing Committee on the Parliamentary Zone and the Joint Committee on the
National Capital appointed during previous Parliaments and of the House of Representatives and Senate Standing Committees on Transport, Communications and Infrastructure when sitting as a joint committee on matters relating to the Australian Capital Territory;

(16) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(17) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

National Disability Insurance Scheme Committee Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:52): I move:

That:

(1) a Joint Standing Committee on the National Disability Insurance Scheme be appointed to inquire into and report on:

(a) the implementation, performance and governance of the National Disability Insurance Scheme;

(b) the administration and expenditure of the National Disability Insurance Scheme; and

(c) such other matters in relation to the National Disability Insurance Scheme as may be referred to it by either House of the Parliament;

(2) as soon as practicable after 30 June each year, the committee present an annual report to the Parliament on the activities of the committee during the year, in addition to reporting on any other matters it considers relevant;

(3) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 2 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(4) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(6) the committee elect a:

(a) Government member as its chair; and

(b) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(7) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(8) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall have a casting vote;

(9) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;
(10) the committee:
   (a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and
   (b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;
(11) each subcommittee shall have at least one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;
(12) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee, the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;
(13) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall comprise one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;
(14) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;
(15) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:
   (a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;
   (b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;
   (c) sit in public or in private;
   (d) report from time to time; and
   (e) adjourn from time to time and sit during any adjournment of the House of Representatives and the Senate;
(16) the committee or any subcommittee have power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the former Joint Standing Committee on the National Disability Insurance Scheme, and the former Joint Select Committee on DisabilityCare Australia appointed during previous parliaments;
(17) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and
(18) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

Northern Australia Committee
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:52): I move:

That:

(1) a Joint Standing Committee on Northern Australia be appointed to inquire into and report on such matters relating to the development of Northern Australia as may be referred to it by either House of the Parliament or a Minister;

(2) annual reports of government departments and authorities and reports of the Auditor-General presented to the House shall stand referred to the committee for any inquiry the committee may wish to make and reports shall stand referred to the committee in accordance with a schedule tabled by the Speaker to record the areas of responsibility of each committee, provided that:
(a) any question concerning responsibility for a report or a part of a report shall be determined by the Speaker; and

(b) the period during which an inquiry concerning an annual report may be commenced by a committee shall end on the day on which the next annual report of that department or authority is presented to the House;

(3) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 2 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(4) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(6) the committee elect a:

(a) Government member as its chair; and

(b) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(7) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(8) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall have a casting vote;

(9) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(10) the committee:

(a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and

(b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(11) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee, the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;

(12) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(13) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(14) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:

(a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;

(b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;

(c) sit in public or in private;

(d) report from time to time; and
(e) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(15) the committee or any subcommittee has power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the Joint Select Committee on Northern Australia appointed during the previous Parliament;

(16) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(17) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

Trade and Investment Growth Committee
Appointment

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (12:53): I move:

That:

(1) a Joint Standing Committee on Trade and Investment Growth be appointed to inquire into and report on such matters relating to measures to further boost Australia’s trade and investment performance as may be referred to it by either House of the Parliament or a Minister;

(2) annual reports of government departments and authorities and reports of the Auditor-General presented to the House shall stand referred to the committee for any inquiry the committee may wish to make and reports shall stand referred to the committee in accordance with a schedule tabled by the Speaker to record the areas of responsibility of each committee, provided that:

(a) any question concerning responsibility for a report or a part of a report shall be determined by the Speaker; and

(b) the period during which an inquiry concerning an annual report may be commenced by a committee shall end on the day on which the next annual report of that department or authority is presented to the House;

(3) the committee consist of 10 members, 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 2 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips or by any minority group or independent Member, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 2 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(4) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(6) the committee elect a:

(a) Government member as its chair; and

(b) non-Government member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee;

(7) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting;

(8) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, shall have a casting vote;
(9) three members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(10) the committee:
   (a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of three or more of its members and to refer to any subcommittee any matter which the committee is empowered to examine; and
   (b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(11) at any time when the chair of a subcommittee is not present at a meeting of the subcommittee, the members of the subcommittee present shall elect another member of that subcommittee to act as chair at that meeting;

(12) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(13) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum;

(14) the committee or any subcommittee have power to:
   (a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;
   (b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;
   (c) sit in public or in private;
   (d) report from time to time; and
   (e) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(15) the committee or any subcommittee has power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the Joint Select Committee on Trade and Investment Growth appointed during the previous Parliament;

(16) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(17) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Question agreed to.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL’S SPEECH

Address-in-Reply

Consideration resumed of the motion:

That the following Address in Reply to the speech of His Excellency the Governor-General be agreed to:

May it please Your Excellency:

We, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Australia, in Parliament assembled, desire to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the speech which you have been pleased to address to Parliament—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Vasta): Before I call the honourable member for Bass, I remind the House that this is the honourable member's first speech. I ask the House to extend to him the usual courtesies and I wish him all the very best in this 45th Parliament.
Mr HART (Bass) (12:54): I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to elders past and present.

I was honoured to attend the welcome to country ceremony prior to the opening of parliament on Tuesday, and to witness the wonderful first speech of the member for Barton yesterday. It is also important to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land that comprises my electorate of Bass. I acknowledge the connection the traditional owners of the land in north-eastern Tasmania have with their land and country, and I respect their continuing customs and traditions. I acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands now called Tasmania—their stories, their culture and their history must be acknowledged and respected. I pay my respects to their elders, past and present.

I wish to thank the very many people who have made it possible for me to stand here today in this extraordinary building as a member of parliament. I thank the chair of my campaign committee, Senator Helen Polley, who is in the chamber here today. I would particularly like to thank Elliott Bell for his long and dedicated service to my campaign. I also wish to extend my most heartfelt thanks to the amazing Amy Jenkins, who acted as field organiser for the campaign—a campaign which was won on the ground, with literally thousands of conversations with the electors of Bass about the matters that were important to those electors.

There are others too—Yvette, Fay, Victor, Jennifer, Susan, Lewis, Jane, Andrew, Jack, Greg, Rob, Elaine, Marian, Andrew, Phil and Astra, Adam and Coby, David, Woody, Marita and many more. I am sorry that I cannot use my allocated time here today to list everyone. Thank you also to my friend and mentor, Michelle O'Byrne, a former member for Bass in this federal parliament.

I wish to pay particular tribute to the teams of people who doorknocked, handed out how-to-vote cards and contributed in many varied ways to a successful campaign. To my comrades in the union movement, thank you once again. You provide for the empowerment of people who would otherwise be disenfranchised, particularly those who are in a low-paid or insecure work. To Tim Jacobson of HACSU, Jannette Armstrong of United Voice, Paul Griffin of the SDA and other unions: I thank you for putting your trust in me. Your members inspire me. They dedicate themselves to improving the lives of working people.

It is also important that I mention my friends at the MUA, the CFMEU, the Australian Maritime Officers Union, Rainbow Labor, the Tasmanian Left and the Bass Labor branches and affiliates, all of whom were energised by this campaign. I was proud to acknowledge the Labor movement on election night and I do so again today in this House.

I stand here today after having served 30 years as a legal practitioner in private practice, both as a commercial and a commercial litigation lawyer. I represented both individuals and corporate clients and, because of the nature of Tasmania, many family businesses. I understand the pressures of small business. I have lived and worked in my northern Tasmanian community for the whole of my working life. Small businesses do well when everyone does well.

One of the remarkable aspects of a small community like Tasmania is that whilst people might disagree on their politics they will put that aside if they have confidence in someone as a professional who can focus on the relevant issues in good faith. I look forward to
representing all of those who voted for me and, most importantly, I send a message to those who did not vote for me. The role of a member is to represent the electors of a division and I will do my best to ensure that the residents of Bass receive representation in this place.

I thank the former member for Bass Andrew Nikolic for his service in this place. I commended him for his service to the electorate on election night and I do so again in this place. We must not forget that public service demands sacrifice, and sometimes that sacrifice goes unrewarded.

Bass is based around the city of Launceston and its greater urban area. It is described by the Electoral Commission as a provincial electorate and, in many respects, represents a microcosm of the larger Australian electorate. It has a manufacturing past, most notably based around textile production and the automotive industry, and a significant rural sector. Until the 1990s, there was a substantial industrial base at Inveresk railway workshops. It was a Labor government that invested funding to facilitate economic transition to address jobs lost when that industrial past was left behind with the closure of the rail yards.

Northern Tasmania's economy now rests, to a large degree, on education, health care and the rural sector, including viticulture, forestry and tourism. Much of the good work being done now in exploiting tourism and food and wine was identified in analysis undertaken in the mid to late 1990s under the auspices of the Northern Tasmanian Regional Development Plan. I was fortunate to serve in the organisation with Lance Barnard—another former member for Bass and, notably, a former Deputy Prime Minister in the first Whitlam ministry. Lance Barnard showed me that you did not need to raise your voice or bang on the table to win an argument. He also showed me that it is important to listen and allow people to say their piece—and then win them over.

My connection with industrial Launceston and its future development was renewed when I was appointed to the board of the Inveresk Railyard Management Authority. With the UTas transformation project, some 16 years later Inveresk will again play a prominent role in the future of Launceston, Bass and Northern Tasmania.

I was also honoured to serve as a council member of the Tasmanian health organisation North, then responsible for public healthcare services in the north of Tasmania. I know the importance of Medicare in ensuring access to public health care and the role of federal funding to sustain our public healthcare system.

Whilst I have a background in legal practice, with experience in regional development and health governance, the focus of what I wish to speak about in the balance of my allotted time today is on the broad themes of disadvantage and inequality, framed as aspects of justice for my community and a better future for all. I wish to talk today about how the government's focus on budget repair disproportionately affects those who are in receipt of government benefits or on low income whilst notionally being employed. These effects are not just economic. But first I need to give some context for what I will talk about.

We often hear about the golden days of the 1950s and 1960s, prior to Thatcherism and neo-conservatism, when everybody got a fair go—unless, of course, you were Indigenous or female or affected by the White Australia policy. The truth, as we now know, is that those days are not something that could, or should, be reinstated. However the sense of community then present in our suburbs and regional towns may be at risk today in our present society in
terms of what might now be described as 'social connectivity'. In those days, we probably thought about whether you 'belonged' to the community. This issue is particularly important today if you are in receipt of Newstart allowance or on a disability pension or under-employed. We now understand that rising inequality means a greater likelihood that the long-term unemployed and low-income earners are more likely to lack social support—the social connectivity to allow you to actively participate in today's community. This was the subject of academic discussion some years ago but is now framed in the context of, or discussion about, inequality.

The long-term unemployed suffer in many ways which are difficult to comprehend. One way, which is easily overlooked, is the fact that a person experiencing long-term unemployment is highly likely to lose their support networks, which are vital for their continued participation in community life. This is not readily obvious but it does become clear when you realise how low the payment is that we expect a recipient to survive on.

Low income by itself, if support networks are in place, may involve disadvantage. But my fond memories of university, despite the fact that I had little money, emphasise the many networks, particularly support networks, I enjoyed as a student. They sustained me. In contrast to this, unless those networks are already in place and very robust, a person who is in receipt of Newstart is unlikely to maintain strong connections with a support network, which may be very necessary to maintaining physical and emotional health. So, when we speak of disadvantage, in my experience we must think of multiple layers of disadvantage—and the very worst layer of disadvantage is the erosion of the support networks that are capable of keeping a person connected with a community.

How can a person who has parental responsibility, who may be on government benefits, who has an obligation to search for work and also the school or sporting obligations of a child or children, have any resources left to engage with community activities and maintain support networks? When we fail to progress any real increase in the very basic level of support to the most disadvantaged in our community, we are condemning those people to isolation and a potential threat to their health and emotional wellbeing.

I know that those agencies that are tasked with supporting the long-term unemployed understand the level of support that is required to not only locate employment but also keep that person in employment. This is a practical reflection of the isolation which comes from being excluded from society. I would like to see not just a practical increase in the level of benefits available for those who are on Newstart or a disability pension, or for that matter the aged pension, but also practical steps to support the maintenance of networks necessary to maintain the health and emotional wellbeing of the most disadvantaged in our society.

Community groups and welfare agencies have had multiple programs defunded or restricted. Too often the performance measures that service providers are assessed by in this space are financial rather than 'soft factors' such as customer satisfaction. And sporting groups speak about supporting 'grassroots sport'. But the practicality is that, in areas where there is extreme disadvantage, that must mean investment in hyper-local activities—that is, at the suburb level or even at the street level—to be of any practical benefit. In many respects some regional communities are doing better than suburban communities because of the local institutions which had been maintained, such as the local cricket, football or soccer club. A
suburban community might lack that level of engagement, unless the local suburban football team has well and truly engaged with the local community.

How is this relevant to the people of Bass? As at March 2016 there were 4,837 Newstart allowance recipients and 4,838 disability support pension recipients in Bass. There are also many who can only be described as underemployed, or who are in insecure employment, not represented in the official figures but reflected in levels of disadvantage. People on low incomes, whether within the allowance or pension system or not, are likely to find it difficult to find and stay in housing and seek medical help. They are more likely to be unwell or to be unemployed. The unemployment rate in Bass was approximately 7.4 per cent as at May 2015, according to ABS figures. The rate of poverty in Bass extends from 12.13 per cent in West Tamar municipality to 20.81 per cent in George Town. Thirty-three per cent of Tasmanian households depend upon income support payments as their main source of income. Low-income families have an average disposable income of $359 per week, compared to an average for all households of $1,224 per week. Thirteen per cent of Tasmanian households have an after-tax income of less than $281 per week.

I was fortunate to be able to campaign, over an extended period of time, within my electorate on the simple but positive themes of jobs, education and health. There is no doubt in my mind that these issues resonated across the communities I spoke to. It was reinforced in every conversation. The mantra of 'jobs and growth' at the centre of the government's campaign was contrasted with the very simple Labor message around well-paid jobs, protecting penalty rates, education in the form of 'Your Child. Our Future' and substantial investment in the University of Tasmania transformation project.

People in the electorate of Bass, particularly those on low incomes or in receipt of allowances or benefits, also well understood that only Labor would stand up to protect public health, Medicare and our public hospitals. Given the substantial research undertaken in the area of social determinants of health, northern Tasmania is at the centre of an unfortunate coincidence of low income; pockets of extreme disadvantage; greater incidence of chronic disease, including those likely to expose the health system to greater demand; and a federal and state government refusing to face the reality that the public health system could not sustain removal of funding.

The 2014 federal budget had an immediate impact upon me. I watched the delivery of the budget by the then Treasurer. I felt physically ill. I knew from my involvement in health governance that substantial cuts to acute hospital funding, particularly for chronic and multiple morbidities, would expose the health system to significant pressure. The advice that I received at that time was clear, if brief. Detailed financial analysis as to the budgetary position of a hospital with a budget of $350 million per annum, run on a financial knife edge to a break-even position every year, I found, can be reduced to a short summary. The summary was: it's bad—really bad.

That aside, my immediate concern was for those young unemployed, under the age of 30, as the government assumed that they would be able to survive without income for six months of every year. Either that or business and the community would be required to bear a burden to support an underclass of unsupported unemployed living in absolute poverty.

That budget was unfair, and the government which attempted to deliver that budget remains determined to deliver many of the programs and cuts announced in that budget
despite a change of leader. That leadership claims a mandate, subsequent to the election on 2 July, for a program which still requires the disadvantaged, low-income earners and those on allowances and benefits to pay for the cost of budget repair whilst the government insists that trickle-down economics in the form of $50 billion of tax cuts will create jobs and growth. I was concerned and remain concerned about rising inequality and, it seems, the disregard for unemployed and low-income people and the marginalised within our communities, whether it is in northern Tasmania, elsewhere in regional Australia or in public housing in our large cities.

The plan Labor took to the election was based around a positive plan for the electorate and a positive plan for Australia based around investment in people, in education and in infrastructure—infrastructure like the NBN—and, importantly, in protecting our public healthcare system. I am proud to say that, in hundreds of conversations, particularly in areas which can only be described as disadvantaged, there was a general understanding and agreement with Labor's proposal to make additional investments in education as a driver of economic growth. There is correlation between lower educational attainment and health outcomes, and economist Saul Eslake has long campaigned to the business community within Tasmania that investment in the education and skills of our young people will drive better economic performance. I agree. This is something which provides a strong pathway to a positive future for Tasmania, which I am committed to work upon during my time here.

I thank the entire Labor leadership team—the Leader of the Opposition, Bill Shorten; our deputy leader, Tanya Plibersek; Penny Wong; Chris Bowen; Mark Dreyfus; and others—for their wonderful support of me during the election campaign. This included specific policies announced for Bass including the commitment of $150 million towards the UTAS transformation project. This project benefits not just people within Bass but also the electorate of my good friend the member for Braddon, with the relocation of the Cradle Coast Campus. The aim of the project is to drive enrolment in UTAS's northern campus through new state-of-the-art facilities at Inveresk. Thus the railway workshops of Launceston's industrial past become essential to a future which involves transforming the lives of young Tasmanians through education and training.

I am doubly proud that this commitment was made prior to the formal launch of the campaign and that the Tasmanian Labor team and visiting shadow ministers hammered the government on their commitment to this vital project throughout a long winter campaign until the government finally relented and committed to the project. There is no doubt that this project—with $150 million of federal money, $75 million of state money and $75 million of university funding—will provide important jobs in construction, as an infrastructure project, and will also, in the long term, play a significant part in the revitalisation of the CBD of Launceston as well as driving better education and job outcomes for young Tasmanians.

I am also strongly committed to continuing my advocacy for improved sewerage infrastructure discharging to the Tamar River. There has been significant private and public investment in tourism infrastructure in Launceston in addition to vital federal funding for flood protection. However, Launceston's sewerage system carries the distinction of being one of the very few remaining combined sewerage and stormwater systems in the world, because when it was originally commenced in the 19th century it was state-of-the-art for the time.
Labor made a commitment of $75 million towards TasWater's $250 million sewerage infrastructure project on the basis that the project could not be further delayed. The burden of such a large project would rest on ratepayers and municipal councils within Tasmania without federal government contribution. This echoes the commitment made by Prime Minister Gough Whitlam to supply sewerage infrastructure to Western Sydney. Labor has the vision to build and invest. It is significant that Infrastructure Australia has assessed the project as within its top priority projects.

I wish to say some words about the Labor Party that I know and love. Labor stands for people. Labor recognises that we live in communities and the fact that we are not simply consumers in an economy, with overriding individual self-interest. We believe that there is public good in investing in the future. That is why we invested and we campaigned on the transformative power of the investment in education in driving economic growth, particularly in a state of below average income and poor education and health outcomes. Talk of present debt being a burden on our children ignores the obligation we have to invest wisely for our children and the wise investments that have been made by taxpayers past. At a local level, people understood that investing in education meant that the child next door or the child over the road would receive the best education and that would be a public benefit—a public good. Similarly, people understand that paying taxes sustains public education, a universal public Medicare system and public infrastructure. This is the Labor way: putting people first.

Finally: my family. I have my dear wife, Annie, and my son, Pete, in the gallery here today. Pete is studying architecture and design at UTAS's Inveresk campus. He is the future for young Tasmanians. To my family: thank you for indulging me in the long hours of my legal career, hours when I should have been with you both. I regret that I was not there when I should have been.

To my mum and dad: thank you once again for investing your love and values in me. I know you will be keen to see and hear about this week's events when I see you next. I know that your interests will now be capably looked after by the member for Lyons. If not, I am sure you will let me know!

To my sister, Sue, and brother-in-law, Kip, also in the gallery today: thank you for your love and support. I know you have had a difficult couple of years. It has been fantastic to have you here this week.

Finally, to the people of Bass: I will do my best to serve my community; a community I grew up in and a community that has sustained multiple generations of my family. I am deeply humbled that you chose me to serve.

Mr WYATT (Hasluck—Assistant Minister for Health and Aged Care) (13:19): by leave—I move:

That standing order 43 be suspended until the conclusion of the speech on the Address in Reply by the member for Eden-Monaro.

Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Eden-Monaro.

Dr MIKE KELLY (Eden-Monaro) (13:19): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Now, where was I before I was rudely interrupted?
Firstly, Mr Speaker, congratulations on your reappointment. I think I speak for the nation when I say what great relief and joy we had when you were initially appointed, in the circumstances, and I do not think we have had any cause for regret since that time. Thank you for all you have done to restore sanity to the House and good luck with the rest of this term; I know it will not be easy.

It is wonderful to be here as, now, a member of two classes. Hopefully that gives me the opportunity to learn more and to make many more friends.

An opposition member: You have needed more classes.

Dr MIKE KELLY: It is often said to me that I need more classes. It is wonderful to see, reflecting on the first speeches we have heard, what a massive infusion of talent we have had into this House.

I listened to the member for Perth talk about his experiences with asbestos victims. That was a very formative experience in my career too after I left university. I will never forget reading some of the records that were revealed in some of those processes where American executives in asbestos companies had for many years hidden the results of X-rays on their workers and what they were suffering in terms of the damage from asbestos. One conversation in particular stuck out to me. It was a discussion whereby they were arguing about whether those records should be revealed to the workers. One of these executives vigorously argued that that should not be the case. The response to that from one of the other executives was: 'What are you proposing—that we work our workers to death?' The response to that from the other executive from Johns Manville was: 'We find it's cheaper that way.' Nothing brought home to me more effectively how important the trade union movement is. Effectively, the justice that has been achieved and the reforms in work safety that have been achieved have been achieved through that great movement.

Listening to many of these other comments, I realise too what an enrichment we have had in this House by the infusion of our Indigenous representatives. It really is adding to the quality of this place and adding tremendous new perspectives.

There are others who we will be hearing from. In particular, I look forward to hearing from the member for Wills, whom I served with in Iraq 10 years ago. It is where he met his wife Lydia, who is definitely the better half. She is a very intelligent and strong woman. It is wonderful to be here 10 years later serving in the House together, to bring that experience to bear along with people like Anne Aly, who has tremendous background in the counterterrorism struggle that we are engaged in at the moment.

It is coincidental that I speak today after we have heard from the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition on security matters. I am very proud to have picked up responsibility as the shadow assistant minister for defence industry and support. In the last couple of years I have been working on security matters for our leader, and I would like to echo his comments from this morning in relation to the bipartisan spirit with which we cooperated with the former Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, and his chief of staff, Peta Credlin, who I worked a lot with behind the scenes to ensure that bipartisan approach. I will say on the public record that I greatly respected Peta Credlin as a strong, intelligent woman. It seems that some have problems with strong, intelligent women. I am glad to say that on this side of the House that is not a problem. I wish her well. I am very pleased to see the security team that
has been appointed on this side of the House. I do believe that we will continue in that very important spirit of bipartisanship in what is an essential aspect of the federal government's responsibility. We on this side of the House certainly take that very seriously.

That brings me to the circumstances in which the election was fought. We have representation now in this parliament that seems to hark back to the days between the two world wars, between the First World War and the Depression, when people reached out to ideologies that seemed to provide simple answers. It brings to mind the old saying that for every complex problem there is an answer that is simple, clear and wrong. To those who are reaching out for simple answers I would say that some of the ideas and approaches put forward by some of the people who have entered this building will not provide greater security. In fact, in some aspects they will endanger that security if they go uncontested. So I am grateful for the opportunity to be back in this House to be able to do that contesting.

I will say also that I really hope to engage in a constructive dialogue with the Minister for Defence Industry, but I do warn him that I will challenge vigorously and in detail any attempts to misrepresent the record of the Labor Party and Labor governments on security and defence industry. There has been some of that and I intend to contest it.

That brings me to the primary reason for my being here, which is to represent the people of Eden-Monaro. I think there are many reasons why I was returned to this place to do that representation. There were generic issues, which we have commented on, in relation to health matters. I think it would be a grave mistake for the government to believe that text messages were the issue for the people of our communities. People were fearful of lived experience and the disappointments and the approach of the death by a thousand cuts to Medicare and health measures that have been occurring in recent times. I had farmers and other people on the phone to me in tears in anticipation of the extra imposts of the changes that were in prospect for Medicare. They did not need text messages or me to tell them about those threats. Those concerns are real and they need to be addressed. We have ongoing health issues in places like Pambula hospital, Tumut and Yass, and I have to advocate for their benefit in this place.

We also of course have the education issue. Nowhere is that more important than in rural and regional Australia. The great promise of the Gonski program was not the dollars but the programs that the program funds, in particular the rural and regional loadings, the loadings for our Indigenous kids and disabled kids. The early days of the program were having such an impact in my region in schools like Bega public and Eden public, where we have large populations of Indigenous kids. The dramatic improvements that it was delivering show why we need to go the full Gonski, as they say, and I hope to continue to advocate for that and to see it brought to fruition.

A very important issue for us—right up there in the top three issues in our region—was renewable energy and climate change. In all the polls you will see that our region understands that issue deeply. We are probably the canary in the cage in the mine in many ways, because we are really more vulnerable than other areas of Australia. We have a billion-dollar skiing industry, and to see the contraction of the snow available for that industry over the years has been deeply distressing. Obviously, if we do not take urgent action that industry will be under threat. The Sapphire Coast is at risk from sea level rises and salination. We have fruitgrowers on the south-west slopes who rely on dependable and predictable rain patterns and who cannot afford to be placed in the circumstances they were in that recent terrible drought.
We have many reasons to be fearful of exaggerated climate change through further temperature rises. But, more than that, our region saw the massive opportunity that the response to climate change presented. One of the things I am tremendously proud of is the great body of policy work that was done by our team during the last few years. The central piece of that for me is the Climate Change Action Plan. It is a magnificent, 41-page document that does not just comprehensively address the issue of climate change but presents a program for economic reform that will help drive the new economy that we need. There was nowhere that the benefit of that investment was landing more profoundly than Eden-Monaro. During the time that I was a member, from 2007 to 2013, we saw over $1 billion of investment in renewable energy projects alone, leaving aside subsidiary industry and investment. It was the largest single source of private investment we have ever seen in Eden-Monaro. We have every single available renewable energy resource in our region and we are close to the grid, so the opportunities for us are enormous. We are also home of course to the big granddaddy of renewable energy, Snowy Hydro. I will send this shot across the bow of the government, because we have seen these ideas perpetuated or floated from time to time, most recently in articles in The Financial Review: we will never sit still for any attempts to privatise the Snowy Hydro scheme. It was tried by the Howard government in 2006 but widespread community reaction prevented it happening then. We will not let it happen, ever.

I am proud to stand side by side with my mates and colleagues in the ETU, who are sound men and women of integrity, fortitude and courage. They highlighted the dangers of privatisation to us: there would be job losses in the electricity industry and there would be price rises and issues that would arise from the security of our grid. We are seeing all of that playing out. So I am proud to stand with them in this fight and to keep that battle going.

But there are so many issues in our region that our union brothers and sisters are fighting that are so important to my community—for example, penalty rates. There are our high levels of underemployment in our region, where we have people who may only have two or three days of work a week and need those penalty rates of the weekend in order to put food on the table. You would need to put yourself in their position to understand the importance of penalty rates. There are our forestry and construction workers who just want to come home in one piece at night—what can possibly be wrong with that ideal?

Our public servants have suffered from terrible impositions over the last few years, as members here who represent this area know and a great many of them live in Eden-Monaro and Queanbeyan. The government is suffering itself from its inability to deliver even its own policies in that process. It has been grossly inefficient because we are seeing the hiring of consultants, adding cost to federal budgets, without the efficiency result coming from that. It has a terrible effect on our region. We depend a lot on the holiday-makers driving from Canberra and Queanbeyan, and that has put a big hole in our economy.

I want to also highlight in particular a group who are very close to my heart. They are all around us in this building. The cleaners in this building have suffered terrible impositions under the changes that have been made by this government. It is extremely hard to get by and support their families on the wages that they are asked to survive on—it is unconscionable. I would like to reach out to all members in this House to address this issue, because it is just unsustainable. I am proud to stand side by side with United Voice to keep fighting that battle as well. If the cleaners are around, do not ignore them. They are not shadows and they are not
ghosts; they are real people. I am proud to say that many of the people who work in this House live in Queanbeyan, so we have a big stake in this building.

I must say too that the forced mergers in New South Wales were a big issue as well. This is a process that is deeply flawed and badly executed. I think many of my fellow colleagues across the other side of the chamber, who have seen this playing out, feel the same way that I do about how this has been handled and some of them have spoken out. The people of Tumbarumba are still not happy and will not accept this forced merger process—it will not stand for them. They have commissioned me to take that fight up with Minister Toole, and I will do that.

They are not alone: the people of Bombala are equally distressed at what has happened. These were councils that were in the black and met the Fit for the Future criteria, but were nevertheless forced to merge. It is this syndrome of people in Sydney thinking, 'We know what's best and we'll just draw big red lines with crayons on maps in country New South Wales without any consideration for the community of interest, the traditions and the geography.'

Particularly if you look at my region—we are now bigger than 66 countries in the world and we have a bloody great mountain range in the middle, with a lot of snow and ice during this time of year—there are significant issues about how we relate to each other. The government is Sydney simply ignored all of that. It is not good enough and we need to come back and have a look at how that has been done. Of course, a lot of infrastructure issues impact on our region. I call on my colleagues on the other side to work with me to deliver the Barton Highway duplication. The New South Wales government also needs to see the importance of this as an investment in the southern New South Wales economy and the huge potential that we have there now.

The issues that I have been advocating for 10 years are starting to come to fruition, in terms of the opening up of the Port of Eden for committed commercial use and also for greater tourism through the extension of the wharf and the bringing in of large cruisers, boosting our tourism. There will soon be the opening of the Canberra international airport, which will also provide not only extra tourists from that source but an opportunity to get our wonderful high-quality produce from this region onto plates in that region and take advantage of that.

From as far afield as the cherries of Young to the beautiful fruit from the Batlow growers to our abalone oysters and wonderful seafood from the coast to our beef, sheepmeat and our superfine Merino wool, this is a huge opportunity for us and we need to work together as a region to exploit the full potential of that. The Barton Highway is an important piece of inland infrastructure to help make that real. I need not only this federal government but also the state government to realise that it is not just about commuters to Canberra from New South Wales: it is a broader regional economic investment.

We also have tremendous social and economic issues around jobs. I will now pursue a strategic economic plan for our region, where I hope to bring together all my colleagues from all parties—right across the divide at state and federal level—to take advantage of those issues that I have just mentioned and also to do our best to get a proper rollout of the NBN and make the most use of it. I have certainly seen a lot of potential demonstrated in our region. One significant example is Jane Cay and her business Birdsnest down in Cooma. It started out as a simple shop in Cooma and now occupies an entire block of the town,
employing 110 people on very magnificent, flexible workplace arrangements. It employs largely women, working around their lives as wives of farmers, mothers and whatnot. It is a tremendous example of what is possible in rural and regional areas and the potential that the NBN will further open up.

There is a lot for me to do and I am very eager to get on with it. One of the most important things that has led to me being here is that the community has spoken loud and clear that they must have community based representation. In these last few years, we have seen a break in our tradition of having members of both sides who are part of our community. That just did not happen in the last couple of years. I know there are a lot of relieved Liberal Party members in Eden-Monaro who are happy to see the change. Obviously, it is now my responsibility to meet those expectations from all those people who said to me that they were voting Labor for the first time.

I also want to thank all those people in the branches in our region. They are just magnificent people. I thank my fantastic campaign electoral office staff, Riley, and Robbie Rynehart, our campaign manager. He is a magnificent bloke who has stuck with me through a lot of ups and downs. I thank Linda Colman, Radmila Noveska, Sarah Niall, Jil and Brian Brown. Brian is a really good bloke for an artilleryman, but I have never held that against him!

There are so many others. There were thousands of people out there volunteering for us, from the Young Labor troops across the border here in the ACT to all our proud union members and trades men and women. I would love to pay tribute to Steve Butler, Graham Kelly, Jarrod Dwyer, Bernie Smith and all those wonderful people who stood beside us shoulder to shoulder. It was an inspiring experience because they all believed in what we believe in in terms of the future of this country. It was an inspiring experience for me.

But primarily I must thank my wife and my son. My wife has been with me through all my character-building years of 20 years in the Army through Somalia, Bosnia, Timor and a year in Iraq and then the sedate experience that I have had here with its high level of security in a marginal seat. She has been there all along. I would like to say that it is a partnership of equals, but I know that that is a lie. It reminds me of the phrase that 'behind every successful man is a surprised woman'. Thank you for your support. And I thank my son as well. We are really proud of him with his ideals.

I would like to conclude with this observation. One of my guiding principles is a dictum by first century scholar Rabbi Tarfon, who said: 'We are not obliged to complete the work of perfecting the world, but we are not permitted to resile from it.' My view is that I am here to be a part of a continuum of the movement to improve the human condition and that is why I am proud to be part of the labour movement. I want to be here to move that ball forward and be a part of that human chain of progress, which is not immutable and is not inevitable. It requires a lot of passion, sacrifice, leadership and discipline to build it brick by brick with blood, sweat and tears. I am immensely proud particularly to be standing shoulder to shoulder with these men and women in that endeavour. Thank you for having me back.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the member for Eden-Monaro and I welcome back a fellow member of the class of 2007. The debate is interrupted in accordance with standing order 43. The debate may be resumed at a later hour.
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Pakenham Cenotaph Memorial

Mr BROADBENT (McMillan) (13:40): Last Sunday, 28 August, we gathered with Mr Gary Elliott, President of the Pakenham RSL, for the unveiling of the cenotaph rock memorial at the Pakenham cenotaph. Mr Elliott, a Vietnam veteran himself, outlined the inspiration behind the concept of the commemorative walk to name and honour those who served from our district in Malaya, Indonesia, Korea and Vietnam. In the absence of Mr Don Buntine, who served in the Far East Strategic Reserve in Malaya, Mr Ron Ingram, Vietnam veteran and Citizen of the Year for the Cardinia Shire, unveiled the Malaya and Indonesia plaque. Denise Cervasio, daughter of Mr Leslie Wentworth Stephens, a veteran of the Korea conflict, then unveiled a plaque in honour of the Korean conflict. Mr Henry Van Diemen, tour of duty to Vietnam 1967, unveiled the plaque in honour of those who served in Vietnam. Mr Elliott thanked Travis Delarue Landscapes and Tynong Quarry for the granite and the Shire of Cardinia for funding support. Miss Emma Marsen concluded the official ceremony with a beautiful rendition of the national anthem and Mr Damien Lord played The Last Post. Inner Wheel provided the lunch.

This we know: these memorials will keep in remembrance through the generations the names and contributions of those who defended our national sovereignty. It takes real commitment to acknowledge and then deliver the missing link in the story of defence service in our district. To know your past is to respect the families that have given greatly to the community through service to the nation in defence of freedom and all the values embodied in our shared national DNA. Congratulations to Mr Gary Elliott, along with his wife, Alma, and his team for dreaming and then finding a way to fulfil that dream. Well done, good and faithful servants. (Time expired)

Taxation

Dr LEIGH (Fenner) (13:41): On budget night the Treasurer said, 'From 1 July this year we will increase the upper limit for the middle-income tax bracket from $80,000 to $87,000 per year,' and then the Treasurer trampled to an election, stamping on the way the tax cut that he had promised to Australians earning over $80,000 a year. Today we have introduced into this House the legislation to give effect to this bipartisan tax cut. It could have been done before 1 July—it would have had support from the Labor Party—but the government chose not to do it. In today's bill we discover that the benefits of that tax cut from 1 July through to September will not come to Australians until after the end of the 2016-17 tax year.

This is another broken promise and another demonstration of the fact that the government are unable to implement the basic aspects of government. They cannot run a census. They cannot deliver an omnibus savings bill which actually has the maths done correctly. Now they have shown that they cannot deliver a bipartisan tax cut. If the Turnbull government cannot do the easy stuff, how can Australians think that they are going to be able to do the hard stuff? Australians should be rightly outraged by the fact that they are not getting this bipartisan tax cut simply as a result of the ineptitude of the Turnbull government.

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Mr ENTSCH (Leichhardt) (13:43): Australia has defeated tuberculosis but sadly it is still a reality in our regional neighbours, particularly in Papua New Guinea, which impacts on
communities in the Torres Strait in my electorate and in Cairns. But tuberculosis can be managed at home and overseas. The best way for Australia to help achieve this is by investing in the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Since 2002 the global fund has supported programs in over 100 countries and has saved 17 million lives and provided tuberculosis testing and treatment for 15 million people, half of these in the Asia-Pacific region.

On 16 September global fund investors will meet in Montreal to pledge to the fund's work for the next three years. The fund is seeking US$13 billion to save another eight million lives. For every dollar Australia invests the global fund ploughs $15 back into our region, which has 40 per cent of the global TB burden. The global fund's in-country investments stimulate national health systems towards financial self-sustainability. Numerous investors have already committed to maintain or increase their global fund pledges, including Japan, France, Canada and New Zealand. I am working closely with my colleagues in this place, on both sides of the House and on the crossbench, because Australia must also make a strong pledge and do the right thing. Let us seize the chance and end TB, AIDS and malaria for good. (Time expired)

Mathias, Mr David

Mrs ELLIOT (Richmond) (13:44): It was such a privilege last Saturday to present the French Legion of Honour to David Mathias, who is 90 years of age. He lives in Banora Point in my electorate of Richmond. The order is, of course, France's highest decoration and recognises his service as a signaller in the Royal British Navy. David Mathias was with the 50th Landing Craft Tank Flotilla, which was part of the landing force carrying soldiers and tanks to Utah Beach in the Normandy operations. He completed six such crossings from the UK to France.

It was such an honour to present the award to David, especially as so many of his family and friends were present. We also read a letter from the French embassy which included the following:

France will never forget the thousands of soldiers who came to fight on French battlefields & we still remain grateful today. It was in this regard that the President of the French Republic opened the Legion of Honour to WW2 veterans who risked their lives for the liberation of France.

Thanks so much to David Mathias for his service and thanks to his family, and in particular his wife, Ann, for inviting me to be a part of their very special occasion.

Following the war, Mr Mathias worked in London before moving to Australia in 1948 and eventually working on the Snowy Mountains Scheme. In 1961 he married the love of his life, Ann, and their family grew to include a son, daughter and six grandsons, many of whom were able to attend the wonderful service on Saturday. They retired to the beautiful North Coast of New South Wales in 1982 and David Mathias played a major role in the 50th anniversary commemoration of D-day in 1994 after he travelled to France with the then Prime Minister, Paul Keating. Thank you for your service.

Grey, Professor Jeffrey

Mr HASTIE (Canning) (13:46): Today I rise to honour the memory of the late Professor Jeffrey Grey, who sadly passed away on 26 July this year at the age of 57. Professor Jeffrey Grey taught military history at the University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence
Jeff was a gifted writer of history. He published many works, including the definitive *Military History of Australia*, but I believe his real impact was made on the lives of his students. Today I acknowledge his teaching legacy in this chamber and the service he rendered to this country in equipping many of our leaders in the Australian Defence Force to think deeply, critically and intelligently about war and conflict.

Jeff was a student of war and its consequences, not just for those directly involved in hostilities but also for the societies that send young people to fight on their behalf. Jeff was often a gruff man, but always with a twinkle in his eye, and beneath the exterior was a man who was generous and cared greatly for his students. For Jeff, war had consequences and future leaders had to be intimately aware of them. The Australian Defence Force is stronger because of Professor Jeffrey Grey. His legacy is carried on by the many leaders he taught over his life. I for one will always be thankful for the time he invested in me. To his family, I pass my condolences during this time of grief.

**Kingsford Smith Electorate: Surfing Walk of Fame**

**Mr THISTLETHWAITE** (Kingsford Smith) (13:47): I wish to congratulate Leigh McCleery, Gordon Merchant and Jon Donohoe on being inducted into the Australian Surfing Walk of Fame at Maroubra Beach at a ceremony on 24 July as part of the Beach Breaks junior surf carnival.

Gordon Merchant was a Maroubra grommet who grew up surfing at Maroubra and with his partner, Rena, began making board shorts on their kitchen table in 1973. They called their company Billabong and it went on to be one of the world's most successful surf labels. Gordon was made a Member of the Order of Australia in 2010 and continues to be a supporter of many medical, youth and marine conservation organisations—a worthy recipient of this honour.

Jon Donohoe won 10 Australian surf lifesaving titles and swam for Australia at the 1956 Olympics. He has been involved in surf lifesaving for 62 years, as an athlete, administrator and commentator. He was also made a Member of the Order of Australia and is Chairman of the Westpac Rescue Helicopter Service.

My good friend Leigh McCleery, better known as Leigh Habler, won numerous Australian surf lifesaving titles, represented Australia at the 1992 Olympics in swimming and was five times an Australian surf lifesaving team member and the first female captain of an Australian surf lifesaving team.

They are all worthy recipients. The culture of being around the ocean is strong in Kingsford Smith and these worthy recipients deserve these accolades. Thanks to Randwick City Council for continuing to support this initiative.

**Manufacturing**

**Ms HENDERSON** (Corangamite) (13:49): I rise to celebrate the significant investments the Turnbull government is making in local manufacturing across the Corangamite and Geelong regions. Last week I was joined by the Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Greg Hunt, to announce nearly $2.7 million in manufacturing grants to boost local jobs.
SNF Australia in Lara is investing a total of $22 million to develop a major liquid acrylamide plant to treat wastewater, supported by $2.17 million from our government's Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program, part of our $155 million Growth Fund.

After Australian Lamb Co.'s exciting announcement of a 10-year supply deal with Coles, one of Colac's biggest employers will receive $516,000 to support a new robotic-processing operation. In total, 37 new jobs will be created.

The minister and I also visited Ford's proving ground, a state-of-the-art global facility where Ford is investing another $10 million. Combined with its Research and Development Centre, Ford will continue to employ around 500 people in Geelong—engineers, designers, researchers and scientists. We are also very proud of the $250,000 which will go to an Advanced Fibre Cluster in conjunction with the Advanced Manufacturing Growth Centre at Deakin University's Waurn Ponds campus. These are all signs of the very strong investment the Turnbull government is making in manufacturing in our region.

**Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria**

Ms CLAYDON (Newcastle) (13:51): I rise to call on the Australian government to increase its financial support to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria for the period 2017 to 2019. At each of the previous two occasions of Global Fund replenishment, Australia made a contribution of $200 million. It is now time to increase our pledge so we can continue to work alongside government, civil society, the private sector and people affected by AIDS, TB and malaria to put an end to the world's worst epidemics.

By the end of this year, the Global Fund will have saved more than 22 million lives in more than 100 countries. Recent successes in our region include a near tripling in the number of people on antiretroviral therapy in PNG in the last five years, good progress on TB control in Fiji, and a tenfold increase in the number of insecticide-treated bed nets distributed throughout Bangladesh to protect against malaria. Since 2000, deaths from HIV, TB and malaria have fallen by more than 40 per cent, due in large part to the work of the Global Fund.

The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade's own figures show that for every dollar Australia committed to the Global Fund over the last period, it returned US$15 in our region alone, culminating in a total of US$2.9 billion. I call on the Turnbull Liberal government to show genuine leadership on this issue. There is no time to waste. *(Time expired)*

**Woolgoolga Curryfest**

Mr HOGAN (Page) (13:52): The Woolgoolga Curryfest is on again this year. The festival's history is firmly entrenched in Punjabi culture, which is so prevalent in our region, and it happens in September. The official program starts on Friday, 23 September with Bollywood on the beach. On the Saturday there is a full program of great entertainment. The fabulous Babas Band is performing again. There will be traditional and modern Indian music.

This year the event will host the inaugural 'State of Origin' bhangra dance competition with dancers competing to be crowned the Woolgoolga Curryfest bhangra dance champions. Local reggae band Ebb N Flo will also have the crowds up and moving. The colourful team from Kulturithmik will be performing their amazing dance routines on stage—and there will be much, much more. Obviously there will be many great food options available. I am a fan of butter chicken myself, but I may break out a bit while I am at the curry fest.

---

**CHAMBER**
There are many volunteer groups assisting—the Woolgoolga chamber of commerce, the Scouts, the Garden Club, the Rotary Club, Red Cross, athletics club, junior surf club, the art gallery and the Lions Club all play a big role. This is all made possible by the Curryfest committee. I would like to thank Tegan Ewart, Pam Fayle, Sherry Price, Carl Mower and Val Swan. I cannot wait for what is going to be a great event, and I encourage everyone to go along.

**Fox, Mr Warren**

Ms OWENS (Parramatta) (13:54): Last Friday was a very sad day for many members of the close-knit Granville community with the passing of Warren Fox, a well-known and respected Granville identity. Warren was known for his quick wit and love for his local community. He came from a family with deep, lasting connections to Granville. Warren had a love of punting that he shared with his close friends the Parkes family, most notably Larry, Blocka and Charles. Their discussions about the merits of the horses running each Saturday were often loud but based on a keen knowledge of the sport. He also had a passion for local history and painting; but he was best known for his care and attention to those he considered his seniors, helping less mobile residents with their shopping and daily tasks.

I first met Warren many years ago through his membership of the Granville central branch of the Labor Party. He joined in 1970 and was awarded life membership in 2011—not that you would know from speaking to him; he was remarkably modest. I am honoured to have enjoyed his support and have the benefit of his advice and assistance during campaigns and on issues that spiked his interest. Warren had a keen sense for hypocrisy and would waste no time in pointing out the facts as he saw them. He was a frequent caller to talkback radio, frequently calling in to Alan Jones and Ray Hadley. Unsurprisingly they did not always agree, but Warren was treated with and showed respect and manners reminiscent of another time. Warren will be sadly missed by his family and friends and those in the local backyard who loved him. I will also miss him dearly.

**Petrie Electorate: Infrastructure**

Mr HOWARTH (Petrie) (13:55): I rise today to congratulate all those responsible for the housewarming that was arranged to officially open the new stadium at Dolphin Oval in Redcliffe last Saturday night. It was an unforgettable housewarming for our new stadium, and, to really top the night off, the Redcliffe Dolphins won the game against the Tweed Head Seagulls by some 74 points to six, also wrapping up the minor premiership in what has been a stellar year.

I was approached by the Dolphins some two years ago, as they had vision and they needed funding to make this community benefit a reality. I was very pleased to secure some $4 million in Commonwealth funding to build the Des Webb stadium. The stadium is important infrastructure for our community. It will bring an added boost to tourism and, in addition to the 200 construction jobs, it will provide ongoing casual work opportunities for over 100 people, which is very important for senior people in my electorate of Petrie and also for younger people who are actively studying.

Investment in sport encourages people of all ages to be active, which reduces the burden on taxpayers in relation to preventative health. The opening of the Dolphins’ stadium was a wonderful celebration and an important milestone for the Dolphins club.
Indi Electorate: Galen Catholic College

Ms McGOWAN (Indi) (13:57): I would like to welcome to parliament today student leaders and two staff members from Galen Catholic College in Wangaratta. Captains Will Robinson and Kate Saunders, vice-captains Chloe and Will and teachers Laurie Burt and Tracey Walsh. I would like to acknowledge, honour and thank these young people and all the young people in my electorate who take on a leadership role in their schools. These young people tell me that Galen, with a population of 1,400, is a good school. There are so many opportunities, in a relaxed and productive way, to learn, to form good relationships and to learn the skills that they need to take their places in society. There are many opportunities, including leadership training 'Why Lead?'; immersion trips to Timor-Leste and Santa Teresa in the Northern Territory, exchange trips overseas, many activities for the arts, production, theatre and for singing, and opportunities for social justice work.

Today at lunch we discussed issues facing young people at schools in north-eastern Victoria. One of the particular issues we discussed was the broader anomalies that exist for young people in getting their licences and driving between New South Wales and Victoria—the different ages in getting your P plates and the different rules governing P plates. If we could do something at all in this House to create national road laws, it would make a big difference to young people. Congratulations, Galen! Welcome to Parliament House. I hope you return here often.

Mort, Mrs Shirley

Mr IRONS (Swan) (13:58): Shirley Mort is a resident of Rivervale in my electorate of Swan. Shirley has been a long-time volunteer and has now decided to retire at the age of 91. Shirley collected for the Salvation Army for 26 years at the Perth train station overpass, a corner that many know as 'Shirley's Spot' or 'Shirley's Corner'.

One of the things Shirley used to do when she got donations from children was to give them a small but cherished 'gift from Mrs Mort'—either a sticker or a colouring book—and she always greatly appreciated their donations. It is estimated that Shirley's efforts raised $1.7 million for the Salvation Army over the 26 years that she has been collecting at the Perth train station.

Shirley has been the Salvation Army's largest single collector during that period of time. She stood on the footbridge for about three days a week for about four hours per day. During that time, when she first started volunteering, Mrs Mort would wake up at 5 am six days a week, prepare hundreds of sandwiches and give them out to homeless people all around Perth. I would like to recognise Shirley Mort for her efforts for the homeless and the Salvation Army over the last 26 years.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with standing order 43, the time for members' statements has concluded.

STATEMENTS ON INDULGENCE
Rio de Janeiro Paralympic Games

Mr Turnbull (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:00): On behalf of the House, I would like to offer our best wishes to our Paralympic team bound for the 2016 Paralympic Games in Rio next week. The Paralympics has a special place in the hearts of all Australians and,
indeed, right around the world. There will be 178 Australians in the athletes' village, and they will compete in 16 sports. Whenever they step out in the green and gold, every time the starter's whistle is blown and at the finish line, 24 million Australians will be cheering them on. We know how hard each of our athletes has worked to get there.

I had the pleasure of addressing our Paralympians in June to wish them well on the road to Rio, and their spirit and their commitment inspires us all. Each of our Paralympians represent all that is great about our proud sporting nation, and we are reminded of the capacity of sport to inspire, to motivate and to bring out the best in all of us. Like all Australians, I am sure that we are looking forward to watching our athletes compete over the next two weeks. And I have no doubt, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, we wish today the very best of luck to our Paralympic team. We are all behind you.

Mr SHORTEN (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01): 'Spirit in motion' is our Paralympians' motto that they take to Rio. It is of great credit to the Australian Paralympic Committee and it should be a source of great national pride that Australia is sending a record team to this year's games. In winning the right to represent their country, each and every one of these elite athletes has already achieved tremendously. It is no exaggeration to say that, for every challenge an Olympian overcomes, a Paralympian faces and conquers it 10-times over. Only those closest to them—their parents, partners, coaches, mentors and teammates—truly know the courage and determination required to reach the pinnacle of the Paralympic Games. All Australians can unquestioningly admire our athletes' extraordinary feats of athleticism, fortitude and grace.

I am confident we will achieve great success in the pool, on the track, on the court and on the water, with medals in great numbers and of all colours. But there is much more for all of us here in Australia to gain and to learn. I was privileged to attend the Beijing Paralympics in 2008, and it opened my eyes to what the future could be, what the future should be. At the Paralympics, people of all abilities and of all nations mix together as equals. At the Paralympics you very soon stop looking at the impairment and instead see the whole person. What you see are elite athletes who happen to have an impairment. It is a lesson for all time. In the coming weeks, our Paralympians will not just inspire us; they will teach us. In doing so, they will make us all a bit more proud to be Australian.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
Banking and Financial Services

Ms CLAYDON (Newcastle) (14:03): My question is to the Prime Minister. Earlier today I met Michelle, a single mother with three children who lives in Newcastle. Michelle was talked into a mortgage she could not afford by a dodgy financial adviser. For the last five years, Michelle has worked three jobs around the clock to make her mortgage repayments and to keep her head above water. Will the Prime Minister explain to Michelle and the House why he continues to deny her a royal commission?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:04): I thank the honourable member for Newcastle for her question, and I can well understand the concern and the distress that her constituent has had having been given poor advice by this financial adviser. But I have to say to the honourable member that I imagine what her constituent seeks is compensation or recompense, that she seeks justice and some form of compensation for the losses she incurred.
Is the best that the Labor Party can do is offer her a royal commission? What is that going to do? Will that pay her back? No. She will get nothing. The Labor Party has embarked on a populous campaign that does nothing to support the honourable member's constituent. As she got to the end of that question I wonder whether it did not occur to her that the royal commission will be of no assistance to her constituent. It will not repay her at all. She has a debt and she needs to find some financial compensation. She needs to seek justice. What we have in place are ombudsman services. We have legal services. We have ASIC. We have a range of avenues that she can employ. I do not know what measures she has sought to undertake, but the one place she will achieve no compensation at all is in a royal commission. The only beneficiaries from a royal commission would be, frankly, the legal profession.

We all know what the problems are. The member for Newcastle's leaders opposite—the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Treasurer—between them held the offices in this government responsible for banks and financial services for the best part of six years. They know all about this. What did they do? Did they order a royal commission? No. To his credit, the Leader of the Opposition brought in reforms to the laws about financial advice. He sought to make changes. He recognised that the answers lay in changing the law. A royal commission can do nothing there. It cannot change a law, it cannot change a regulation, and more importantly—most importantly—the compassion you seek to offer to your constituent cannot be fulfilled by a royal commission, and you know that, and I suspect she does too.

Honourable members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Just before I call the next question, the level of interjections through the answer, as members well know—I am pointing out the obvious—was far too high. I will take action if it continues. I particularly caution, to my right, the members for Barker and Hume and, to my left, the member for Jagajaga—and the member for Kingston.

Budget

Mr WALLACE (Fisher) (14:07): My question is to the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister outline to the House why a responsible and disciplined approach to managing the nation's budget is vital to the economic security of Australians now and into the future?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:08): I thank the honourable member for his question. Like all of our members, he understands—and all members should understand this—that right at the heart of social justice is intergenerational equity. How can we say we are a fair nation if we are going to keep on living on the credit card of our children and grandchildren? How can we say that our nation is just if we keep on living beyond our means, lading our children and grandchildren with more and more debt, the only consequence of which will be, as we all know, that they will either have to pay vastly higher taxes or endure vastly diminished government services?

Dr Chalmers: You're big on equity! You just put $50 billion on the credit card for big business. A $50 billion tax cut will fix it!

The SPEAKER: The member for Rankin!

Mr TURNBULL: The task of budget repair, therefore, is a fundamental moral challenge. Our economy has proved strong and resilient. It has weathered many global shocks. But there are serious economic and global challenges ahead of us. The three ratings agencies have warned that walking away from budget repair will put serious pressure on our AAA credit
rating, which will make the cost of every loan in Australia higher. Those ratings agencies have made that concern very clear: an obstructionist parliament will risk a further deterioration in the budget position and a slower return to balance.

Dr Chalmers: What will the $50 billion do?

Mr TURNBULL: Like John Howard and Peter Costello before us, we must maintain a disciplined approach to budget repair.

Dr Chalmers: They destroyed the budget.

Mr TURNBULL: Only then will we be able to say we can respond to significant global shocks. And so the challenge for all of us is very clear: like the household budget, we have to balance our books by ensuring we do not spend more than we earn. Only then can we afford the standard of living that Australians expect.

Our agenda to address this challenge begins with our omnibus savings bill.

Dr Chalmers: Which one? There've been two already.

Mr TURNBULL: It includes 24 measures worth just under $6 billion, supported by those opposite during the election. If Labor's word means anything, they will support the bill.

Dr Chalmers: Which bills? There've been two in a day.

Mr TURNBULL: All we ask of the Labor Party is that they support the budget measures, the savings measures of ours that they appropriated for the purposes of their own campaign. If they do not, they will be walking away from the commitments they made to the Australian people. Only a strong economy, only a strong budget position, can ensure that Medicare, schools, pensions and all the other services that Australians expect from their government can be provided for, guaranteed and paid for.

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:11): The Leader of the Opposition continues on what the member for Lilley would describe as a crass populist campaign, one which offers nothing to Michelle—no compensation, no restitution, nothing. And yet, with all of his years as the financial services minister, buttressed by the shadow Treasurer with all of his years in the same portfolio, they come to this parliament and they come to the case of Michelle with not one practical idea that would deliver her or others similarly situated the compensation that they are seeking. There is no justice—simply a populist campaign for a royal commission which would sit for years, run up hundreds of millions of dollars in legal costs.
fees and then write a report, at the end of which—and throughout all of that time—action and reform would be delayed.

The difference is we are getting on with the job. We are getting on with the job of ensuring that there are better mechanisms for Michelle to resolve the challenges she has with the financial services industry, with the banks and with planners, ensuring that there is better regulation, better supervision and better means of mediation and resolving small claims. That is why Professor Ramsay is undertaking his review of the various small claims ombudsman agencies, with a view to bringing them together into a more effective tribunal that can achieve better outcomes for people like Michelle.

I said yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition is like a latter-day Jack Lang, taking on the banks—a heroic advocate for the people, taking on the big end of town. I think he is getting so carried away with himself he sees himself rather like the image of Liberty in that great Delacroix painting Liberty Leading the People, the tricolour in one hand, the musket in the other. There he is, trampling over the barricades, freeing the people from their wrongs, taking on the banks.

This is a hopeless, hopelessly populist political campaign.

He is exploiting the suffering of people like Michelle; exploiting the suffering of people who have been done badly by the banks; exploiting the suffering of people who were ripped off, for example, in the big financial collapses that occurred during the last Labor government. Timbercorp, Great Southern Group, Willmott Forests—all of these failures of these managed investment schemes occurred during the Labor government. What did that minister do when he was the minister? He made no attempt to set up a royal commission and he said it was well-regulated. The reality is that populism will not help Michelle; action will, and that is what we are undertaking. (Time expired)

Fiscal Policy

Mr TED O'BRIEN (Fairfax) (14:15): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer outline to the House why we must arrest debt and reduce deficits by taking responsible fiscal decisions to balance the budget? Is the Treasurer aware of any alternative views?

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Treasurer) (14:15): I thank the member for Fairfax for his question. I congratulate him on his election to the House of Representatives to be here as part of a returned Turnbull coalition government after our success at the last election. We took to the election a plan for economic growth—a clear national plan for economic growth and jobs—that was endorsed by the Australian people, and they have sent us here for that purpose. This is a term of delivery, and that delivery has already commenced.

Today, the excessive surcharging for debit and credit cards ends. It is banned from today as a result of the actions of this Turnbull government. When consumers are going off and paying with their credit cards or debit cards, when they are going to the football final or something, those excessive card surcharges end today as a result of the delivery of this government.

There are tax cuts for small businesses in particular but also for households and ordinary wage earners. The bill for that was introduced to the parliament today as part of our economic plan, and we are getting on with delivery.

I am asked about the need to arrest the debt because that is the great challenge for this government and for this parliament. We must arrest this debt, which today stands at $430
billion because of the enormous debt burden that we inherited from those opposite. It was not bad enough to gift us the debt. In the last term they engaged in budget sabotage every single week, and we are seeing them doing the same thing as they come back at the start of this parliament seeking to disrupt the parliament and the delivery of this government's programs after our re-election. That sabotage has already cost the Australian people $10 billion in higher debt, as those opposite have delayed budget savings measures over the last three years. But they have an opportunity to fix that with the omnibus bill. The omnibus bill will deliver savings that will save us, in increased debt, $30 billion over the next 10 years. They have the opportunity to support those measures.

That is just the start, because we have $40 billion in budget improvement measures that we are putting before this parliament. All of those measures in the omnibus bill are measures those opposite put into their costings. They put them into their costings. But the former shadow minister for finance and the shadow Treasurer clearly did not tell all the rest of them, because now they seek to undermine them in supporting the measures they put to the Australian people.

What we know on this side is that higher taxes, higher debts and higher deficits are no road to prosperity, but that is the path that those opposite would seek to take this country on.

**Banking and Financial Services**

**Ms TEMPLEMAN** (Macquarie) (14:18): My question is to the Prime Minister. Dwayne and Jenny live in the member for Warringah's electorate. They were advised by a finance broker to borrow $500,000 against the value of their home and put it into dodgy investments. Dwayne and Jenny have spent the past seven years struggling to stay afloat and fighting to save their one remaining asset: the family home. Will the Prime Minister explain to Dwayne and Jenny why he refuses to listen to victims like them, who are calling for a royal commission? *(Time expired)*

**Mr MORRISON** (Cook—Treasurer) (14:19): I thank the Prime Minister for the opportunity to respond. I would be very grateful if the member for Macquarie could provide the details of Dwayne and Jenny. We would be very happy to have a look at the case issues that she is raising. The Minister for Revenue and Financial Services, I am sure, will take that forward. I would seek commitment from the members of the opposition to provide those details.

I noticed in the member's question that she referred to Dwayne and Jenny having been dealing with this for seven years. Seven years, Mr Speaker! This government has been in power for three years, not seven years. I know that Senator Gallagher said today that others she had met with have been 'arguing for years—eight to 10 years … for some sense of justice'. During that period of time, when they were arguing for this, this is what the Leader of the Opposition said in relation to our banking and financial system and what was necessary:

… the Australian 'twin peaks' regulation model has worked very well and continues to work.

He said on another occasion:

… Australia has some of the best banks in the world.

The shadow Treasurer, back when he was the Assistant Treasurer, said:

The standard they set is world's best practice.
I do not know what comfort that was to Dwayne and Jenny at the time when they were struggling as the member has said, but clearly there was nothing being done by those opposite when they sat on these benches.

By contrast, rather than offer Dwayne and Jenny the crass populist approach of the Leader of the Opposition—who has only had one interest in this issue since he started, and that is to pursue his own political gain and not to pursue the genuine interests of Dwayne and Jenny or any of the others who have had serious cases—we have the great work of the parliamentary joint committee and members on this side of the House in pursuing cases. Those cases are now being referred to the Small Business Ombudsman for specific review. On top of that, there is the Financial System Inquiry, which has dealt with the system-wide changes we need to make to the financial system. Those changes are already being delivered. On top of that there is Professor Ramsay's review, which will look at how we can have more of a small claims tribunal process so that the Dwaynes and Jennys of the future will be able to get their cases heard.

Now, what this government is doing is addressing those concerns. What the leader of the opposition is doing is just using those concerns and using those constituents' genuine issues to promote his own crass, populist agenda. That is not in the national interest.

**Mayo Electorate**

Ms SHARKIE (Mayo) (14:22): My question is to the Prime Minister. Prime Minister: the people of Mayo were made a series of funding commitments by the government during the recent election campaign, such as $14 million for road infrastructure, $3.7 million for the Mount Barker Regional Sports Hub, $500,000 for the Victor Harbour RSL and a mobile phone tower for Stokes Bay on Kangaroo Island. Will the Prime Minister confirm that all of the election commitments made to Mayo will be honoured during this term of the parliament?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for her first question in this House. The government will deliver on all of its local election commitments, including to the people of Mayo.

The people of Mayo will also benefit from the government's national economic plan. In the electorate of Mayo there are over 20,000 small businesses with a turnover of less than $10 million that will benefit from lower tax rates or increased concessions this tax year. The honourable member's constituents are already benefiting from the rollout of the NBN. Approximately 37,600 homes and businesses can connect and over 16,432 have an active NBN broadband service in Mayo. By the end of 2018 approximately 86,000 homes and businesses will either be able to connect to the NBN or will have services under construction.

The government will deliver its promise to extend the mobile black spot program in Mayo and will invite mobile network operators to bid for funding to provide coverage to Ashbourne and Kangaroo Island. Our commitments to Mayo will help boost the local economy, support local communities and provide more jobs. We will improve road infrastructure by investing $14 million to upgrade roads between Lobethal and Mount Barker. These commitments include $3.75 million for the Mount Barker Regional Sports Hub to deliver first-class sport and function facilities for the local community and half a million dollars towards the Victor Harbour community facility.
We will also deliver on our commitment to upgrade sporting facilities for Strathalbyn Football Club, the Adelaide Hills Hawks Soccer Club and Yankalilla Hockey Club. And we will deliver on our commitment to improve the local environment in Mayo. These will include two new Green Army projects for the Lower Lakes and the Adelaide Hills, and more support for community groups to install solar and battery storage.

The government will deliver for all of the people of Australia and, indeed, the people of Mayo in this 45th Parliament. We will honour our election commitment and deliver on the strong, clear economic leadership that we took to the election and that was endorsed by the Australian people.

Agriculture Exports

Mr HOGAN (Page) (14:25): My question is to the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources. Will the minister update the House on how the government is growing the economy by securing export markets for the agricultural sector? And is the minister aware of any alternative policies?

Mr JOYCE (New England—Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for his question and I commend the honourable member for the work he has done with our department in securing a further $1 million for Beef Week in Casino, because we know how important beef is to our economy. We have record prices in cattle at the moment. We are continuing to drive markets. In fact, even in recent days we have reopened the live cattle trade to Japan, which is also going to bring further returns to our nation.

The member would also be aware of the great work that has been done in the horticultural industry. Between our two seats there are Drake and Tabulam—the blueberry industry, employing in a season up to a thousand workers. That is actually also going to add to the economy of this nation and help deal with some of the economic issues that the Treasurer so rightly points out.

We continue to work on expanding our agricultural exports, so much so that agricultural exports are now the second-biggest exports after iron ore. To go through them section by section would take vastly more time than we have here, but even if we look anecdotally at some of the smaller areas: in table grapes to Japan, we have had record exports in April at 32,587 tonnes. This market is up more than 400 per cent from where it was last year. We have the protocols through for exports of melons and pumpkins, and this continues to add to our agricultural exports.

We see that we have record prices in goat, in lemons, in mutton, in bananas, in lamb and in sugar—all turning around. Pork, which has been doing it so tough in the past, is now getting back to record prices. Wool also is seeing a turnaround. We keep working hard because we know that it is not only how we help people on the land; it is how we help our nation's economy.

Now, the member asked for alternative policies. At the previous election the opposition went forward with 100 positive policies. And do you know, Mr Speaker, how many of them had anything to do with agriculture? Not one! Not one policy had anything to do with agriculture. Not one! They have no vision on agriculture. What they need is someone with a bit of entrepreneurial flair.
Opposition members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

Mr JOYCE: They need someone with a bit of entrepreneurial flair. They need someone with a little bit of pizzazz! They need somebody who has the capacity to find the loot! They have to find the loot. They need Senator Sam Dastyari! That's who they need—someone who has the capacity to see round the corners, to get round those difficult corners. They need a Captain Thunderbolt of politics.

That's what they need—they need some pizzazz in agriculture, and this is a role that I think Senator Sam Dastyari could well play for you!

Mr Fitzgibbon: You're obsessed! You're obsessed with Sam! What's going on there?

The SPEAKER: The member for Hunter will cease interjecting.

Mr Rob Mitchell interjecting—

The SPEAKER: As will the member for McEwen.

Banking and Financial Services

Ms PLIBERSEK (Sydney—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Prime Minister. Victims of bank rip-offs support a royal commission, the Senate has voted to establish a royal commission and even members of the Prime Minister's own backbench are still threatening to cross the floor to support a royal commission. When will the Prime Minister stop running a protection racket for the banks, stop insulting and lecturing victims, telling them what they want, and finally establish a royal commission?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:29): Does the honourable member really imagine that a royal commission is something the banks would be afraid of? Does she really imagine that the banks, with all of their resources, with all of their lawyers, will not be equal to a royal commission? Does she really imagine that Michelle, from Newcastle, and Dwayne and Jenny will be able to afford the legal representation to defend themselves, to make their claims in a royal commission? A royal commission will be a forum for the legal profession. It will go on for years, it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars and it will not tell us anything new.

Take the case of Dwayne and Jenny. The honourable member made only a brief question, but I gather that Dwayne and Jenny were given poor advice by a financial planner. Well, we know what happened there. They were given poor advice. That is what a royal commission would find. So what are the issues? Can Dwayne and Jenny recover compensation from the financial planner? That is a matter of law. Is it likely to happen again? Should we change regulations? Yes, we should, and we are doing that.

So the fundamental problem is that the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy present us with these cases where we know precisely what happened. We know there was poor advice. Sometimes the advice was conflicted. Sometimes banks were careless or reckless. Sometimes they knowingly acted wrongfully in giving that bad advice. But we know all of that, and what we are doing is setting in place the measures to ensure it does not happen again. What we are doing is setting in place the structures that will ensure Dwayne and Jenny and Michelle will be able to resolve their differences with the banks, notwithstanding that they do not have the armies of lawyers and barristers to defend themselves and press their case.
What we are offering is practical solutions. It is extraordinary that here the Labor Party is so cynical, so populist, that it wants to exploit the real problems of Michelle and Dwayne and Jenny and say to them that the solution is a royal commission. It will cost hundreds of millions of dollars—not paid to Dwayne and Jenny, not paid to Michelle, but paid to the legal profession—and it will go on for years and years. And then what will it tell them? It will tell Michelle that she got bad advice from a mortgage broker. It will tell Dwayne and Jenny that they got bad advice from a financial adviser. And it will not compensate them one cent. What a cynical racket the Labor Party is running, exploiting the misery of others! (Time expired)

**Global Security**

**Mr ANDREWS** (Menzies) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Will the minister update the House on the threat posed by foreign terrorist fighters and the government's response to this threat?

**Ms JULIE BISHOP** (Curtin—Minister for Foreign Affairs) (14:33): I thank the member for Menzies for his question. I acknowledge his concern about the threat posed by Islamic extremist terrorist organisations such as Daesh—or ISIL, as it is known. As the Prime Minister advised the House this morning, the threat from Daesh is one of the most immediate security challenges facing Australia. The disturbing frequency of attacks in recent months directed or inspired by ISIL/Daesh—in France, Turkey, Iraq, Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Indonesia—demonstrates that this is a global, regional and domestic challenge.

Around 110 Australians are overseas fighting with or supporting groups like ISIL/Daesh and as many as 65 Australians have been killed. No one country can counter the threat of ISIL alone. This is why Australia remains a significant contributor to the international military coalition in Iraq and Syria. We are committed to combating this terrorist organisation at its source. With Australian support, this campaign is making progress. ISIL's territorial hold is being reversed. The group has lost 50 per cent of the territory it once controlled in Iraq, and 20 per cent in Syria, and the group's leadership ranks are being successfully targeted. Indeed, most recently, one of the terrorist leaders in Syria, al-Adnani, described by the Pentagon as 'a principal architect of ISIL's external operations', was killed in Syria, a significant blow to the terrorists. I take the opportunity to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his in-principle support for the government's changes to Australia's policy on targeting enemy combatants.

Australia is playing its part also in preventing our citizens from travelling to the battlefields in Iraq and Syria. To date, I have cancelled around 180 passports, refused 24 and suspended a further 33. We are equally active and committed to combating the threat from violent Islamic extremism in our own region, where ISIL's growing influence is a serious concern. We are working with partners in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore. We are improving border security measures to detect and disrupt foreign fighter travel. We are redoubling our efforts to counter extremist messaging, and improving the management of prisons and terrorist prisoners. We are also working with other nations in the region to cut off the financial support to ISIL. So the government continues to take all necessary steps to counter the threat from terrorists, to combat the terrorist organisations and to keep Australia's safe and secure wherever they may be.
Mr SHORTEN (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question is to the Prime Minister. The member for Warringah met Senator Hanson yesterday to discuss the government's agenda. Was the member for Warringah commissioned by the Prime Minister to conduct these negotiations or was he acting of his own initiative?

Mr Pyne: Mr Speaker, questions to ministers and the Prime Minister need to be within their areas of responsibility, and, while the Prime Minister's responsibilities are very broad, they do not run to the motivation for people—

Honourable members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House will resume his seat. The Manager of Opposition Business will resume his seat. The level of interjections prevented me from hearing the Leader of the House. This is not the way for the House to conduct itself. I had asked the member for Hughes already to cease interjecting, and he interjected right through the Leader of the House, preventing me hearing him. He can leave under 94(a).

The member for Hughes then left the chamber.

The SPEAKER: I would like the Leader of the House to make his point of order without interruption.

Mr Pyne: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, questions to ministers and the Prime Minister need to be within their areas of responsibility, and, while the Prime Minister's areas of responsibility are broad, they do not go to the motivations for why individual members or senators have cups of tea.

Mr Husic: Or dinners at Wild Duck!

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

The member for Chifley then left the chamber.

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker, to the point of order: the question asked quite specifically whether the Prime Minister commissioned the member for Warringah to conduct those negotiations. Surely the Prime Minister is in charge of who he commissions to conduct negotiations.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House.

Mr Pyne: It is just spurious conjecture, Mr Speaker, and it is quite clearly ruled out under the standing orders. It is utterly hypothetical and it should not be allowed to stand.

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat. The preamble was certainly out of order. I could easily rule the question out of order, but I have said previously that, where we can, I would prefer free-flowing debate. There was one specific question there about whether the Prime Minister had commissioned another member. I will allow the Prime Minister the opportunity to answer it in any way he sees fit, of course.

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:39): The answer to the honourable member's question is no.
**Defence Industry**

**Mr TIM WILSON** (Goldstein) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industry. The people of Goldstein are very interested in defence and economic security. Will the minister inform the House why a sovereign defence industry capability is vital to Australia's national security and international interests, and is he aware of any other approach?

**Mr PYNE** (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (14:39): I thank the member for Goldstein for his question. It is a very important point. This government, of course, made defence industry one of the fundamental inputs to capability for the very reasons that he enunciated. It is vital to build our sovereign capability in defence industry to truly protect our national security and promote our international interests. To play our part in maintaining an international rules based order, we need to maintain our role as a strategic regional power, and to do that we need a sovereign defence industry capability.

For example, we have a vital national interest in ensuring free passage for our trade and commerce through the South China Sea. This has been a bipartisan issue in recent years, but I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition agrees with this statement:

The South China Sea is China's own affair. On this issue, Australia should remain neutral and respect China's decision.

That statement was made by Senator Sam Dastyari, who is the Manager of Opposition Business in the Senate and the shadow minister for consumer affairs. He is not simply a backbencher on either side of a parliament. He holds an executive role in the opposition and, if the opposition were to be elected to government, he would be a minister in a Labor government and presumably the Leader of the Government in the Senate. It is contrary to Labor Party policy, it is contrary to the government's policy, and it is contrary to our national security and to our international interests. It does not endorse an international rules based order.

So the Leader of the Opposition needs to explain to the House or to the people, through the press, when he became aware that a business with links to the Chinese government had paid Senator Dastyari's personal debts. He needs to explain what action he took at that time and whether he is satisfied with Senator Dastyari's response to the revelations that occurred this week. Until he does that, this matter will not go away. The Leader of the Opposition needs to take responsibility for his frontbench, who are issuing contrary views to Labor policy, and it has now been revealed that the motivation for those views may be the fact that a business with links to the Chinese government paid that senator's personal debts.

**Turnbull Government**

**Mr BURKE** (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (14:42): My question is to the Prime Minister. Senator Pauline Hanson and the member for Warringah met yesterday. After the meeting, Senator Hanson stated: 'Tony and I had a frank discussion about various bills coming up. He gave his considered opinion with regards to them.' Given the meeting goes directly to the government's agenda, has the member for Warringah conveyed a report of the outcome of the meeting to the Prime Minister?

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the House.
Mr Pyne: Mr Speaker, the Prime Minister is not responsible for the opinions of other members of parliament, particularly those on the back bench. Therefore, how on earth can he answer these questions and why on earth would anyone expect the member for Warringah or any other member to make notes of their discussions with other members of parliament and provide them to the Prime Minister? Allowing this question to be asked sets a very dangerous precedent, because it means that the Prime Minister is apparently responsible for private conversations between individual members of parliament, and that is obviously not in order.

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: I will hear the Manager of Opposition Business.

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker, the precedent which is set by this question is whether or not we are allowed to ask the Prime Minister what reports he has received. That is the question that is being asked and that must be in order.

The SPEAKER: The Manager of Opposition Business will resume his seat. I did allow the last question. I said it was line-ball. Many speakers would have ruled it out of order. The Prime Minister is responsible for his ministry. The Prime Minister is not responsible for other members of parliament, those who are not part of the executive, and I am not going to rule this question in order. The Prime Minister has answered the previous question—I allowed that—but I am not going to rule this question in order. I think it would lead to a whole range of questions of a fishing expedition on 150 members of the House of Representatives. That is my ruling.

Mr Burke: It is more likely to be on one!

The SPEAKER: Well, I am not going to enter into any commentary, and I do not think it is a question that is capable of being rephrased, given my ruling, so I am going to move to the next question.

National Security

Ms FLINT (Boothby) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection. Will the minister update the House on the important role Border Protection plays in securing our great nation? Why is it important to always put our national interest first?

Mr DUTTON (Dickson—Minister for Immigration and Border Protection) (14:44): I thank the honourable member very much for her question. She is a very accomplished person and will make a great contribution in this parliament.

Obviously, we are all working closely with our intelligence and law enforcement agencies, and that is certainly the case for Border Force. We have CTU officers at our eight international airports—in fact, 100 officers now. The threat is real, and government and opposition—every member, particularly senior members—need to act in our nation's best interests. It is inconceivable that any person in this place could fall under the spell of any foreign national.

It is funny, because during the break I watched a great TV miniseries by Chris Uhlmann and Steve Lewis called Secret City. It was a six-episode series. It was filmed in this very building, as it turns out, and it was based around a character called Mal Paxton. He was a defence minister in a Labor government. He was very familiar. He had close contact with a foreign national and was influenced by this foreign national, perhaps even to the extent of
accepting financial payments. He even changed his position on national security policy, as I recall. It was a great watch, and congratulations to Chris Uhlmann and to Steve Lewis!

I thought it was a fictional plot. I thought it went a bit far. But it turns out that it may have been a documentary, because imagine my surprise when I read that Senator Sam Dastyari had received a payment from a third party and had changed his view, and expressed a different view from that of his own party, on national security policy.

Ironically, the first episode within this six-episode series by Mr Uhlmann and Mr Lewis was called 'A donation to the struggle'. Another episode was called 'Ghosts in the machine'. But my favourite episode was 'Falling hard', and if this Leader of the Opposition has any leadership skill at all then that is exactly what will happen to Senator Sam Dastyari.

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

Mr Burke: I seek leave to table photographs of Senator Brandis with the same person, of the Prime Minister with the same person, or a list of political donations to the Liberal Party—any one of the three will do.

Leave not granted.

Economy

Dr CHALMERS (Rankin) (14:47): My question is to the Treasurer. Last week, in a speech to The Sydney Institute, the finance minister said there would be $6.5 billion in savings in the omnibus bill. Yesterday, during question time, the Treasurer said it was $6.1 billion, but by later that afternoon he had lost another $107 million. What will the number be next week, and isn't this 'omnishambles' just more evidence that this bumbling Treasurer is completely incompetent?

Government members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Members on my right! The Treasurer does not have the call because the level of interjections is far too high.

Mr Frydenberg interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Minister for the Environment and Energy is denying the Treasurer the call. The minister will cease interjecting. The Treasurer has the call.

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Treasurer) (14:48): I thank the member for his question. I refer him to my statement to the House yesterday and the revised explanatory memorandum for the bill to which I refer. But I have to update him on something else. At the last election the Labor Party put forward their fiscal plan and they claimed that an increased deficit—

Mr Burke interjecting—

Mr MORRISON: You are going to interrupt me again. It is a common tactic.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Manager of Opposition Business, I remind him that the Treasurer is about 20 seconds into his answer, so he will need to state very clearly what the standing order is.

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker, you will appreciate we have very rarely been calling on the relevance point of order, but it is a bit of a giveaway when he says, 'Let me talk about something else.'
The SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, I have not called you yet. I appreciate your statement that you have not been calling points of order on relevance in the one question time we have had. I now give you the call. Is your point of order relevance?

Mr Burke: Yes.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The Manager of Opposition Business will resume his seat. There is no point of order.

Mr Burke: He said he wanted to talk about—

The SPEAKER: You do not have the call. The Manager of Opposition Business will resume his seat or he will be going for a walk. The Treasurer has the call.

Mr MORRISON: I was asked about the omnibus bill. The omnibus bill contains the measures that those opposite put in their forward estimates before the last election, and that is what I am referring to. Despite the fact that they had supported some $6 billion in savings, which are included in that bill, they went to the election claiming, in the fiscal summary they issued before the election, that the deficit would be no worse than $16.472 billion.

I have gone back to what the Parliamentary Budget Office actually reported after the election, and it turns out it was not quite as good as that. In fact, it was $16.6 billion. Those opposite, while they like to dwell on these matters, may wish to reflect on their own contributions to these issues. Going to the last election they said that they thought the best plan for Australia was to increase the deficit by $16.5 billion. They told the Australian people that. It turns out it was $16.6 billion, and there is a great and terrible risk of the approach that Labor was putting forward.

That is our view, but it is not just our view. Saul Eslake, an economist respected by those on that side of the House, said:

…it hardly seems sensible for a would-be Labor government to tolerate a significantly greater budget deficit over the next four years.

He also said, 'They are potentially risking the AAA credit rating if they outline significantly bigger deficits.' Now, that is exactly what they did.

Those opposite present a AAA threat to our economy, because they believe in higher taxes, higher spending and higher debt. The burden is on those opposite. Those savings are set out in that bill, which is the first of many bills that will come through this parliament that are designed to do one thing, arrest the debt. The Turnbull government is committed to arresting the debt that was left to us by those opposite, but those opposite have sat on that side of the House every single day and worked against us as we try to deal with the debt that they gifted to this government.

Broadband

Mr COLEMAN (Banks) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Urban Infrastructure, representing the Minister for Communications. Will the minister update the House on the strong progress of the NBN rollout under the Turnbull government?

Mr FLETCHER (Bradfield—Minister for Urban Infrastructure) (14:53): I thank the member for Banks, who is a very strong advocate for his electorate and a very strong
advocate for the National Broadband Network, where by September 2018 there will be some 36,760 homes where the NBN is either under construction or ready for service. That would be a good performance in any situation, but when you look at the extraordinary mess we inherited from those opposite you see it is an impressive performance. Our friends opposite managed to spend $6 billion in 6½ years. They started with a plan written on the back of a beer coaster by those two financial geniuses Kevin Rudd and Stephen Conroy. In fact, the former Prime Minister, Mr Rudd, thought it was such a good financial opportunity he recommended that there should be infrastructure bonds and that mums and dads should invest in these bonds. After 6½ years, how many premises around Australia were connected? They had 6½ years and 51,000 was all they managed to do.

The opposition leader has been throwing around that term 'stuff-up' fairly freely recently. If you want to see a rolled gold example of a stuff-up, look at what this lot did with the National Broadband Network. What did we do when we came to government under the leadership of the then Minister for Communications and now Prime Minister? We set about fixing it. We put in place a competent board, led by Ziggy Switkowski. We put in place a world-class CEO, Bill Morrow. We introduced a sensible business strategy, the multi-technology mix. We introduced a transparent process under which the rollout numbers were reported online every week. That never happened under that lot opposite, because they had a lot to hide.

The results speak for themselves. Over three million premises around Australia can be connected. We are connecting more than 50,000 premises a month. That is the same number in one month that Labor took six years of government to achieve. In the financial year 2016 the number of homes able to connect doubled from 1.2 million to 2.9 million, beating the corporate plan, and revenue was $421 million, beating the corporate plan. Compared with the period under Labor, when NBN regularly missed its targets, we have a clear, consistent plan to deliver the NBN. We are executing against the plan. We are on target to complete the build by 2020. The Turnbull government is delivering. That is what competent delivery is about.

**Economy**

Mr BOWEN (McMahon) (14:56): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer confirm his omnibus bill had a $107 billion black hole? Given the Treasurer cannot add up, got rolled on negative gearing changes and has delayed his superannuation changes to the never-never because he cannot get some through his party room, Treasurer, how does it feel to be worse at your job than Joe Hockey?

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Treasurer) (14:56): I thank the member for his question and I refer him again to the statement I made on the omnibus bill savings yesterday. What those opposite seem to fail to grasp is that they took to the Australian people at the last election—

*An honourable member interjecting—*

Mr MORRISON: I welcome questions on debt and deficit. They took to the Australian people at the last election a plan to increase the debt and deficit of this country by $60.6 billion. That is what they took to the Australian people. They said to the Australian people, as our economy is going through transition from the investment phase of the mining boom into a broader based economy, that they thought the best thing they could do to turn around investment in this country, boost small business, get people employed and earning more was
to tax them more and increase the debt and the deficit. That is what they thought was the right plan and the way forward for this country.

The Australian people rejected that and they rejected those opposite because they have no economic plan for the future. What this government is doing in this budget is taking the decisions to ensure that we can bring the budget back to balance. We have put measures in the House to ensure that that can be achieved. Those measures include important reforms. Whether they are the changes we are making to make superannuation fairer and more flexible and to be there in the future, whether they are the changes we are making to get young people into work through our youth path program, whether they are the changes we are making to income tax to ensure that those on average ordinary time earnings do not go into the second-highest tax bracket, whether it is that small businesses with turnover of between $2 million and $10 million do not pay higher rates of tax but pay lower rates of tax and get access to more concessions, they are the things that this government is doing and is bringing through the House.

What we see opposite are those who like to have a good whinge about these issues but have no plans to address them. What they like to do is whip up populism and give the impression of doing things but, they actually do none of the above. I suggest those opposite take a closer look at the inadequacy of their own economic policies and support the policies of this government, which are putting us back on the road. If that is not achieved, if we go forward and our debt is not arrested, those who will come after us in this place will have to put higher taxes on people who are growing up in this country. They will not be able to depend on service, because this parliament did not step up to the plate and support the measures that are necessary to arrest the debt and provide for the future generations who rely on this parliament to do its job now. The challenge is on those opposite to support the government's path and plan for economic recovery and fiscal reform.

Mackay Ring Road

Mr CHRISTENSEN (Dawson—Chief Nationals Whip) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister update the House with the long-awaited news that initial works on the Mackay Ring Road stage 1—the biggest infrastructure project that Mackay, in my electorate of Dawson, has ever seen—is about to begin?

Mr CHESTER (Gippsland—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport) (15:00): I thank the member for Dawson for his question and I recognise his passionate advocacy for his community. I also congratulate him on his great win in the election. He is a real champion and a real giant of the Liberal-National Party in central Queensland. Can I also say that the Turnbull-Joyce government is getting on with the job of delivering the infrastructure that Australia needs. This is a Prime Minister, this is a cabinet and, in fact, this is a backbench that understands that when you invest in good infrastructure, you can change people's lives and you can save people's lives. We talk about changing people's lives by reducing congestion and getting them home to their families sooner and improving productivity but you are also saving people's lives by engineering treatments on roads, which reduces road trauma.

This is a government that has a record $50 billion infrastructure investment program and $6.7 billion of that is going to the Bruce Highway; $558 million that is going to Queensland this year. We are fixing the Bruce Highway, because we love the Bruce Highway on our side of the House. Right along the Bruce Highway, we have the member for Dickson and the
members for Fairfax, Fisher, Wide Bay, Hinkler, Flynn, Capricornia, Dawson, and Leichhardt. They are all champions for the Bruce Highway because they understand that if we invest in the highway, then we change people's lives and we save people's lives.

Mr Albanese interjecting—

Mr CHESTER: The member for Grayndler is interjecting. He has been a forlorn figure of late. I like the member for Grayndler and I feel his pain. He yearns for those glory days of the Albo era, those glorious 83 days as Deputy Prime Minister! The sun shone brighter, the honey tasted sweeter and the Rabbitohs won every week. If you listen to the member for Grayndler, he built everything in those 83 days; but we know that he is delusional. We know that he is not the father of modern Australia, because we are getting on with the job of delivering this $50 billion investment program.

The member for Dawson referred to the Mackay Ring Road. It has now been finalised and the initial works will be commencing shortly. The federal government is providing 80 per cent of the funding for that project—$448 million—with the total cost of the project being $565 million. The member for Dawson has been advocating for this project for many years and I congratulate him on the success he has had. This is a major infrastructure project which will deliver for the Mackay region for many years to come. There will be jobs during the construction period but also improvements in terms of freight, productivity and safety for local residents.

I congratulate the member for Dawson again on his advocacy, and I look forward to working with members on both sides of House as we deliver hundreds of projects across the next three years across the length and breadth of Australia. This is a government which is building our nation's future. We are investing in our nation's future because we have a strong economic plan. I urge those opposite, rather than carping and harping on needlessly, to work with the government as we invest in our nation's future, as we build an nation's future, as we build our strong economic plan and as we deliver over the next three years. I urge those opposite to support us and to get on board with the government. It is great plan for the future of Australia.

Superannuation

Mr SHORTEN (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My question is to the Prime Minister. I refer to the Prime Minister's ironclad superannuation policies that will see a $500,000 lifetime non-concessional contribution cap applying from 1 July 2007. Prime Minister, as your new changes to super apply to investment decisions made 10 years ago, in good faith and under previous laws, how is this change not retrospective?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (15:03): The honourable member would be well aware that a retrospective change to the tax laws is one which has the result that a transaction in a past tax year, which was not taxed or which incurred a particular rate of tax, is—because of the retrospective law—subject to a different, and typically a higher, rate of tax. There is no retrospectivity in the proposed changes to the non-concessional cap whatsoever.

Moreton Bay Rail Link

Mr HOWARTH (Petrie) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Urban Infrastructure. Will the minister please update the House on the progress of the Moreton Bay Rail Link and how the Turnbull government is delivering on this vital billion dollar infrastructure?
Mr FLETCHER (Bradfield—Minister for Urban Infrastructure) (15:04): I am very pleased to have this opportunity to answer the question from the member for Petrie. He has been a longstanding champion of the Moreton Bay Rail Link and he has been a longstanding advocate for this remarkable project, which is going to transform the lives of his constituents.

I was very pleased to have the opportunity to visit Mango Hill station with the member for Petrie in November 2015. We looked at the progress on this very important piece of infrastructure. We met the members of the Mango Hill Progress Association and they are very pleased because this is progress. It is officially opening on 3 October this year. This 12.6 kilometre line will link Petrie and Kippa-Ring with six new stations along the line. This is a very significant breakthrough for the member for Petrie's constituents. He has really been a traffic advocate for this project and he has been particularly strong in delivering the financial commitment that has been so key to getting this done.

It is quite instructive to look at the numbers because the member for Grayndler is determined to claim credit for this, along with his unlimited capacity to claim credit for every piece of infrastructure ever built. The numbers are extremely instructive. There is $595 million of Commonwealth funding and only $65 million dollars was paid by the previous government before they left office. Around 90 per cent of the funding was provided by a coalition government for the Moreton Bay Rail Link. The advocacy and the leadership of the member for Petrie has been absolutely critical to delivering that outcome.

The member for Grayndler is indignantly claiming that it was all him. He simply does not understand the difference between making a start and getting the job done. It is like he got to base camp and he is claiming that he made it to the summit. He did not. It is the coalition that has got this job done. It is the coalition which has delivered this funding. The Moreton Bay Rail Link is going to make a very significant change. The member for Petrie has played a very important role in this vital piece of infrastructure and that will be appropriately acknowledged at the opening on 3 October this year.

Mr GOSLING (Solomon) (15:07): My question is to the minister for tourism. I refer to reports of a fall in the number of backpackers coming to Australia. What connection is there between the fall in the number of backpackers and the government's backpacker tax?

Mr CIOBO (Moncrieff—Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:07): I am certainly very pleased to take this question, as I know there is a longstanding interest in Australia's tourism industry, although in the past that has been explicitly more on this side of the House than that side of the House. But, notwithstanding that, let us be clear on what is being proposed. We as a government have taken the decision to have a review of Australia's backpacker tax. We have had to make that decision off the back of the unfortunate circumstances that were left to us by the previous Labor government, because the previous Labor government not only cut funding to Tourism Australia and imposed record tourism taxes but left the nation's books in such circumstances that we have had to make decisions and look at various proposals to try to reach fiscal consolidation on a faster pathway than the Australian Labor Party has put forward.

Let me put a proposal to the member opposite who asked the question. If you are genuinely concerned about this proposal, if you are genuinely concerned about this prospect, then why don't you encourage your leader to support the $6 billion of savings that Labor announced
they are now walking away from? If the Labor Party were quite genuine about making sure that Australia's tourism industry continues to go from strength to strength, as it has under the coalition, which I outlined only yesterday, then the best thing you could be is a strong advocate to encourage your leader to stand by the very promises that he made only two months ago.

Telecommunications

Mrs WICKS (Robertson) (15:09): My constituency question is to the Minister for Urban Infrastructure representing the Minister for Communications. Around 30,000 residents, or around one in four of the adult workforce on the Central Coast, have to commute very long distances to and from work, including thousands who travel daily on the train line between Newcastle and Sydney. Can the minister please update the House on how the government will upgrade and build telecommunications infrastructure to help improve the lives of Central Coast commuters through better mobile coverage?

Mr FLETCHER (Bradfield—Minister for Urban Infrastructure) (15:10): I am very pleased to have this opportunity to respond to this question from the member for Robertson. The member for Robertson spent many years in the telecommunications sector. She has real business experience, like so many people on this side of the House and like virtually nobody on that side of the House. One of the consequences of that was she was able to deploy that expertise in working with the government to arrive at this very exciting policy under which $12 million will be committed to deliver continuous in-train mobile coverage between Hornsby and Wyong, a 60-kilometre rail route. A number of stations will also receive wi-fi along the way—stations such as Gosford, Point Clare, Woy Woy and Cowan.

The benefit of this project is that some 30,000 Central Coast commuters will be able to use their time more productively as they are sitting on the train going towards Sydney or heading back home at the end of the day. It builds on our $220 million mobile black spot program. It will mean that people will be able to use their time very productively. For example, they will be able to go online and do some research while they are on the train. They might want to go online and research David Feeney's personal interest statements. Did he find any more non-declared negative-geared homes?

The SPEAKER: The minister will refer to members by their correct titles.

Mr FLETCHER: They might want to have a look at a map of where the member for Isaacs lives. Is his residence anywhere in his electorate? They will probably find not. All kinds of research can be usefully done while you are on the train. What we have done with this $12 million commitment is allow people to use their time more productively. We have been able to draw upon the experience of the member for Robertson and we are committing infrastructure here which will allow people to use their time more productively and more efficiently. They will be able to go online while they are on the train. They will be able to go online when they are on stations by using the wi-fi. This is a terrific initiative. It is all about delivery and allowing people on the Central Coast to enjoy their time more productively and efficiently.

Mr Turnbull: I ask that further questions be placed on the Notice Paper.
PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE HOLDERS
Speaker's Panel

The SPEAKER (15:13): Pursuant to standing order 17(a), I lay on the table my warrant nominating the members for Hindmarsh, Moore, Canning, Page and Calwell to be members of the Speaker’s panel to assist the chair when requested to do so by the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker.

AUDITOR-GENERAL’S REPORTS
Reports Nos 10, 11, 12 and 13 of 2016-17

The SPEAKER (15:13): I present the Auditor-General’s Audit reports Nos 10 to 13 for 2016-17 entitled Performance audit: award of funding under the Mobile Black Spot Programme: Department of Communications and the Arts; Performance audit: Tiger: Army’s armed reconnaissance helicopter: Department of Defence; Performance audit: the design of, and award of funding under, the Living Safe Together grants program: Attorney-General’s Department; and Performance audit: delivery of health services in onshore immigration detention: Department of Immigration and Border Protection.

Ordered that the reports be made parliamentary papers.

COMMITTEES
Treaties Committee
Membership

The SPEAKER (15:14): I have received advice from the Chief Government Whip and the Chief Opposition Whip nominating members to be members of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties.

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (15:14): by leave—I move:

That Mr Crewther, Ms M. M. H. King, Ms Marino, Mr O’Dowd, Mr Robert, Ms Templeman, Mr Vasta, Mr Wallace and Mr J. H. Wilson be appointed members of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties.

Question agreed to.

DOCUMENTS
Presentation

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House, Minister for Industry and Innovation and Science) (15:14): A document is presented as listed in the schedule circulated to honourable members. Details of the document will be recorded in the Votes and Proceedings.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE
Medicare

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

The Prime Minister’s failure to abandon his cuts to Medicare.
More than the number of members required by the standing orders having risen in their places—

Ms KING (Ballarat) (15:15): We had the Prime Minister, immediately after the election campaign, claiming that he had learned his lesson in the election when it came to health and Medicare. He said he would do more to reassure voters about his commitment to health. But in the two months since the election absolutely nothing has changed. As the Prime Minister confirmed in question time yesterday, he has not reversed a single one of the cuts to Medicare or to health care generally. Either the Prime Minister lacks the authority to lead his government or he has not learned his lesson at all, because a Prime Minister who had learned his lesson when it comes to Medicare would not be continuing with the six-year freeze on Medicare rebates. A Prime Minister who had learned his lesson on Medicare would not be continuing with the cuts to Medicare bulk-billing incentives for pathology and diagnostic imaging. A Prime Minister who had learned his lesson on Medicare would not be continuing with the cuts to the Medicare safety net. A Prime Minister who had learned his lesson on Medicare would not be seeking to increase the cost of prescription medicines. And a Prime Minister who had learned his lesson on hospitals would be funding them properly.

The fact is that this Prime Minister's claim that he has learned his lesson on Medicare is as believable as the claim of the former Prime Minister, the member for Warringah, at the last election that there would be no cuts to health and no GP tax. The Australian people know that when it comes to Medicare you cannot trust the Liberals. Just as with the former Prime Minister, the decisions that this government have made to gut healthcare spending, to force people to pay more for health care, to abandon sensible healthcare reforms and to privatise the Medicare payment system will be a millstone around their necks for however long their tenuous grip on government remains.

The government's Medicare freeze, in particular, has entered its second year, and it is clear to everyone that it is bad policy that will force Australians to pay more every single time they see the doctor. That is clear even to the health minister, who was put into witness protection during the election campaign after she said that she does not really like the freeze and that she 'would like to lift the Medicare rebate freeze but Treasury and Finance won't let me'. There is a gaffe if you want to talk about one.

New data this week shows that more than one in four Australians already has to pay to see a doctor and when Australians do pay to see a GP then on average that visit costs around $35; that is the gap payment. We know that those costs are a significant barrier to care for many Australians. Nationally, one in 20 Australians already skips seeing a GP because of cost. Unfortunately, those figures are much higher in some areas. In Tasmania, south-eastern New South Wales, Murrumbidgee and here in the ACT, one in 14 people delays or avoids seeing the GP due to cost. In country Western Australia it is one in 12, and in the Murray Primary Health Network in northern Victoria one in 11 people delays or avoids seeing a GP due to cost. As the Australian Medical Association and the college of GPs have said repeatedly, that figure will get worse if the Prime Minister's freeze on Medicare rebates stretches into what the rural doctors have called an 'ice age'. We are already seeing evidence of that in general practices around Australia. In my own electorate, the Springs Medical Centre has advised its patients that:
Over the past two years … government support for General Practice has significantly reduced. Unfortunately it is no longer sustainable … to maintain fees at the current levels. To do so would seriously impact on our service quality …

As a result, that practice will now charge even concession cardholders up to $30 every second consultation.

Up in Queensland, in my colleague Cathy O'Toole's electorate of Herbert, the Latitude 19 Health on Magnetic Island has been forced to make a similar decision. They advise:

Due to Medicare restrictions and cuts, we have had to make a difficult decision to become a mixed-billing practice and we are unable to bulk-bill everyone.

Down in Tasmania, in the electorate of Denison, the Grosvenor Street and Collins Street general practices posted a note:

Due to the Medicare rebate freeze we will be changing to private billing for all patients.

On the morning before the election, the Prime Minister claimed that no-one would pay more to see a doctor as a result of the Medicare freeze. If you want to talk about a lie during the election campaign, well there is a big one for you. In practices in Ballarat, Herbert, Denison and around the country, patients who were previously bulk-billed, including concession cardholders, are now being charged—and that is in the second year of the Prime Minister's Medicare freeze; imagine the impact after six years! Unfortunately, it is the most vulnerable in our community who are hardest hit. With growing health inequality in this country, the question has to be asked: why does this government want to make it worse?

Of course, this is not the only cut to Medicare that this government has imposed. The Prime Minister confirmed during the election campaign that it is still his intention to increase the cost of prescription medicines for everyone, including concession cardholders. We already know, from data and from pharmacists across the country, that compliance is a major issue when it comes to medicines and that cost plays a very significant role in that.

We also have cuts to pathology and diagnostic imaging. On 1 October the government is set to cut all Medicare bulk-billing incentives for pathology. The regulations to do this, according to the government's own timetable, are due to be tabled this month. The result of the Prime Minister's decision will be that some of the sickest people in the country—the Australians with chronic conditions; the Australians who need blood and other pathology tests—will be forced to pay more for them. This, alongside the decision by the government to reduce bulk-billing incentives for diagnostic imaging as of 1 January next year, will mean that patients being treated for cancer and other serious health conditions will pay hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of dollars up-front for diagnosis and ongoing treatment. These are this government's decisions on health!

And then, of course, there are public hospitals. Despite the government's eleventh hour deal to get them through the election, the reality for our public hospitals is that they are in trouble. They are barely keeping up with demand, and the pressure this is placing on our dedicated nurses, doctors, other health professionals and all of those who work in supporting them is taking its toll. Basically, instead of increasing public hospital funding, the government has locked in the status quo until 2020.

The government's continued public hospital cuts mean that hospitals are being funded at a level that is simply not sustainable, and its abandonment of funding and targets for emergency
department waiting times and elective surgery is having an impact. With the government's Medicare freeze and cuts to pathology and diagnostic imaging, the pressure placed on public hospital emergency departments is only set to grow—and if the Prime Minister thinks that the states and territories will quietly sit and wait until 2020 for this to get resolved then he is a fool.

We also have the government's decision to continue to count the cut to the Medicare safety net in its budget figures. We know from the Senate report on this legislation that there are many concerns about the way in which the government is intending to go about it—and it is a cut to the safety net. The College of General Practitioners said that they had:

… significant concerns that the proposed changes will leave all patients with greater out-of-pocket costs.

The Private Mental Health Consumer Carer Network said that they had significant concerns about the measures, in particular the serious associated risks to the lives of those sex abuse victims—something they raised through the course of the Senate inquiry—noting that the measures would 'severely interfere with their real chance of recovery'. The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists also said it was:

… very concerned about the impact that the proposed new Medicare Safety Net will have on vulnerable people with mental illness who require long-term intensive psychotherapy.

But the government is far from learning the lesson of the election. As the AMA president said earlier this month, we are seeing exactly the same health policies from before the election, and many of them—all of them, I would say—are bad health policies. All of the cuts to Medicare remain. Far from learning the lesson on Medicare, the government is showing it has no idea when it comes to Medicare.

And what is this government backbench doing? What are those brave souls on the backbench, who have discovered that in toppling a former Prime Minister they actually have some power, doing? What is activating them at the moment? Are they going to the Prime Minister saying, 'We are really worried about what is happening to health care in this country and the cuts that are impacting on our constituents'? No. They are bogged down in squabbles about superannuation for wealthy Australians, watering down race discrimination laws and trying to scuttle same-sex marriage. Well, if the government backbench will not stand up for Medicare, this side of the parliament definitely will—every single day.

The test of this Prime Minister on health is absolutely clear: if you have truly learnt your lessons of the election, you will unfreeze the Medicare Benefits Schedule, drop the decision to increase the price of prescription medicines, get rid of the cuts to pathology and diagnostic imaging, properly fund our public hospitals and drop your plans to slash the Medicare safety net—and, while you are at it, stop pretending that you were not planning to privatise the Medicare payments system and tell us what you are going to do to improve delivery. (Time expired)

Ms LEY (Farrer—Minister for Sport and Minister for Health and Aged Care) (15:25): I wish the member for Ballarat well in getting up the question time order so that she can put questions to me and the team during question time. I see that she has been the reserve question two days in a row, and I know that is that a tough position to be in.
There are a lot of mistruths—and I do not like to say the word 'lie'; it gets thrown about too much in this place. But I want to take those listening to today's broadcast directly to Leigh Sales, 7.30 and the Leader of the Opposition. Leigh Sales asked the Leader of the Opposition, 'Can you put your hand on your heart and look Australians in the eye and say that the coalition has a policy to privatise Medicare,' and he would not and he did not. I refer everyone to the broadcast.

After the Leader of the Opposition had refused to answer that question, Labor went into bat with its union mates—not on the building sites around Australia; we are dealing with that through the ABCC—robocalling elderly Australians late at night and then sending fake texts from fake accounts based on a fake proposition about something that was never going to happen and will never happen. This was even after the Prime Minister stepped out and made very clear that every element of Medicare that is being delivered within government by government will continue to be and that there is nothing in our approach that has ever been inconsistent with that. In spite of that, the scare campaign went on.

It is disappointing, because it is actually not about what patients and families and people who voted recently want to hear about. What they want to hear about is our plans for the health system. What they should consider is Labor's record versus ours.

Ms Catherine King interjecting—

Ms LEY: Now the member for Ballarat keeps talking about cuts, and I say this: no government has invested more into Medicare than the Turnbull government. No government has overseen a higher bulk-billing rate than the Turnbull government. The Turnbull government is currently investing about $23 billion a year into Medicare. That will increase by $4 billion over the next four years. There were 17 million more bulk-billed Medicare services last year under the Turnbull government than during Labor's last full year in office—17 million more bulk-billed services.

There are things that we say in this place, but the thing that I will not allow to go past on this occasion is the suggestion that we are going to put up the price of prescription medicines and make it harder for Australians to access medicines. The shadow minister and the Leader of the Opposition were in parliament when a previous Labor health minister refused to sign drugs for mental health, asthma and other conditions onto the PBS, because what you cannot pay for you cannot deliver. That Labor health minister was caught out, because, as we know, Labor cannot manage money. They can talk the big talk, but they cannot manage the dollars. On this occasion a Labor health minister decided that they were not going to list medicines.

We have spent $4.5 billion on listing medicines in the last three years. We have listed three times as many medicines as Labor did in government.

Ms Catherine King interjecting—

Ms LEY: Deputy Speaker, I sat quietly and listened to the member for Ballarat—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): The member for Ballarat will listen.

Ms LEY: I do not mind if she ignores me, but I do mind if she interrupts me. We have spent $4.5 billion in new listings. Every time you meet a patient in the pharmacies or the general practices around Australia you hear about how the listing of new medicines has made a difference to their lives, like the most recent one, something called Bydureon for type 2 diabetes, which is a once-weekly injection instead of a confusing regime of shots.
We know that the first place in the world to list Keytruda for melanoma was Australia. We know that we could because we know how to manage the dollars responsibly and invested a billion dollars, so we are the only jurisdiction in the world that offers cures for hepatitis C to every single Australian without fear or favour, everywhere in every circumstance. Now the reason why we need a sustainable Medicare, the reason why budget repair matters for Medicare and the reason why you can always trust a coalition government when it comes to managing the dollars responsibly and managing the health system responsibly is demonstrated by these things—by the fact that we can to that. But at the same time, the figures that I have just given you about bulk-billing underscore the fact GP bulk-billing is higher—at 85.1 per cent—than it has ever been in our history, because we know that we are continuing this investment.

Ms Catherine King interjecting—

Ms LEY: The member for Ballarat continues to interrupt. As I said, I do not mind if she ignores me, but I do mind if she interrupts. They ran around in circles like Chicken Little during the campaign saying, 'It's happening already. It's happening already. Doctors are stopping bulk-billing.' Well, the figures belie that. And we know that with these strong and sustainable bulk-billing rates, we will continue to see that. However, it is not just about that. Our reforms to health are about more than that: they started long before the election, they are continuing and they will land in a place that ultimately is very, very good for Australian patients. Our healthcare homes, a new model of remunerating doctors for general practice—

Ms Catherine King interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Ballarat will listen in silence.

Ms LEY: Our healthcare homes are something that was actually advised to Labor in 2009 but that they ignored. So they could have done this but they did not. Doctors are coming to the table with a plan, with implementation and with ideas, and we are having a really positive discussion. Remember that the reforms that we are going to make in the delivery of health will be done in partnership with clinicians. That has been my determination every step of the way. It is not just about the bureaucracy. It is not just about things being done at a level that only looks at one side of the discussion. It is about recognising what is good clinical practice. It is about recognising that good clinical practice engages the patient, as our healthcare homes model will. It will engage the patient in their own care.

Consider our reforms to mental health—almost $100 million more was added during the campaign for something that is a huge priority of the Prime Minister, that matters to every Australian, that sees a stepped care model available depending on where you are on the steps of treatment, that will see patients no longer discharged into a vacuum, that will join up the acute hospital setting with the primary care setting and that will wrap that care around the patient in a way that our mental health practitioners and the community sector tell us has not happened till now and is broadly welcomed, particularly in regional Australia.

I want to come back to Labor's record because we have not seen a Labor government for a while. We want to know what Labor did. So this is what they did. When they were in government they cut over $6 billion from Medicare and medicines. I have just talked about the $4 billion that we are adding over the next four years. They cut $6 billion. They were actually the first ones to introduce a pause on Medicare indexation. You know how they did
it. They attacked doctors' wages. A previous health care minister—I am not going to name her; she is still in parliament—actually said, 'Doctors make enough money. They can suck it up.' That is what a previous Labor health minister said. This coalition health minister says to doctors, 'We want to work in partnership with you. We know it's tough. We are dealing with Labor's debt. We are dealing with a fiscal situation and we want to work in partnership.' A previous Labor health minister—and I wonder if this shadow minister says the same thing behind closed doors—said, 'Doctors earn enough. They can suck it up. Let's not worry about that.'

So that is what Labor did. We are talking about diagnostic imaging and pathology. Labor cut $1.4 billion from diagnostic imaging and pathology. Labor took out a billion dollars a year from Medicare for dental services and they put it in a means-tested scheme where it only helped a third of the kids. The member for Sydney has gone very quiet on that because she has actually recognised that what we have done is introduce the first sustainable public dental scheme that will make a difference at every level.

Labor cut billions from the private health insurance rebate. That previous minister for health said, 'You know where I went to for my savings? I went to private health.' At one stage the private health insurance premium went up 30 per cent almost overnight and that Labor minister for health was proud of it. Talk about attacking patients. Talk about attacking families. Talk about not recognising how to build a sustainable system. There is plenty more. Labor broke a $57 billion promise on hospitals. They talked about it and talked about it, the member for Ballarat tried to get questions up everywhere she went and then all of a sudden during the campaign the Leader of the Opposition just stopped talking about it. The shadow minister stopped talking about it. Suddenly it evaporated. It was their promise and they broke it.

We have a Medical Research Future Fund that will build to a billion dollars disbursements a year. That is a fantastic addition to actually find the cures for the future. What did Labor do in government? They tried to take out $400 million but then everyone caught them out, so they sneakily put it back. They waged war on future cures to diseases when they did that. They took money out of medical research. Shame, Labor, shame. They cut $1.6 billion from aged care funding without fixing the problem. They talked the big talk on mental health, but they actually wrote a road map to nowhere. We are working on the problems of everyday Australians. *(Time expired)*

**Ms COLLINS** (Franklin) (15:35): I think the minister has just confirmed to everybody who is listening that they have indeed done nothing since the election. Nothing has changed since the election. Nothing has changed since Malcolm Turnbull, the Prime Minister, said that he had learnt his lesson. Only days after the election, he actually said, 'We have to do more to reaffirm the faith of the Australian people and our commitment to health and Medicare.' That is what the Prime Minister said just days after the election.

What have we seen since? We have not seen anything since the election from the government because the Australian people know that this government cannot be trusted when it comes to health policy in this country. They know they cannot be trusted to look after Medicare and to keep Medicare in public hands. They know this government cannot be trusted. They know it because everything this government has done before and since the election shows that this government is not committed to better health outcomes for
Australians and they are not committed to keeping Medicare in public hands. Two months on we are still waiting for the Prime Minister to convince Australians that he is serious about what he said prior to the election and just after the election.

We all remember the election campaign, where they were so worried about Medicare and the fact that people understood what their plans for Medicare were that he had to get out the corflutes—and they were very reminiscent, actually, of the Gonski corflutes, and they will probably go the same way: they cannot be believed, just like the Gonski ones. Remember when he signed this corflute about Medicare just before the election. And what have we seen since the election?

This government has done nothing at all to restore Australians' faith in the Medicare system whatsoever—nothing. It has not taken off the rebate freeze on GP visits. We still have GPs in this country going round and talking to patients, putting up signs in their surgeries, saying that people will have to pay to go to the GP because of this Medicare freeze. This freeze is scheduled to be there for a long time, and this bulk-billing situation is going to get worse over that period if this government continues to do nothing. We have people on low incomes, people on concession cards and healthcare card holders who will be in a position where they are going to have to make a tough decision about whether or not they can afford to go to the doctor. Not only are they going to have to make a decision about whether they can afford to go to the doctor but, because of this government's plans, they are going to have to make a decision about whether they can go to the chemist afterwards and pick up their prescription. That is what this government is doing to the Australian people—to low-income Australians and Australians on healthcare cards.

Mr Laming interjecting—

Ms COLLINS: You seem to think it is funny. You seem to think that this is not real. It is real, and it is happening out there. We have already heard that one in 20 Australians do not go to a GP now because of the cost. Already we can hear this. Already it is happening, and you actually have done nothing about this. You are making it worse, and you do not intend to resolve this issue, clearly.

It is not only the freeze and the cost of prescriptions but also diagnostics and blood tests. People with chronic illnesses on a low income are going to have to pay up-front to get their blood test at their local clinic. They are going to have to pay up-front to find out whether or not they are getting better and to get their test results.

Mr Laming: They'd never let you in a hospital. You wouldn't know how it works.

Ms COLLINS: Clearly they do not know how it works over there. Clearly they do not understand how people on low incomes are forced to make these decisions. Clearly they do not understand what it is like to live on a low income and be in this position, because it is real, and you are making jokes about what is actually happening to people in Australia.

What you need to realise is that it is actually cheaper for you to fix them earlier. It will actually be better for you to treat people sooner and to give them the medication they need. But not only are you doing all this; you are still cutting money out of hospitals. In my home state of Tasmania, we have the bowel kit and bowel cancer test. Last week we had a GP on the radio saying category 1 patients are taking up to 12 months to get the tests they need if they have had a bowel cancer test come back saying they need further investigation. This is
category 1. These are people that need to be seen within 30 days, and they are taking a year. Do you understand what you are doing to people? Clearly you do not, and clearly you do not care.

This government and this Prime Minister are not serious when it comes to improving health outcomes for Australians. They clearly do not understand the impact of their decisions. They would rather give a $50 billion tax cut to companies in Australia, including $7 billion to the big banks, than look after ordinary Australians. *(Time expired)*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton):** Before I call the shadow minister, this is a free-ranging debate but the general rules do apply and, if we have a free-for-all across this chamber, I will be evicting people.

**Dr GILLESPIE (Lyne—Assistant Minister for Rural Health) (15:40):** One thing that people get really cynical and angry about is when their leaders mislead them. And what have we seen in this last election campaign? The very misleading Mediscare tactics of sending texts out days before the election, telling people that the coalition government is going to privatise Medicare. Nothing is further from the truth—take a snippet of information about IT support and turn it into a massive great scare campaign.

Another failed scare campaign is the so-called $57 billion cuts out of hospital funding. In the campaign—and before that in the last COAG deal—the opposition had to withdraw that. In the last COAG agreement, there was another $2.9 billion for hospitals. So in fact, with regard to the member for Franklin's quite emotional speech there about the situation in Tasmania, since 2013-14 there has been a 29½ per cent increase in hospital spending.

I know why they have brought this out. Whenever things are going badly there, they wheel out the regular emotional argument. I know they have problems in the Senate, with senators that have caught the attention of the Australian public. Whether they are doing it for that reason alone or because they are bereft of other positive ideas, this whole MPI is suggesting that there are cuts. The total spending on health in the last term of the previous Labor government—I can tell you; I looked it up—was $61.9 billion in the 2012-13 budget. Then in 2013-14 it was $64½ billion, and the next year $67 billion, and the next year $69.1 billion, and in the last budget the total health spend was $71.4 billion. In the Medicare spending there have been 17 million more bulk-billing episodes—$23 billion per year, and $4 billion over the next four years. When you are going to discuss cuts, you actually have to have the figures to back it up, not an emotional argument. It is the old chestnut of the ALP's argument: they have an emotional argument rather than a factual one, and people get very cynical when you actually point out the facts and figures.

Here are a few other facts. I have mentioned hospital spending, but on pharmaceutical benefits, in the last term of the coalition government and just after, there has been another $4½ billion worth of drugs put onto the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme, whether it is drugs for ovarian cancer, the diabetes drugs that were just announced, hepatitis C drugs, or melanoma and other cancer drugs. That is $4½ billion. In primary care and mental health, there is an extra $1½ billion. So the facts and figures just do not add up.

We have a lot of rural health initiatives. We have a commitment to developing and delivering an integrated rural training program and appointing a rural health commissioner. Courtesy of your advocacy, Mr Deputy Speaker, we have a cancer centre being delivered in
Dubbo. Instead of hundreds or thousands of people travelling hundreds of kilometres, they will be getting first-class cancer care in Dubbo. I congratulate you on your efforts there, Mr Deputy Speaker. We have committed $11 million extra to the Royal Flying Doctor Service. All of this is focused on delivering rural, regional and remote care.

As I mentioned, we have a good track record on the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. In aged care we have got extra funding. Most recently we have announced Health Care Homes, an initiative for people with chronic diseases. It will mean that care for people with complex, multifaceted illnesses will be focused in one place rather than being disparate and disjointed. It is an initiative that was actually proposed during the period of the previous Labor government, but they did not even follow their own advice. It is a great initiative and great that it is actually coming to fruition. *(Time expired)*

**Mr ZAPPIA (Makin) (15:46):** It was only four days ago that I received an email from a local doctor in my area which said:  

'It appears that they—  

'they' being the Turnbull government—  

haven't learned anything from their narrow victory.  

He was talking about the cuts to Medicare and to health generally. That was his summation only four days ago. It was Labor that built Medicare, and it will always be Labor that will fight to protect it. It is because of Labor and because of Medicare that we have one of the best health systems in the world. Despite the Prime Minister's hysterical denials that this government and this Prime Minister are intent on dismantling Medicare, Australia's universal healthcare system, we know that they are simply following in the tracks of every other coalition government before them.

If you want to know what this government is doing, Mr Deputy Speaker, just look at the facts. This is the government that cut $50 billion of funding to hospitals. It made three attempts to increase a GP co-payment: first it was $7, then it was $5, then it was $20. When it could not do that, it froze the GP Medicare payments for six years, knowing that doctors would have no alternative but to charge a GP co-payment, possibly up to $20. This is the government that wants to cut $650 million from pathology and diagnostic imaging incentive bulk-billing payments. This is the government that wants to cut around $1 billion from the Child Dental Benefit Scheme. It is the government that wants to increase pharmaceutical costs by some $5 on top of the $37 that many people already pay.

Members opposite—including the Minister for Health and Aged Care only today—cry foul over Labor's Medicare campaign. The facts speak for themselves and they are very clear: when the government cuts public funding of government services and transfers that responsibility to the free market, that is privatisation, clear and simple, and that is exactly what this government is doing.

Of course, we also know that this is the government that set up a Medicare privatisation taskforce. You do not do that unless you have intentions of privatising services currently being delivered by Medicare. It is a government that also paid $5 million to PricewaterhouseCoopers and tasked the Productivity Commission to advise the government on how to privatisate essential services, including Medicare. So when members opposite cry foul, perhaps they should turn around to their own government and their own ministers and
ask them: what are you really doing and why won't you come clean about what your intentions are here?

The reality is—and the research from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare shows—that people in rural and remote communities generally experience poorer health, higher rates of most chronic diseases and shorter lives than people from metropolitan areas. That is because they are generally more disadvantaged, have poorer access to health services and have to travel greater distances to access those services. The incidence of chronic disease, cancer, injuries, mental health issues, dental health issues and obesity are all much higher in regional and remote parts of Australia than they are in metropolitan areas. Yet, under this government, what we have seen from the latest statistics is that the GP numbers in those areas are actually declining—that is, we have fewer GPs per 100,000 people in rural and remote areas than we had previously. The government's health policy is simply not working, and it is particularly failing people in regional and remote Australia.

Members opposite might try to deny the reality, but again I go back to the local GP services in my area, who claim that they had to cut the after-hours services to people in the local area because of the cuts to the practice incentive payments that they were receiving. I note that the cost of after-hours GP locum services has gone up from $90 million five years ago to $195 million in the last year. Those are costs that are blowing out because of the misguided policies of this government, who would do far better, as previous speakers on this side have already pointed out, by spending the money wisely and properly. It will actually save them money in the long term.

The last comment I want to make is about the Health Care Homes trials. Again, this is a program we would generally support, but it is not going to work if you do not give the doctors more funds, and instead do the opposite and freeze their Medicare payments.

Mr LAMING (Bowman) (15:51): I think people in the gallery must be getting quite used to health debates where both sides of politics just complain about cuts by the other side. It is simply unsatisfying, I think, for people listening to this debate. More tragically, Australia really is one of the few nations where we have this deep partisan political divide over health care. We are almost unable to talk about significant improvements in the quality of health care because there is an abject fixation on the quantity of funding. I think that may seem, quite superficially, a reasonable place to start—how much money we are spending on health—but ultimately, when you are talking about the user experience in health, it is about the quality of the money spent and whether it is directed appropriately. It would be very helpful if we could rely on both sides of this chamber, at some point in this three-year term, to engage meaningfully in that debate. I could spend my next four minutes talking about how they cut money and how they froze stuff. Of course, there is a litany of these descriptions that can be attributed to both sides of politics, but that is not going to help us get anywhere.

Ultimately, we need to turn to the smartest minds in health policy and say to them, 'What will take us forward?' As a former GP, with respect, I would certainly appreciate it if my payments were indexed every year; I would be very happy for that to occur. But some greater good needs to be considered, and that is the sustainability of the system that provides those services.

Now, both sides are guilty of this, so before we get into simply regurgitating the ministerial talking points let's just remember that ultimately the fee-for-service approach is increasingly
becoming difficult to sustain high-quality care with. If it is simply focusing on how many item 3s, 23s, 36s and 44s you can bill in eight hours in a cowboy practice in an inner city where you are seeing 80 patients a day then, honestly, time is a very significant proxy—an inverse proxy—of quality of care. I want to see the GPs who are doing the serious work with chronic disease, seeing 20 or 30 patients a day, acknowledged and rewarded. But you cannot if you simply let Medicare rip with overservicing in areas where it is all about the speed. Unless you have an honest conversation about that—me and you—an honest conversation about rewarding quality, then we will simply have these debates forever and a day.

It was Francis Peabody back in 1920 addressing the Harvard Medical School who said that the key to caring for patients is quite simply the care of the patient. So how do we penetrate and say what the best possible user experience is? I would have to say that even you over there across the political partisan divide have to confess that we need to look at the new models that are going to deliver quality—the healthcare outcomes start there. There are 360,000 nurses enrolled, 200 practices across seven PHNs and we are just going to say, 'Enough of the alphabet soup of health authorities!' We do not measure ourselves simply on how much money we spend—how many pot plants we can put into multi-high-rise buildings full of non-service-providing bureaucrats providing data we never use! That is not improving health, although it is spending more money. It is not just about the quantum. It is about the effectiveness of the spend.

With respect, it was Kevin Rudd, with so much promise, who talked about running the show nationally but controlling it locally. But in the end it was funded by debt and completely out of control. He came to the states and said, 'Look, we'll swap the 40-60 federal-state funding split to 60-40, but we are going to do a smash and grab,'—or should I say, 'A grab-and-smash tactic'—GST and take 30 per cent of your GST to do that change,' meaning the Feds put just one disappointing per cent more into the hospital mix. They smelled that a mile away and that is why at the end Catholic Health Australia and the COAG reform council said, 'Look, you made barely two per cent difference in the rate of people being seen in A&E in a reasonable period of time but you let the OR rates blow-out.' The chance of seeing a GP blew out. Stephen Duckett, your age-old ally said it himself. He said it was an alphabet soup of new authorities, tonnes of data and no changes in access to community care—no changes. In fact, a blowout in residential aged care.

Just be honest with yourselves: you were no better at running the show. But we can together work to make sure money is spent better. That has to be the objective here. Sure, we do not control many levers here in the federal government but we need to work with states to do it better. Stop funding corporate health and start devolving responsibility; let the regions of our great states have more say in how they employ, how they fund and how they deliver health services. Call it a Medicare Local, call it a PHN—the future is giving support to general practitioners and private direct primary healthcare providers to do their job better. It is not about buying more three-by-three tents. It is not about standing outside fairs and saying, 'Please, grab an apple or come for a walk.' Ultimately it is about taking the sickest, most stratified, high-need patients and giving them the care they need—the wraparound care they need. Together, I secretly believe both sides of this chamber can achieve that noble goal.

Mr GEORGANAS (Hindmarsh) (15:56): It is interesting to hear the speaker opposite talking about overservicing. Try talking about overservicing to the single mum who works...
part-time, relies on her penalty rates—which is a debate for another day and which those opposite want to cut—and who has three kids. One gets the flu, it goes around in the family and she has to visit the doctor three to four times in the next fortnight, paying the co-payment. Try telling her that is overservicing.

Or try telling the pensioner in my electorate who suffers from chronic diabetes and a heart condition and who has to visit a doctor weekly that he has to be asked to pay a co-payment. Try telling him that he is being overserviced. These are the conversations that I had in the lead-up to the last federal election in the seat of Hindmarsh. There is no doubt that this 2016 election was fought on the issue of protecting our exceptional Medicare system. We built this system back in the Whitlam days. It was taken away by the then Fraser government and then we reinvested in Medicare and created a good universal health system for all Australians.

Twenty per cent of my electorate is over the age of 65, therefore this was a crucial issue and a crucial discussion that we had at the last election with my constituents. There was a loud message from them, and I said this last night in this place. The message from those people was, 'Do not tinker with Medicare.'

Now, I know the Turnbull government's incredibly poor election result; you see the new members that are here, and my seat as well. But this furphy about some lies about Medicare—let's look at the facts. Let's look at the history and go back from 2013 when Mr Abbott was the Prime Minister, and their first budget. There was an attempt to bring in a co-payment through legislation through this House. What happened was that it was rejected in the Senate. It was rejected and it was rejected. It was rejected three times. Do those opposite think the Australian public are stupid? That they do not remember these things and they do not know these things? Therefore, the seeds were planted in the Australian public's mind that there was something wrong with this government's position on Medicare.

Not only that, because they could not get it through, thanks to Labor's opposition, they then tried to bring it in through the back door by having a freeze on doctors' payments. We know if you put the freeze on doctors' payments that in some of the clinics in my electorate—in some of the inner western suburb clinics and the one that I visit on a regular basis and which my family has for many years—you go in there, they start at eight o'clock in the morning and they are there till eight o'clock at night.

I talk to my doctor sometimes and I say, 'You need a break.' He says, 'I can't have a break. Who's going to look after these people?' It is a lower socioeconomic area—a lot of migrants with English as a second language, lots of young mums and unemployed people. These people need health services, and if they also have an ailment or a chronic health issue it is even more important that we look after these people and ensure that they can visit a doctor. If they do not visit a doctor, their illness—their diabetes or blood pressure—will get worse. And a couple of nights in hospital will cost the government and the budget bottom line far more than what you are trying to save through this freeze on their payments.

Health is a fundamental right for a nation like ours—in fact, all nations—and it should be one of the goals that we all set. We should have a universal health system. When people need to see a doctor, the services should be there for them and they should not have to think of their hip pocket.
We can talk about these furphies—text messages et cetera—but the Australian public did not need a text message to know what the government was up to. The seeds of doubt were planted in 2013—and more seeds were planted and flourished at this election because the Australian public knew they could not trust the Turnbull government on Medicare and health.

Cutting Medicare bulk-billing incentives for vital blood tests and imaging scans is another issue. In the 2015-16 Mid-Year Economic and Financial Outlook the Prime Minister cut $650 million from Medicare for vital tests and scans. This was in spite of the overwhelming evidence that the former Labor government's incentives were achieving their aim of maintaining an increase to bulk billing.

Mr ALEXANDER (Bennelong) (16:01): Scare campaigns are some of the most dangerous things in our political discourse, and Labor's fabrications about Medicare were some of the most potent in the recent campaign. I had many people come up and talk to me in May and June, armed with the falsehood they had seen in Labor's leaflets, to berate me for what they believed the Liberals would do to Medicare. Some people had been woken in fright on this issue—although, to be fair, that was because Labor was robocalling pensioners late into the night. Shameful behaviour! I was very happy to talk to everyone who raised concerns over Medicare because, once I had explained the truth of the matters, most people readily saw the gaping holes in Labor's arguments.

The facts are as follows. The Turnbull government is committed to ensuring that all Australians have access to affordable, universal health care by building a healthier Medicare. The Turnbull government is currently investing about $23 billion per year into Medicare. This will increase by $4 billion over the next four years. There were 17 million more bulk-billed Medicare services last year under the Turnbull government than in Labor's last full year in office. No government has invested more into Medicare than the Turnbull government. No government has overseen a higher bulk-billing rate than the Turnbull government. We are undertaking budget repair to protect Medicare. There are no plans to privatise Medicare, and its payment systems will be delivered in house.

Every element of the health budget has grown since the Liberals came into power. Let's look at the figures and compare them to the 2013-14 year: health, $71.4 billion, an 11.6 per cent increase; Medicare, $22.7 billion, a 13.6 per cent increase; hospitals, $17.9 billion, a 24.9 per cent increase; Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme, $10.4 billion, a 9.8 per cent increase; additional primary care investment, including mental health, $1.5 billion, an 11.7 per cent increase; and aged care, excluding Department of Social Services, $17.8 billion, a 25 per cent increase on 2013-14. Overall, the number of Medicare services increased to 384 million in 2015-16, or more than one million per day, at a total cost of $21,107,750,246, an increase of nearly $1 billion on 2014-15. The overall Medicare bulk-billing rate also increased by 78.2 per cent in 2015-16, up from 77.6 per cent the year before.

These are not just the views of the Liberal Party—because we believe in consultation and discussion. We know that they are also supported by independent experts such as the AMA. In June this year the AMA President, Michael Gannon, declared that 'there is absolutely no evidence at all that the Liberal Party has any desire to privatise Medicare'. I have long held an interest in this area. Bennelong is home to all levels of medical supply chain—from small business pharmacies and GPs through to the Australian headquarters of some of the world's...
largest pharmaceutical companies. So it is one of the areas in which I have been most involved, and I know the fantastic effects of Liberal policies in relation to the PBS.

On this front, we have undertaken important budget savings that have enabled us to list triple the number of medicines on the PBS than Labor did, at a cost of $4.5 billion over the past three years. The total Commonwealth investment in health will grow by over $71 billion in 2015-16. This will increase to $79 billion within four years. The PBS is a critical tool for helping people get access to the world's leading medicines, which they deserve, fuelling medical investment in Bennelong. But, more importantly, each of these new medicines will make a life-changing impact to a person's livelihood and, in many cases, it will save their lives and add to their quality of life.

The Labor scare campaign was so far off the money that it would be laughable had there not been so much at stake. The Liberal Party is the only true friend of Medicare. I congratulate our Minister for Health for what she does to keep Australia—

Ms CLAYDON

(Time expired)

Ms CLAYDON (Newcastle) (16:06): People listening to this debate could be forgiven for thinking that we are somehow caught in parallel universes here. Members opposite are stuck in the Medicare denial phase, having lost seat after seat after seat in the last election, which was fought very much on this issue around access and equity in health, an issue that members opposite had failed to grasp. The member for Bowman recounted how this was all about people abusing a system—oversupply, overservicing of areas.

We on this side of the House have no trouble in believing the studies that have been done year after year alerting us to the growing inequality in our communities in accessing quality health care. It is no surprise to members on this side of the House. Those opposite might note that we have grown in number quite substantially since we were last here. Each of us were out there campaigning with our community members on what it means to them to have access to quality health care, a universal healthcare system that was designed by Labor. The member for Makin made the point earlier that it was Labor that created Medicare. It is Labor that will always stand up to protect Medicare, because we get what it means to have universal health care. We get what it means to make sure that every single Australian, regardless of their wealth, regardless of their postcode, has access to quality medical advice and assistance when they need it.

It is regrettable that members opposite swallowed the Prime Minister's dummy spit on election night. It suggests that no lessons have been learnt by members opposite. It suggests that you subscribe to the Prime Minister's view that: 'There is nothing to see here. We are not really continuing to slash Medicare.' We knew that happening throughout the election campaign. The Prime Minister has had eight weeks to reflect on some of the lessons he might have learnt from that election period. Yesterday in question time he had an opportunity to come to the dispatch box and point out what cuts he has taken off the table. But what did we get? Absolutely nothing. Actions always speak louder than words in this House.

In my electorate of Newcastle, people are suffering with regard to access to doctors. Indeed, GPs in my electorate are increasingly worried about the impact on the health of our community members. They are worried about their ability to provide the quality medical advice and assistance they have always been able to provide. It is not unusual to hear about this. Constituents are coming to talk to me about the signs that are appearing in GP clinics. I
suspect everybody on this side of the House has seen the signs that doctors have put up in GP clinics referring to the Medicare freeze by this government.

And let's not pretend here. I have heard some interjections by those opposite that this was Labor's freeze in the first place. Labor did have a temporary freeze for a period. That came off, and this government put a new one on. Not only did they put a new one on; they extended it. So this is your freeze that you have to own totally. Our doctors have signs in their clinics saying that the GP freeze means they will not be able to bulk-bill as many patients as they currently do. In order to remain open and provide a service, they are having to increase their prices, which means an increase in out-of-pocket expenses for people coming through the door. There are gap charges of anywhere between $20 and $40 to see a doctor in my community. That is a financial obstacle that prevents large numbers of people in my community from accessing medical advice and assistance when needed, as needed, as is their universal right—which you should be supporting. (Time expired)

Mr CRAIG KELLY (Hughes) (16:11): Here we are in the first week back, and what a disappointment the Labor Party in opposition are proving to be. In this matter of public importance debate they are continuing with the same disgraceful 'Mediscare' campaign that we saw at the last election. It should embarrass every single one of them. During an election campaign, it is one thing to stand up and make statements and argue back and forth, or to put things out in brochures, but it is quite another thing to send out text messages, to send out what is in fact a fraudulent document that creates the perception that it is from an official source, from Medicare, and that pushes the lie that the coalition is going to privatise Medicare. Every single member on that side of the chamber should hang their head in shame over that campaign. But what they do? They come in here and wear that deception like a badge of honour. Every single one of them should be disgraced. Whenever they are talking about health policy or Medicare, the first statement they should make is to apologise—apologise for misleading the Australian public. That continues here today with this MPI on so-called cuts to Medicare.

Let us look at the truth and expose what is just another Labor deception and untruth. In 2012-13, the last year of the Labor budget, total health spending was $61.9 billion. If you listened to Labor, you would think that we have cut that spending this year. In fact, in this current financial year health spending is $69.1 billion—over $8 billion more than it was in Labor's last budget. How is that a cut when we are spending $8 billion more? What about over the forward estimates? We will raise spending on health to $79 billion. At the end of this three-year term, spending on health will be $79 billion compared to Labor's last year in government, when it was $61 billion. That is close to a 30 per cent increase. When you spend more money, when you spend billions of dollars more, it is an increase. Yet Labor comes in here pretending that health spending is being cut.

As for Medicare spending, we have seen it go from $21 million in 2014-15 to $23 billion this year. Over the next four years it will go up to $27 billion. Another $4 billion increase is going into Medicare over the forward estimates. Yet we have Labor continuing to perpetuate this untruth that Medicare spending is being cut.

What about the actual number of services? We know, if we compare this year to the last year of the Labor government, that there have been 17 million more swipes of the Medicare card—that is, 17 million more services provided by Medicare. We have bulk-billing rates at
historic highs in this nation, yet we hear Labor member after Labor member going on and on about cuts.

The thing is, we would like to put more into health care. I am sure we would all like to put more into health care, but the money has to come from somewhere—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The time for the discussion has concluded.

COMMITTEES

Treaties Committee

Appointment

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton) (16:16): I have received a message from the Senate informing the House that the Senate concurs with the resolution of the House in relation to the appointment of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SENATE

Banking and Financial Services

Consideration of Senate Message

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton) (16:16): I have received the following message from the Senate:

The Senate transmits to the House of Representatives the following resolution which was agreed to by the Senate this day:

That—

(a) the Senate notes that:

(i) confidence and trust in the financial services industry has been shaken by ongoing revelations of scandals, which have resulted in tens of thousands of Australians being ripped off, including:

(A) retirees who have had their retirement savings gutted,
(B) families who have been rorted out of hundreds of thousands of dollars,
(C) small business owners who have lost everything, and
(D) life insurance policy holders who have been denied justice;

(ii) it is clear from the breadth and scope of the allegations that the problems in this industry go beyond any one bank or type of financial institution,

(iii) the Australian Labor Party, the Australian Greens, crossbench, Liberal and Nationals parliamentarians have supported a thorough investigation of the culture and practices within the financial services industry through a Royal Commission, which is the only forum with the coercive powers and broad jurisdiction necessary to properly perform this investigation, and

(iv) Australia has one of the strongest banking systems in the world, but Australians must have confidence in their banks and financial institutions, making it necessary to sweep away doubt and uncover and deal with unethical behaviour that compromises that confidence;

(b) the Senate calls on the Prime Minister to request His Excellency the Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia issue Letters Patent to establish a Royal Commission to inquire into misconduct in the banking and financial services industry, including their agents and managed investment schemes.

The Senate requests the concurrence of the House of Representatives in this resolution.

CHAMBER
Mr HARTSUYKER (Cowper—Assistant Minister to the Deputy Prime Minister) (16:16): I move:
That consideration of the message be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (16:17): I move:
That all words after "That" be omitted with a view to substituting the following words: "the message be taken into consideration immediately."

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): Is there a seconder to this motion?

Ms Chesters: I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The House divided. [16:21]
(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)
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Question negatived.
Debate interrupted.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER (16:30): It now being past 4.30, I need to propose the question:
That the House do now adjourn.
Parramatta Electorate: Recognition of Indigenous Service Personnel

Ms OWENS (Parramatta) (16:31): One of the greatest things about representing my community is their respect for our shared history. That respect is exemplified by a group of people in the Parramatta area who are working to develop a memorial in the Parramatta district that recognises the contribution of Indigenous service personnel. The committee is in experienced and capable hands, being led by former councillor Phil Russo and our former Lord Mayor, John Haines OAM. John and Phil are ably assisted by the Parramatta Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Committee, which includes retired service personnel such as well-known local identity David Williams, a retired submariner; Air Force veterans Bryan West and Rick Anderson; Uncle Harry Ali, a respected elder in the community; and Lieutenant Colonel Scott Francis of the 1st/15th Royal New South Wales Lancers, who was second-in-command.

Together they are working towards their worthy goal of raising $200,000 dollars by mid-2017, with a view to dedicating the memorial by 11 November 2018. They have set their sights high and are working hard to reach their target. Since 2014, the committee has been determined to address community ignorance and at times antipathy towards the Indigenous people who have served our country with distinction since 1901. This recognition is long overdue. The memorial will be dedicated to proud first Australians, Australians who in 1903 were exempt from military service because they were not of European descent but who enlisted anyway in quite large numbers.

It was not until 1949 that these restrictions were lifted. These were Australians who, at the outbreak of the First World War, enlisted like thousands of others to do what they saw as their patriotic duty. The best guess estimate is that over 1,000 Indigenous men listed, although the figure is probably much higher as only their physical descriptions were noted. That was 1,000 people out of 93,000 Australians in 1901, according to the best available figures. They were at times rejected because of their race, and in 1915 it became harder to enlist. People travelled hundreds of kilometres to enlist after being turned down in their own communities.

They were heroes like Private Richard Gunn, who listed his birthplace as Dunedin in New Zealand when he was in fact born on Stradbroke Island. Corporal Harry Thorpe, who won a military medal and was promoted to corporal for conspicuous courage during a battle in Belgium in 1917. He was fatally wounded in southern France and his body still rests there. According to Australian War Memorial, he rests with his friend William Rawlings, another military medal winner who was killed on the same day. These are but a few of the proud Australians who answered their nation's call.

The memorial will provide recognition and remembrance for Defence Force members who began as group of five in the Boer War. There were 700 at least in First World War, up to 6,000 in the Second World War, 30 to 35 in the Korean War, nine in the Malayan Emergency and at least 160 in Vietnam. Although these figures are sketchy, it is indicative of the commitment and loyalty of many Indigenous people. We know that Indigenous members continued to serve in later conflicts and operations in Somalia, East Timor, Afghanistan and Iraq. Figures from the defence department show that in 2014 there were 1,054 Indigenous men and women serving in the Australian Defence Force.

The committee is currently negotiating with administrators in the City of Parramatta Council, who are keen supporters of the project. The council have engaged an arts consultant,
who has identified six artists who will submit concept designs for the memorial. The winning artist will be selected by the committee with the assistance of a public art expert. The memorial will increase cultural awareness and understanding from casual observers, family members and serving and retired service personnel.

It will provide a site for up to 200 community members to participate in formal services, including Anzac Day, Remembrance Day and during NAIDOC Week. It will also offer a place for reflection and an opportunity to show respect for our fallen brothers and sisters. While the group is still identifying a site, it is envisaged that the memorial will be situated in a high-volume area that is close to the CBD. I wish the committee well in their endeavours with the knowledge that the overwhelming support of the community is with them. Their work is long overdue, and I thank them.

Roads

Mrs WICKS (Robertson) (16:35): This has been a time of great sadness on the Central Coast with two sudden and fatal incidents on our roads, which have sent shock waves through our tight-knit community. A bit over a month ago, teenager Jackson Williams died on Willoughby Road at Wamberal. Jackson was a back seat passenger in a car that left the road, hitting a power pole. A year 11 student at Lisarow High School, Jackson was a respected member of our community, described by friends as being full of life, laughs and ambition. Just three weeks later, a mother of four young children, Annabelle Deall, who was aged just 32, was killed after being struck by a car outside The Cowrie restaurant in Terrigal.

I spoke to a number of local residents who were concerned about the impact and the dangers of this location on the Scenic Highway. In fact, somebody has since stencilled the words 'slow down' in white spray paint on the road surface approaching the bend. It is both a powerful reminder and a poignant warning. While investigations are underway into both these tragedies, I would like to take a moment to pay my respects to the family and friends who have been an impacted by these horrific incidents. The loss of a son and the loss of a mother in this way is quite devastating and almost unbearable to think about, but both are examples of how our Central Coast community has shown great strength in adversity.

I intend to rise in this place at another time to speak about Annabelle and the tragic incident on the Scenic Highway at Terrigal and to advocate on behalf of my community for change, but with just the short time allotted today I will focus on honouring a commitment I made to the people of Wamberal and discuss a petition that is being collected by residents about the dangers of Willoughby Road. The crash happened on a notorious stretch of the road called 'the dip'. RMS figures reveal it has been the scene of 20 incidences over the last decade, including 12 resulting in injuries and one fatality.

Incredibly, our community has quickly rallied to call for improvements to the road. An online petition was started by a local nurse, Lindy Hewett, on the website Change.org. Lindy had no personal connection with the family involved but she has seen enough tragedy and she wanted to do something about it. The petition calls for the Willoughby Road causeway to be levelled and for traffic-calming measures to be installed between Windsor Road and Selma Close. Here we had a horrific tragedy that nobody ever wanted to see happen and yet, despite that, like so often happens on the Central Coast, our community response and support was, quite simply, overwhelming. Indeed, it was actually Jilly Pilon, who also lost her own young
son Banjo tragically just over a year ago in another road accident also at Wamberal, who first alerted me to the petition within hours of it being launched.

When Lindy came to my office recently to present the petition to me it contained more than 5,000 signatures, 1,500 comments and, as you can see here, over 220 pages. There are many beautiful tributes to Jackson contained in this petition by the many people who knew him and loved him and many others who sit in their homes at night listening to the cars speed by on Willoughby Road and who feel unsafe. The most courageous post was from Jackson's mother, Michelle. Michelle said:

Please listen to us. As a resident of the coast all my life I am aware of the dip on the road and the notoriety of it. I want to scream but who will hear me? Please sign to help prevent further loss of life. These words alone are difficult to hear, yet they have moved us all as a community to action. While we know that this cannot be fixed overnight, my commitment is that I am certainly not going to rest until it is done and I know our community will not allow us to rest until it is done either.

One of the first steps in this process has been to speak with the New South Wales government, and I want to commend the advocacy and determination of the member for Terrigal, Adam Crouch MP, who has worked closely with me on this process. I have also been speaking directly with the Central Coast Council and last week raised this matter directly with the CEO, Rob Noble. I understand that the council has applied for funding under the next round of the Australian government black spot funding program.

My commitment remains that I will fight to see some funding delivered. It is an honour to be here today with this petition in what is a small but very important step in that process and also to meet with the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Darren Chester, earlier today. Of course, as Lindy said to me, this does not change the heartache of many, but we hope that in some small way it may work towards ensuring such a tragedy does not happen again.

Rio de Janeiro Olympic and Paralympic Games

Ms ROWLAND (Greenway) (16:40): It gives me great pleasure to rise and speak today on Greenway's Olympic heroes. Timothy Hodge is a 15-year-old swimmer who lives in Kings Langley. When he was four his right foot was amputated when he was identified as having a lower leg deficiency. As reported in the Blacktown Advocate, Timothy said to his mum, Cheryl, when he was recovering from surgery: 'Mum, I will never be good at anything now.' Well, today Timothy stands on the precipice of his dream. He will be swimming for Australia. At Rio he will be competing in five events in the upcoming Paralympics. Timothy will represent not just Australia but the entire Greenway community, and we are so proud of him. Timothy trains with able-bodied athletes. His coach says that Rio is just the beginning as Timothy will hit his peak at Tokyo in 2020. I look forward to cheering on Timothy as he competes in the upcoming games and I wish him all the best from everyone in Greenway.

Timothy is not the only athlete from Greenway participating in the Rio Olympics. Many people will remember the heartache watching the Matildas lose their quarter-final against the hosts, Brazil, in a penalty shootout. After being deadlocked nil all after 120 minutes of world-class play, the Matildas came up just short. Their dedication and commitment was second to none. Blacktown's own Kyah Simon, a veteran with over 60 caps for Australia, played a
critical role for the team. Her attacking flair set up a major chance in the quarter-final before being subbed out later in the second half.

Kyah started off in Quakers Hill in the under-eights and has not looked back. Her contribution to the Matildas is unparalleled and no-one will forget her goal against Brazil in the 2015 World Cup. Thank you, Kyah, for representing your community with such grace and skill. It was thrilling to witness your contribution.

There must be something in the water at Quakers Hill, as fellow residents Fabrice Lapierre, who made the long jump final, and Jacob Hansford, who swam in the 4 x 200 metre heats, both made great contributions at Rio. While Fabrice has a long successful career under his belt—a world championship silver medal in 2015 and a Commonwealth Games gold medal in 2010—I am sure we will be seeing much more of Jacob in the future, as he is just 20 years old.

Seeing young adults like Jacob, a local who was also studying business and working at the Blacktown Workers Club, succeed on the world stage sets such a fantastic example for our community. He certainly sends the right message about the results of hard work and dedication. I am sure we can all agree that this is what the Olympics are all about. Representing your country and your community on the world stage means being a role model for the next generation and pushing yourself as far as you can, standing proud and soaking it up. Inspiring others when you do your best is certainly amongst the most worthy acts one can do.

I thank all these wonderful athletes for their contribution. I look forward to continuing to watch what their futures hold. I know that not only the residents of Greenway but certainly all of Australia will be behind our local athletes from Greenway competing at Rio.

Federal Election

Mr HOWARTH (Petrie) (16:44): I rise this afternoon to record my thanks to the residents of the electorate of Petrie for placing their trust in me to represent them here in this place as their member for Petrie in the 45th Parliament. I thank them very much. I ran for parliament back in 2013 because I believed locals deserved better representation. Since my election, I have been working hard to deliver many infrastructure and community projects, and I am honoured that locals have given me the chance to continue this work.

Elections are not won by individuals; they are won by a team. The most important people in my team are my family. Thank you to my wife, Louise, and our sons, William, Thomas and Samuel, for supporting me and realising that, while I am not home at times very much, you are, indeed, the most important people in my life. My mum and dad are remarkable. My values have been shaped by them. Their support during the past three years and during the election campaign was outstanding. They have a wonderful work ethic and were campaigning for me full time. Dad and a long-time supporter, Barry, led the team putting up signs right across the electorate, and because we had so many signs throughout the electorate this, by any means, was no small task. They then tackled the enormous job of taking all the signs down again after election. I really appreciate everyone who put up signs during the campaign. I sincerely thank you and will do my best for you in this term of parliament.

We had a terrific team of volunteers. Team Petrie was marvellous! John was out and about in the campaign ute and David and Eleana and Michael and Allanna were out at the
Carseldine Markets for months in the lead-up to the election. I do not have time to mention all those volunteers who letterboxed, many times, the whole electorate, but to Ross, Margaret, Ange, Bernadine, the McDougalls and others: thank you. To our phone canvassers and those who got up early to wave my signs beside the road and then returned in the afternoon: thank you. The famous Rothwell roundabout, which we recently secured funding for and which is about to be upgraded, was not the same after the election without Max there.

But, after eight long weeks, then came the pre-poll and manning of election day booths. Our pre-poll team was led by Isaac, Danielle and Will, and, with an army of volunteers, all the pre-poll booths were set up and manned for almost three weeks. On polling day that volunteer army swelled again, and I thank every single one of you. Again, there are too many to mention. At least with a winter election, we did not have too many sunburnt volunteers this time around!

A big thank you to the former member for Groom, Ian Macfarlane, for travelling down to the Petrie electorate on a number of occasions. He also came down on election day to add a bit of firepower for me, and that was great: thank you, Macca. Thanks must also must go to the member for Bowman and the member for Dickson. They were great mentors for me in the lead-up to the 2016 election, as well as all of the class of 2013 colleagues from when I was first elected in the 44th Parliament.

To my campaign team, led by Kerri Anne: thank you very much. Kerri Anne, you are outstanding. To my FDC executive, Chris, Robert, Rodney and Mark: thank you for all the many hours you spent on the campaign. To the youngest and probably most enthusiastic volunteer of my campaign, Jake—his dedication saw him roadsiding, letterboxing, doorknocking, putting up signs, helping at our market stalls and a whole range of activities: so, thank you, mate. Thank you, Jake.

To the LNP team in Brisbane, campaign director Lincoln Folo and deputy Ben Riley: a huge thank you. To the all the Liberal-National Party team in Brisbane: you have done a wonderful job. To my office staff: thank you for the long hours that you have put in. You did a great job and you have all been very productive, and I appreciate that. As the former Australian boxing champion, Jeff Fenech, said, 'I love youse all.'

The Turnbull government has a plan. We are committed to making a big difference. At this point I want to thank the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. They also came up to my electorate. I would also like to thank all ministers that helped during the campaign.

To the people of Petrie: rest assured, I am looking forward to working extremely hard for you in the 45th Parliament and, with the government, delivering a lot more infrastructure, trying to produce an environment in which we create more jobs, rolling out the NBN through the electorate and ensuring that the university in Moreton Bay in the seat of Dickson is built. Thank you very much. I will do my best and I will not let you down.

Census

Mr GEORGANAS (Hindmarsh) (16:49): Mr Deputy Speaker, it was remiss of me in my two previous speeches not to congratulate you on your elevation to Deputy Speaker. I know that you will do a wonderful job. Having worked with you in the past on committees, I know your dedication to this place.
According to the 2011 ABS census data, the electorate of Hindmarsh is a multicultural
diverse electorate with around 30 per cent of its population born overseas. It also has an
ageing population, with nearly 20 per cent over the age of 65. That data was collected in
2011, which was the last census held in this nation. Who knows when the data from the 2016
census will be available and just how representative and accurate it will actually be, because
the current census has had a series of bungles and errors and has been something akin to the
Keystone Cops and Comedy Capers. It absolutely defies explanation. I do not think it is the
fault of the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and I commend their efforts to become a modern
data collection agency and to move with the times. The effort to enable the online completion
of the census forms is a good thing. It saves costs of an estimated $100 million. It also enables
people who have access to a computer and the internet to complete the form quickly and
easily. It also enables resources to be put toward reaching our more rural and remote
communities, as well as the transient and homeless population.

However, there is no doubt that the transition was extremely poorly planned, poorly
resourced and poorly executed. It is safe to say that this has been the worst run census in
Australia's history and one of the worst IT debacles Australia has ever seen. Let us recap on
what happened, at least according to the feedback from within my electorate office. This also
mirrors what other MPs have said to me. People started receiving their census letters, on
average, around one week before the census date. Until then there had been very little
preparation or advance warning that the census would be conducted in a new way this year.

On the first day I moved into my new electorate office on 29 July I was
absolutely inundated with calls about the census, especially from elderly residents who did not have
access to a computer and non-English-speaking residents in my electorate who did not have
computer access. People were absolutely confused and did not understand how to request the
paper census form. They rang the number provided and either got no answer or just an
answering service with nothing else. They were worried that they would get fined. They were
extremely worried.

M1 Pacific Motorway

Mr VAN MANEN (Forde) (16:52): Mr Speaker, I would firstly like to take the
opportunity to congratulate you on your re-election to your office. It has been two months
since the federal election and since Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull announced a $215
million investment in upgrading Queensland's M1 Pacific Motorway through Logan and the
Gold Coast. In that time the Queensland Labor government has refused to come to the party
with their share of funding; instead, they have finger-pointed, blame-shifted and offered
nothing but political games through a media campaign that has done nothing to fix the M1.

The M1 is under pressure and urgently needs that extra capacity. While commuters are
sitting in daily congestion for hours on end, frustrated and at the end of their tethers, the
Queensland Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports, Mark Bailey, sits on his hands
and continues to make excuses. The problem is that Mr Bailey is deceiving Queenslanders.
He is misleading them about the funding principles, while demanding a bigger slice of the pie.
Well, I have news for Mr Bailey: the Australian government is not a piggy bank. You cannot
just ask mum and dad to double your pocket money because you spent it all on sweets.

Mr Bailey's funding shortcomings are a product of his Labor government's disastrous
mismanagement. Queensland Labor has splashed all of their cash on sweeteners and a bloated
public service and left nothing for vital infrastructure that will get Queensland moving. A report released this week by RPS Group, which analyses ABS data, shows public sector spending on infrastructure in the March quarter was at its lowest level since 2006 and half the rate of expenditure seen five years ago. Queensland's public spending on infrastructure is at a 10-year low, and future generations will suffer for it. Queensland Labor's long list of excuses is wearing thin, and my electorate of Forde is not falling for it. While Mr Bailey and members of his M1 delegation continue to split hairs over road classifications, it makes no difference to the facts. The fact is that the Queensland government has a 50-50 funding agreement with the Australian government for the M1 in South East Queensland, a road that transports primarily urban commuter traffic.

Since the M1 was constructed in Queensland, the funding of all upgrades has been on a 50-50 basis. My colleague and Minister for Urban Infrastructure the Hon. Paul Fletcher put it well in an opinion piece recently, when he said:

Mark [Bailey] has not been able to point to any document which lays out such a principle [for 80-20 funding] … the facts about road funding over the last decade or more make it clear that the funding basis varies from project to project.

The fact is that the Turnbull government has taken two of the biggest items on Queensland's infrastructure wish list and moved them from the one-day column to the ready-to-go column. All Mr Bailey and the Palaszczuk government have to do is find their $215 million—a small sum in comparison to their multibillion dollar public service bill—and these vital M1 upgrades can get underway.

Again, my colleague Minister Fletcher has rightly pointed out that the federal government 'can best support state governments which have their own proactive strategy to fund major projects.' Unlike states like the ACT and NSW, the Queensland Labor government has refused to consider any proactive strategies. It has abandoned work done by the previous LNP government, and, instead of coming up with an alternative strategy, the only plan Mark Bailey can conjure is to complain and blame-shift in the hope that the federal government will just pay for it all.

Well, I am sorry to say that excuses and blame shifting do not sit well with the constituents of Forde. Commuters and residents in my electorate have had enough. I will continue to fight tooth and nail to secure this funding for the M1 while the Queensland Labor government is holding up the project. We could see construction on the M1 starting soon, if Queensland Labor and Mark Bailey stopped playing political games and instead focused on finding the funding to fix the M1. The sooner Mr Bailey stops making excuses and stops avoiding his funding responsibilities the sooner we can get the M1 upgraded.

Debate interrupted.

STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
Giurgola, Mr Romaldo, AO

The SPEAKER (16:57): I just want to make a quick statement, which I had anticipated making just before the adjournment—before other events intervened—to recognise the renowned contribution to architecture in Australia and internationally of the esteemed architect Romaldo Giurgola, who died earlier this year in here in Canberra on 16 May 2016.
Mr Giurgola was the principal design architect of Australia's Parliament House from its inception in 1983 to its opening in 1988. The firm of Mitchell, Giurgola & Thorp won the international design competition from 329 entries. In recognition of his work on Parliament House, Mr Giurgola received the Royal Australian Institute of Architects' gold medal in 1988 and was awarded the Officer of the Order of Australia in 1989. He also received numerous other honours and awards throughout his life in Australia and internationally.

Last week, together with the President of the Senate and Mr Giurgola's international and national colleagues and friends, I attended a gathering in the Great Hall of Parliament House to celebrate his life and his contribution to architecture. The gathering included numerous presentations about his work in Australia and internationally and was a fitting tribute to a truly great man and architect.

I—along with the Senate President—was pleased to meet with Mr Giurgola when he came to Parliament House late last year for a morning tea to honour his 95th birthday. I acknowledge Mr Giurgola as not only an exceptional architect of Parliament House but one who, along with a great team of architects, helped to make the Australian Parliament House the iconic symbol of democracy it has become. I express sincere condolences to his family, particularly to his daughter, Paola.

Consideration resumed on the motion:
That the House do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER (16:59): The question now is that the House do now adjourn.
The House divided. [17:04]
(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Brien, T</td>
<td>Shorten, WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasin, A</td>
<td>Stanley, AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice, J</td>
<td>Swanson, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyne, CM</td>
<td>Thistlethwaite, MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert, SR</td>
<td>Watts, TG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudmalis, AE</td>
<td>Zappia, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, AJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTIONS OF THE SENATE
Banking and Financial Services
Consideration of Senate Message

Consideration resumed of the motion:
That consideration of the message be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

Mr ALBANESE (Grayndler) (17:14): I move:
That all words after "That" be omitted with a view to substituting the following words:
"the message be taken into consideration at 5.20 pm today or the first available opportunity thereafter."

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?
Mr Bowen: I second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (17:14): Mr Speaker, you had not actually put the question, so therefore he could not move the amendment.

Mr Albanese interjecting—
Mr PYNE: Yes, but we do not actually know what is before the House until the Speaker states what is before the House, so he will have to do that all again.

The SPEAKER: The question was, prior to the adjournment debate, that the original motion on the message of the Senate be agreed to.

Mr ALBANESE (Grayndler) (17:14): I move:
That all words after "That" be omitted with a view to substituting the following words:
"the message be taken into consideration at 5.20 pm today or the first available opportunity thereafter."

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?
Mr Bowen: I second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (17:15): Quite clearly this is a stunt by the Labor Party about the royal commission into financial services and transactions.

The SPEAKER: The Manager of Opposition Business on a point of order?
Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (17:15): I move:
That the question be put.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be put.
The House divided. [17:20]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes .................... 71
Noes ...................... 70
Majority ................ 1
AYES

Albanese, AN
Bird, SL
Brodmann, G
Burney, LJ
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Chesters, LM
Claydon, SC
Conroy, PM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Feehely, D
Freelander, MR
Giles, AJ
Hammond, TJ
Hayes, CP
Husar, E
Jones, SP
Keay, JT
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Lamb, S
Macklin, JL
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
O’Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Sharkie, RCC
Snowdon, WE
Swan, WM
Templeman, SR
Van Vikanou, M
Wilkie, AD
Zappia, A

Aly, A
Bowen, CE
Burke, AS
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Champion, ND
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Danby, M
Dreyfus, MA
Ellis, KM
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georganas, S
Gosling, LJ
Hart, RA
Hill, JC
Husic, EN
Katter, RC
Kelly, MJ
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Leigh, AK
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Neumann, SK
Perrett, GD (teller)
Rishworth, AL
Ryan, JC (teller)
Shorten, WR
Stanley, AM
Thistlethwaite, MJ
Watts, TG
Wilson, JH

NOES

Abbott, AJ
Andrews, KL
Andrews, KJ
Bishop, Ji
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Christensen, GR (teller)
Ciobo, SM
Coleman, DB
Coulton, M
Cremer, CJ
Drum, DK
Entsch, WG
Evan, TM
Falinski, J
Fletcher, PW
Flint, NJ
Frydenberg, JA
Gee, AR
Gillespie, DA
Goodenough, IR
Hartseyker, L
Hastie, AW
Hawke, AG
Henderson, SM
Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (17:29): The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

The House divided. [17:29]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes .................71
Noes .................70
Majority .............1

AYES

Albanese, AN  Aly, A
Bird, SL  Bowen, CE
Brodman, G  Burke, AS
Burney, LJ  Butler, MC
Butler, TM  Byrne, AM
Chalmers, JE  Champion, ND
Chesters, LM  Clare, JD
Claydon, SC  Collins, JM
Conroy, PM  Danby, M
Dick, MD  Dreyfus, MA
Elliot, MJ  Ellis, KM
Feeney, D  Fitzgibbon, JA
Freelander, MR  Georganas, S
Giles, AJ  Gosling, LJ
Hammond, TJ  Hart, RA
Hayes, CP  Hill, JC
Husar, E  Husic, EN
Jones, SP  Katter, RC
Keay, JT  Kelly, MJ
Keogh, MJ  Khalil, P

CHAMBER
AYES

King, CF
Lamb, S
Macklin, JL
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
O'Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Sharkie, RCC
Snowdon, WE
Swan, WM
Templeman, SR
Van Vikanou, M
Wilkie, AD
Zappia, A

King, MMH
Leigh, AK
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Neumann, SK
O'Toole, C
Perrett, GD (teller)
Rishworth, AL
Ryan, JC (teller)
Shorten, WR
Stanley, AM
Swanson, MJ
Thistlethwaite, MJ
Watts, TG
Wilson, JH

NOES

Abbott, AJ
Andrews, KL
Bishop, JI
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Cioe, SM
Coulton, M
Drum, DK
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hartley, L
Hawke, AG
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Landry, ML
Lester, J
Littleproud, D
McCormack, MF
Morrison, SJ
O'Brien, LS
O'Dowd, KD
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Price, ML
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sudmalis, AE
Taylor, AJ
Tudge, AE
Van Manen, AJ
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR

Andrews, KJ
Banks, J
Broad, AJ
Buchholz, S
Christensen, GR (teller)
Coleman, DB
Crewther, CJ
Entsch, WG
Falinski, J
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Goodenough, IR
Hastie, AW
Henderson, SM
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Laming, A
Laundy, C
Ley, SP
Marino, NB
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O'Brien, T
O'Dwyer, KM
Pitt, KJ
Prentice, J
Pyne, CM
Robert, SR
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Turnbull, MB
Wallace, AB
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP

CHAMBER
Question agreed to.

**The SPEAKER** (17:33): The question now is that the motion, as amended, be agreed to.

**Mr MORRISON** (Cook—Treasurer) (17:33): It takes a tactless stunt to try and force a tactless—

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer will resume his seat. The Manager of Opposition Business now has the call.

**Mr BURKE** (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (17:33): I move:

That the question be now put.

**The SPEAKER:** The question is that the question be now put.

The House divided [17:34]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 71
Noes ...................... 71
Majority ............... 0

**AYES**

Albanese, AN  Aly, A
Bird, SL  Bowen, CE
Brodtmann, G  Burke, AS
Burney, LJ  Butler, MC
Butler, TM  Byrne, AM
Chalmers, JE  Champion, ND
Chesters, LM  Clare, JD
Claydon, SC  Collins, JM
Conroy, PM  Danby, M
Dick, MD  Dreyfus, MA
Elliot, MJ  Ellis, KM
Feehey, D  Fitzgibbon, JA
Freelander, MR  Georginas, S
Giles, AJ  Gosling, LJ
Hammond, TJ  Hart, RA
Hayes, CP  Hill, JC
Husar, E  Husic, EN
Jones, SP  Katter, RC
Keay, JT  Kelly, MJ
Keogh, MJ  Khalil, P
King, CF  King, MMH
Lamb, S  Leigh, AK
Macklin, JL  Marles, RD
McBride, EM  Mitchell, BK
Mitchell, RG  Neumann, SK
O’Connor, BPJ  O’Toole, C
Owens, JA  Perrett, GD (teller)
Plibersek, TJ  Rishworth, AL
Rowland, MA  Ryan, JC (teller)
Sharkie, RCC  Shorten, WR

**CHAMBER**
The numbers for the ayes and noes being equal, the Speaker gave his casting vote for the noes.

Question negatived.

The SPEAKER (17:42): As members would be aware, the principles regarding a casting vote by the Speaker are outlined in *House of Representatives Practice*—specifically on page
and they include that the Speaker should vote to allow further discussion where this is possible. I therefore cast my vote with the noes, and that is against closure of the debate.

Mr Katter: Mr Speaker, can I take a point of order? I know I am not in my seat.

The SPEAKER: No, you cannot. No, the member for Kennedy answered his own question. The Treasurer has the call.

Mr Katter interjecting—

The SPEAKER: You cannot take a point of order out of your seat. You answered your own question.

Mr MORRISON (Cook—Treasurer) (17:42): What we are seeing here this afternoon is a stunt from an opposition to promote their stunt which is the royal commission—a royal commission for which they have no terms of reference, a royal commission that is motivated just by one thing, and that is for the Leader of the Opposition to recklessly and cruelly manipulate and use the genuine pain and the genuine concerns of people in Australia—

Mr Dreyfus interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Isaacs is warned.

Mr MORRISON: of people in Australia to promote his own political self-interest. That is what the Leader of the Opposition is seeking to do here this afternoon. He is using a stunt to promote his stunt, because what we know on this side of the House is that when there are serious issues to be dealt with, particularly in the banking and financial system, you deal with them. You address them. You take action. That is what you do, and what we know is, as they came into this place today at question time and they raised genuine concerns by constituents— (Time expired)

Mr JOYCE (New England—Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources) (17:44): I think it is incredibly important that we clearly understand that there is the capacity for the oversight and the proper delivery of an outcome with the facilities that are currently at our disposal, and we in the government are prepared to put more to it if it is required. But the idea that we would start a royal commission for a royal commission's purpose, which has no power to prosecute, which has not the same powers as what we see—

Mr Fitzgibbon interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Hunter will cease interjecting.

Mr JOYCE: What we see here is that in our capacity to make sure that we look after—

Mr Pasin interjecting—

The SPEAKER: As will the member for Barker.

Mr JOYCE: such people as the farmers, that we stand behind such things as a regional investment corporation, a regional investment corporation to properly facilitate looking after farmers.

I take the interjection from the member for Hunter because we are the people that got the concessional loans out, going out at this time at 2.66 per cent. We have seen well in excess of $450 million—I think it is close to $480 million—being lent out now in concessional loans. We are the people that are making sure that we deliver packages to people in regional areas to look after them. We are the same side of politics that is looking after people with the farm
household allowance, making sure we keep dignity for people on the farm, on the land. We are making sure that this is delivered.

I note with fascination that we get an interjection from—

Opposition members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will take their seats or leave the chamber.

Mr JOYCE: the Labor Party, the same Labor Party that did nothing when milk prices went down to 27c a litre in Victoria. All the Labor Party can do is come up with stunts. They are not a government, they are not an opposition; they are a circus, a circus that believes in stunts, stunts that stand in proxy for even a vague semblance of what a government might be.

I am happy to stay here for as long as it takes to make sure that people clearly understand that those on the other side, those in the opposition, are not worthy of the Treasury benches. They have not come up with one idea, in the hundred ideas they had in the last election, for a positive agenda—not one for the people on the land. In fact, the closest they got was to increase the regulation around tree clearing to put a further caveat on people who live on the land. All they want to deliver to people on the land is nothing, or further regulation to make their life more difficult.

Mr Speaker, it is an interesting day when we are talking about probity, when we are talking about how things could be done better. This is the same week we have heard of Senator Sam Dastyari receiving more than $1,600 from an organisation which has close ties to the Chinese government, and those opposite just brush it off; they do not worry about it. But they do not have the ticker to stand up and make a statement and do something about it.

You would think that that Leader of the Opposition would have the capacity when asked of him to show real leadership, to make a statement, to show the Australian people the sort of person he would be, or he wants to be. He does not have the ticker to stand up to Sam Dastyari. It is obvious that the faceless men have more power than the Leader of the Opposition.

If people want to stay late tonight and hear something then the Australian people should hear this: Sam Dastyari received more than $1,600 from an organisation closely associated with the Chinese government and then had the temerity to make statements about the key arguments around our nation's defence policy, which the Labor Party agree with but he that wishes to change.

Why would he wish to change it? Would it have anything to do with his association that was backed up by a payment of $1,600? In fact, not only that. He said he would donate it to a charity. Even that charity had the decency to see that that money was tainted and handed it back. That charity has more ticker than the Leader of the Opposition, who intends to do nothing about this. He now has to show some ticker. He now has to do something about this. He now has to show his mettle. Has this man any mettle? That is the question that everybody is asking here tonight.

They are not going to be asking about your charade; they are going to be asking about your ticker. Do you have anything? Is there anything inside there? Is there anything inside that shows you have the steel to deal with Senator Sam Dastyari, or is he more powerful than you? Is that the reality? Is he more powerful than you? Are you actually scared of him? Does he
actually run it? Is the Labor Party still run by Sussex Street and you are merely the puppet, sitting there just waiting?

That is what the Australian people want to hear about tonight, and we are happy to talk about it. We are going to make sure that if we have to stay here till midnight this will be the question that we will be asking people: why is it that the Labor Party at their first opportunity, after so much rhetoric over members of the government and with issues when we had to stand people down, had nothing, nothing to show for it. It was amazing. It was the sound of silence. Every time we mentioned Senator Sam Dastyari from New South Wales, there was silence on the Labor Party side, absolute silence; the Captain Thunderbolt of politics.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Prime Minister will resume his seat.

Mr Albanese interjecting—

Mr JOYCE: Don't you want a debate?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Prime Minister does not have the call. The member for Grayndler on the point of order.

Mr Albanese: Yes, Mr Speaker. Given the provocation—

The SPEAKER: No, what is the point of order?

Mr Albanese: and the clear lack of relevance, I move:

That the question be now put.

The SPEAKER: I refer you to the standing orders, particularly standing order 78. There is a paragraph at the bottom of items (a) to (m) that states:

Should any of these questions be negatived, no similar proposal shall be received if the Speaker is of the opinion that it is an abuse of the orders or forms of the House …

Mr JOYCE: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Prime Minister will resume his seat. The member for Grayndler on the point of order.

Mr Albanese: Mr Speaker, I of course understand that standing order. Between the deliberation in which you determined, quite rightly, to cast your vote in the negative—quite clearly, if there were a debate of the substance of the motion that was before the chair, but what we are seeing here is clearly just a filibuster.

The SPEAKER: The member for Grayndler will resume his seat. The Deputy Prime Minister will be relevant to the motion.

Mr JOYCE: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. The issue is that what people want is a form of making sure that they get justice. They want to get justice, because it is only right and proper. That is why we have organisations such as ICAC, that is why we have organisations such as ASIC and that is why we have the prudential oversight not only to investigate but also to prosecute, if it is required to prosecute. This is incredibly important, because people want to make sure they have a clear and unambiguous attachment to the form of probity.

The question of probity is something that is absolutely fundamental to the parliamentary process. Probity is never better seen not only in how people act but also in how they are deemed to act. Where there are any questions that call a judgement against that probity, and when that probity is judged, it relies on those who have a leadership position to stand up and
show the Australian people that they have their best interests at heart and not their certain affirmed loyalties or their requirement of loyalties to their factional mates. What we have seen is that same question, that same desire by people on the land, by people dealing with the banking sector, to say, 'I want to be treated justly.' That justice, which flows down from the top, has to be seen by a parliamentary system to be without question.

We have a senior frontbencher from the opposition, from the Labor Party, who quite clearly—and he admits to it himself—is brought into question, so much so that he tried to refund the payment made to him, so much so that the charity that he tried to refund it to handed the money back. This obviously calls into question that there is not the capacity held by the Leader of the Labor Party to do the right thing.

Honourable members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: I caution members interjecting.

Mr JOYCE: So, if the member for Maribyrnong, the Leader of the Opposition, wants to be taken seriously by the Australian people, he had his test this week. His test this week was to determine whether he had the ticker to stand up to Senator Sam Dastyari, and he never did. If the people in the banking sector—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Prime Minister will be relevant to the question.

Mr JOYCE: The people who are dealing with issues such as those with the banking sector have a right to be heard, and that is why we have the capacity, through organisations such ASIC, not only to determine where things go wrong and not only to determine where justice lies but also to follow that determination with the capacity to prosecute. *(Time expired)*

The SPEAKER: The member for Grayndler on a point of order.

Mr Albanese: Yes. I move:

That the question be now put.

The SPEAKER: I will hear the Leader of the House on the point of order.

Mr Pyne: Mr Speaker, the standing orders and *Practice* are that if a member wants to speak then, the motion having been negatived moved by the opposition earlier—

Mr Bowen interjecting—

Mr Pyne: If I could just speak without interruption.

The SPEAKER: I would like to hear the Leader of the House in silence.

Mr Pyne: Quite clearly, Mr Speaker, the motion that the question be put was defeated. That was negatived. As a consequence, that cannot be moved again in the debate. A similar motion cannot be accepted if it would inhibit debate and stop people having the opportunity to make contributions. There are ministers and members who would clearly like to make a contribution to this debate and, as a consequence, I do not believe—at your discretion—that motion by the member for Grayndler can be accepted at this time. If at some time down the track you thought there were many more speakers speaking than necessary, that would be a different matter. We have had only two speakers on the motion.

The SPEAKER: Obviously having ruled on that principle does not mean that a speaker would therefore allow the debate to continue until every single person in the House had spoken. The closure was moved on the Treasurer and then it was moved on the very next
speaker. I need to allow a reasonable level of debate. I do not at this point think that two
speakers is a reasonable level of debate given the number of divisions that we have had on the
issue and given that I outlined the principle just some time ago. That is obviously a judgement
I need to make. I just asked the Leader of the Opposition to resume his seat. I heard the
member for Grayndler in good faith when the Assistant Treasurer was at the dispatch box. It
is very clear, as I am explaining this, how I am ruling, and I am not going to let the Leader of
the Opposition, despite his seniority, jump in ahead of the Assistant Treasurer.

*Mr Burke interjecting—*

_The SPEAKER:_ All right then. On that point, if he is seeking the call on the motion, that
is a different matter.

_Mr SHORTEN_ (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (17:56): We will never, never,
never give up seeking justice for the victims of banks and financial services. We will never,
never, never give up seeking a banking royal commission. How pathetic is this government?
In our time in government they opposed every reform we made to financial services. The only
other issue on which they fought as hard was action on climate change. And then the Prime
Minister has the sheer hide of coming in and saying he is the only person who will do
anything on banking. You can see the fingernail marks in the concrete as they are dragged
kicking and screaming to action on reform of banking.

Every time there was a vote in the previous parliament, 2010 to 2013—every time; not
once, not twice but on 21 separate occasions—these cowards and defenders for malfeasance
in the financial services sector voted against labour reforms, and since then we have seen
more and more scandals. And today I had the privilege and was humbled to meet victims of
financial crimes and financial malfeasance. And this government has the cheek to patronise
the victims. What they said is, 'There are other means.' Don't they understand that the victims
we have been seeing have tried to do everything? They have been to the Financial
Ombudsman. They have been to the lawyers and they have dealt with the liquidators. They
have been let down to from pillar to post. Labor has arrived at the position recognising that
every other measure has proven inadequate. There is a pathology in our banking and financial
services system, which is sick. It does not mean that we do not want to see banks do well, but
I cannot accept the proposition that the only way our banks can be successful is by leaving a
trail of misery. The cost of thousands of people losing their financial services and accounts
and poor treatment by banks is measured not just in the change down the back of the couch at
a Liberal Party function; it is real: divorces, anxiety and depression. The most common
victims are people in their 50s and 60s, people on the land, people in small business, people
who have paid the school fees, people who have worked hard and have wanted to put some
money aside for their retirement. They get no justice and they get ripped off.

Then there are these pale apologies over here. They say there is nothing we can do about
the banks. They say that a banking royal commission will change nothing. Well, nothing else
has worked. We have seen this government retreat in an untidy fashion. On 10 April the
Prime Minister said: 'Nothing to do here. It is all working okay.' On 20 April he then said,
'Maybe we need to look at giving the regulator some more powers.' Then after the election
they dream up the idea of a neutered parliamentary committee, controlled by the party for big
banks, and then they propose to have a tribunal. Talk to the victims. The Financial
Ombudsman Service can compensate only up to $500,000. They never give awards. The
victims of banking and financial scandals are browbeaten into settlements of $10,000 and $20,000, and the people here know that.

This is the party who represent the seedy end of financial planning. They will not go to the centre of the issue, which is the big banks. There is a business model in this country which puts profits ahead of people. We will never give up on this royal commission. The Senate has voted this way. We may succeed tonight or we may not, but I give the government fair notice, on behalf of people who want justice, that we do not regard this royal commission as anything other than the last resort, long overdue, for justice for a generation of people, a generation of our fellow Australians who have been mistreated and let down by the system. This Commonwealth of ours is a Commonwealth for the people, not a Commonwealth for the banks, and we will never give up.

Ms O'DWYER (Higgins—Minister for Revenue and Financial Services) (18:00): The Australian government does recognise that there has been malfeasance and bad behaviour in the financial services sector. We know that the sector has not always lived up to the expectations of the Australian people. That is why it is this side of the House that is delivering the most significant package of reforms that this parliament has seen, and that is why it is this side of the House that held a root and branch review of the financial system—the Murray financial system inquiry.

Now, did those opposite join us in wanting to hold this root and branch review of the financial system? Did they support us in these endeavours? No, they did not. In fact, they opposed it. On coming into government they opposed our measures. In fact, when the member for McMahon was the Treasurer, he said:

The financial system is strong, well-regulated and well managed and I have not seen a case for a full-blown inquiry.

This is despite the fact that there were so many financial planning scandals during that time. In fact, during the time that the member for McMahon was the Assistant Treasurer, and also the Minister for Financial Services—for more than 1,000 days, when he had the power to propose inquiries, to actually do something in this space—the member for Maribyrnong, the Leader of the Opposition, stood here at the dispatch box with such confected outrage and said that he would have done something if only he had been given the chance. Well, he had that chance when he was the Minister for Financial Services and Superannuation, for nearly three years—more than 1,000 days. He too could have done something at a time when there were financial scandals.

And let me go through them: at the time of their government, there was Opes Prime, there was Storm Financial, there was trio Capital, there was Great Southern group, there were the scandals within CBA financial planning, there was MF Global and Macquarie Equity Limited, there was Banksia. Yet those opposite did not call for a royal commission at that time. In fact, they said that the whole system was incredibly well regulated and that there was nothing to see. Well, in fact on this side we know that action does need to be taken. We know that the complaints handling for those people who have consumer complaints is simply not good enough. People do need access to justice in a really timely manner. They need to know that their complaints can be heard and that they can access appropriate compensation. We have seen the Financial Ombudsman Service apply only to a certain number of people, and we are looking to expand that—and not only to expand it but to see whether there should be a one-
stop shop for the Financial Ombudsman Service, the Credit and Investments Ombudsman and also the Superannuation Complaints Tribunal so that not one consumer falls through the cracks, so that every single one of those people who has a legitimate complaint can be heard and can access appropriate compensation.

That is why this side of the House has instituted the Ramsay review, so that we can get the governance structure right so that it will not be years from now that people can access justice but will be in the very near future that they will be able to access justice through a one-stop shop. And when we think about consumer complaints, I think it is worth noting that the highest number of consumer complaints to the Financial Ombudsman Service occurred at a time that the Leader of the Opposition was in fact the Minister for Financial Services—more than 36,000 complaints at that time. It has, in fact, gone down since then and it is due to the very hard work of putting in place the appropriate changes in regulation and strengthening our regulator that we have seen that number go down.

We have invested very heavily in our regulator. We know that the regulator needed additional capability and additional resources. That is why we have provided them with significant funding not only to chase down those people who have done the wrong thing but also to be far more proactive in detecting problems before they occur and to stop consumer harm before it actually happens. That is why we have also provided ASIC with $9.2 million in funding to accelerate the implementation of a product intervention power for ASIC, so that they can intervene before the harm is done. That is why we have given them more than $61 million to enhance their data analytics and surveillance capabilities and improve their information management systems. That is why we have given them more than $57 million for more surveillance and enforcement activities, particularly in the areas of financial advice, responsible lending, life insurance and breach reporting.

We know that it is very important that we have a tough cop on the beat. On this side of the House, we are not frightened of a tough cop on the beat like those opposite, who are opposing us having a tough cop on the beat with the ABCC. We believe it is important and that is why we have given ASIC appropriate powers.

What would happen if a royal commission actually went ahead? If it went ahead, there would be no legislation that deals with the misalignment of incentives in the life insurance sector, there would be no legislation that lifts the education and professional standards of financial advisers, there would be no changes to current framework for dispute resolution, there would be no one-stop shop for the consumers to get access to justice easily and to access compensation, and there would be no process by which the banks would be held to account by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics for the decisions that they make—decisions that affect all Australian consumers.

We believe it is also important that we take action now to ensure that those people who have suffered harm are properly heard. That is why the Minister for Small Business and I took action in making sure that the Australian Small Business and Family Enterprise Ombudsman could provide a forensic review of the most egregious cases that were presented before the parliamentary joint committee and to make sure that they could go through, in very minute detail, where the problems have occurred and, if so, what they were, to prevent harm going forward. This is a very, very important review.
The Australian Small Business and Family Enterprise Ombudsman is an ombudsman with very significant powers; powers to compel documents from the banks, powers to compel the banks to come before the ombudsman to provide direct information on these very, very specific cases. It is incredibly important that those people who have been harmed by bad behaviour can access justice in a timely manner.

What did those opposite to during their time when they had the ability to take action? They did very little at all. As recently as 2015, they certainly did not support Senator Whish-Wilson when he stood up there in the Senate and proposed a royal commission. In fact, they opposed that and opposed that very directly. They opposed it because they do not really believe it is necessary and they are putting their political interest ahead of the national interest. A royal commission, in fact, is very dangerous because it would send signals to people overseas that they cannot trust our banking system here in Australia, that there are structural problems with the banking system. It would have significant repercussions for confidence. It would have significant repercussions for international investment and it would have very significant repercussions for our AAA credit rating.

Those opposite want to play populist politics with a very serious issue. Those on this side of the House are keen to address the significant issues that we know are relevant for individuals to be dealt with today, to be dealt with now, not three years from now. On that note, I would like to commend to the House the need to ensure that those opposite do not succeed in their plan.

Mr KATTER (Kennedy) (18:10): I have very great respect for the Deputy Prime Minister but I do not think that he did himself a great deal of good today. He would be well aware, or at least he should be well aware, of the pain and agony that agriculture—the dairy industry and the cattle industry—has gone through in Australia. It is said that we do not need an inquiry. I said previously in the week but I think I should say it again: rather than a parliament only two people that I know of have actually called for a royal commission, and they are Bill Gunn and me with the Fitzgerald inquiry in Queensland. We had a terrible problem with police corruption in Queensland. We had had inquiry after inquiry. This government is now saying, 'We'll have an inquiry into banking.' We had inquiry after inquiry in Queensland, and you say that the government should have done something about it. Well, you try doing something about police corruption when it sets in. I can tell you it is a lot of fun! Once you had a royal commission there was the spotlight of public opinion. We could not find out who was at the heart of that corruption but that royal commission did find out who was at the heart of it. We were able to remove that person, which we as a government could not do.

I share the government's fear about where a royal commission might go. As Menzies said, you never have an inquiry unless you know what the answer is going to be. So I share their fears, and they are quite realistic fears. You only have to look at what happened to us in Queensland. In our efforts to get at the police, we were torn apart. So the government is quite right in being worried about that. I ask every person on that side of the House who has said there should be no inquiry into banking whether they are serious. I felt so sorry for the member for Dawson. There would not be a person in his electorate who would agree with that proposition—not a single person in his electorate would agree with that proposition—and nor would most of the other electorates in Australia.
I represent the agricultural industry and particularly the cattle industry. This is what the banks did for us: we received $750 million. We thanked Treasurer Swan and Treasurer Hockey for that money but the banks organised it so that we could not get a reconstruction board because they would lose a lot of business to the reconstruction board. I speak with authority because I was effectively head of the reconstruction board in Queensland. Their antagonism towards us was enormous. They put another banking institution out there, and so we had no banking institution. Something like two-thirds of the dairy farmers in Australia have gone. There is a farmer doing away with himself every four days in this country and no-one seems to think that there is any problem. I would say that one in 10 of those problems comes from deficiencies in the banking system.

Let me just zero in on a case. This was a case that Treasurer Swan thought was so important that he ordered the head of ASIC to meet with me twice. This was a problem that Treasurer Hockey thought was so important that he ordered ASIC to meet with me once. There was a $200 million sugar mill owned by the farmers. It was sold out from under them for $2 million. Has anyone gone to jail? Was there any inquiry? Did ASIC do anything? In Innisfail, where this occurred, they refer to ASIC not as a watchdog but as a lapdog. Of course there are the figures—anyone can find out. The mill was valued the year before, and there was an offer for $56 million. The year after, the mill was sold by the company for $76 million—but they had bought it for $2 million!

The banks are going well. They have loaned money for housing to a point where the housing values in the Greater Sydney area are near enough to $1 million. The average income for an Australian is $75,000, and most Australians are well below that. Take out the tax and you are at about $56,000. If you are paying $970,000 for a house, there is your $56,000 gone. And then you tell me there is no necessity for an inquiry?

You are standing on the brink of a precipice, and every intelligent person in this country knows that you are standing on the brink of a precipice. Maybe you don't want the spotlight, because it might indicate that the precipice is there. I can assure everyone in this House that the government—I don't mean to be offensive to the ALP, but I would agree with people on the other side that I wouldn't be convinced that they would have done anything, because they were there for three years. I am not making a partisan plea. I am simply saying to you that I, like the rest of Australia, would not have faith in this place being able to address the problems of the banking industry. I would have faith in a royal commission because I have seen it at work and I have seen its enormous effectiveness in achieving the goals it was after.

Let me give you one other example. There was a now very famous case of a bloke called Charlie Phillott. The state member for Mount Isa—Robbie Katter, my son—called a big meeting. God bless the Deputy Prime Minister for going to that meeting. It was a last stand meeting at Winton. A bloke called David Pascoe wrote a letter about a bloke called Charlie Phillott. He wrote, 'A letter to my fellow Australians,' and he concentrated on Charlie Phillott. He concentrated on Charlie Phillott. If you want to see everything that is good about this country, meet Charlie Phillott, because he represents everything that is good about this country. My staff sat in front of the screen, reading the letter, and they were all crying. My wife sat in front of the screen and burst out crying. She formed a body to send out food and help to some of these people.

The spotlight was turned on this issue. Phillott had walked off. He owned nothing. The farm had fallen to pieces. But when the spotlight of public attention was put on the bank, the
chairman himself, God bless him—I think he is a good man—said, 'What's going on here?' Charlie Phillott had his $2 million station returned to him. The debt of $2 million was written off and $750,000 to put the station back in order. 60 Minutes ran two segments on it. That is the power of the spotlight. You give us no spotlight and we have got no power, right? If there is one thing I would agree strongly with the LNP about, it is that the ALP failed to do it. The LNP has failed to do it. Believe me, in Queensland we failed to weed out police corruption. Did the royal commission weed it out? Yes, it did.

    What I am saying is that we want the spotlight and the power of public opinion which was so enormously effective in the now famous case of Charlie Phillott. By the way, that letter got 3½ million hits. It was the highest ever recorded in Australian history for a letter on the internet. It pointed out the shortcomings of the banks. The spotlight is in itself a redress.

    We have had an inquiry into Woolworths and Coles. You ought to read it. It said, 'They are going to take over Australia. They've got 60 per cent of the market. They're increasing at 2½ per cent a year. You'd better do something about it.' Did the government—successive governments—do anything about it? No. They now have nearly 90 per cent of the Australian food market. We had a dairy inquiry called by Mr Costello. I am not knocking him. I thank him for calling on the inquiry. It was another whitewash: 'There's nothing wrong with the dairy industry,'—nothing except that 7,000 of the 15,000 dairy farmers have gone broke, bankrupt, and walked off their properties worth absolutely nothing. There is nothing wrong apart from that. If you think you can achieve these objectives with all of the muscle power that we were able to bring on the cattle industry and secured $800 million in loans—do you know how many cattlemen got assistance from the government in Queensland? Four—one, two, three, four. The minister was advised that there were only 13 cattlemen at risk. Well, four stations had been foreclosed on in the Caulfield area. The famous Charlie Phillott said 12 had been foreclosed on in the Winton area. The Catholic priest in Longreach said one quarter of the stations there were being foreclosed on. And you say, 'What's banking got to do with this?'

    If we had a reconstruction board, no-one would have been foreclosed on. And I speak with authority because in Queensland we did have a reconstruction authority. I happened to be the minister with primary, but not ultimate, responsibility. And we went in and we were told—(Time expired)

Mr McCormack (Riverina—Minister for Small Business) (18:20): I note that the shadow Treasurer, the member for McMahon, has declined to speak. His silence in the chamber is deafening.

    Opposition members interjecting—

Mr McCormack: Okay, I am being a little presumptuous. But I can say—

    Opposition members interjecting—

Mr McCormack: I am going to be really pleased to hear the member for McMahon because when he was Assistant Treasurer in 2013 he said: 'The financial system is strong, well regulated and well managed, and I have not seen a case for a full-blown inquiry.' But there was not just that. He also said: 'Our two market guardians are the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority and the Australian Securities and Investments Commission—APRA and ASIC. The standard they set is world's best practice.' He said that when he was Assistant
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Treasurer—in an op ed entitled 'Good place in an economic storm' published in Fairfax's Sydney Morning Herald on 24 September 2008. So, when given the opportunity, the member for McMahon did not want a royal commission.

The big banks can, and will, be accountable. Australia's major banks are now going to be called to appear before parliament at least annually. They will be brought before the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Economics to report jointly to the Treasurer, the member for Cook, and the parliament on our banking and financial system in Australia. That is entirely right and appropriate. It is up to the banks to explain their actions to their customers in full so that customers can be fully informed when making their personal financial decisions. Of course, we live in a free market age. In financial markets, if people do not like what they are getting from the banks they can walk down the street to a customer owned banking association facility. They can go to a credit union.

The banks, in coming before the committee, will have an opportunity to explain how they are responding to funding issues to support Australian consumers and businesses. I am proud to be the Minister for Small Business. Small business is the engine room of the economy. It employs 4.7 million Australians. It accounts for $340 billion worth of economic good to this nation. The banks' appearance before the committee will ensure they can transparently account for their decision making and how they balance the needs of borrowers, savers, shareholders and the wider community. This is important. The banks will be required to explain to the parliamentary committee matters including international economic and financial market developments and how these are affecting our nation. They will be required to explain, if necessary, developments in prudential regulation, including capital requirements, and how these are affecting the policies of Australian banks. They will be required to explain the costs of funds, the impacts on margins and the basis for bank interest rate pricing decisions. All these are good. All these are necessary. They will be required to explain how individual banks and the banking industry as a whole are responding to issues previously raised in parliamentary inquiries through the necessary processes, through their package of reforms announced in April this year, and also bank perspectives on the performance of the Australian economy, including its strengths and potential risks.

The coalition government has already taken significant and proper steps to further strengthen our banking and financial system through the conduct of the Murray financial system inquiry and the ongoing implementation of the recommendations of that particular report. In addition, the government has acted to strengthen the resources and capability of ASIC—not just the investigator powers of a royal commission but also the ability to prosecute and otherwise act against those responsible for malfeasance in the banking and financial sector. And that is totally right and proper.

Just yesterday Minister O'Dwyer and I announced that the Australian Small Business and Family Enterprise Ombudsman, Kate Carnell, who is a very respected political and business figure, has been directed to take undertake an inquiry to assess whether the current laws address the concerns raised by the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Corporations and Financial Services in its report. It was tabled on 4 May 2016 and was entitled, Impairment of customer loans.

The ombudsman will examine selected cases as identified by the parliamentary joint committee and, with the terms of reference provided, she will give advice to the government.
to help determine if further regulatory action is required. That is right, that is proper, that is necessary. We are taking action. We do not need a royal commission into the banks. The PJC raised serious concerns about how banks treated some of their small business lending customers and they made a number of recommendations to address the deficiencies they identified.

The government has a substantial financial sector agenda to improve consumer outcomes. However, the ombudsman will be able to identify, through a forensic analysis, if further reforms are needed. Ombudsman Carnell will do that. She will provide interim findings to the Ramsay review to inform the wider review of external dispute resolution schemes in the financial services sector, and the final report is due to be provided to the government in 12 weeks.

The government has recently announced that the major banks and other financial firms are going to report annually. As I said previously, this is necessary and this approach will ensure that the banks and other major financial firms are more transparent in their decision making. They will be held account to the Australian people and by the Australian people.

I would like to put in Hansard the terms of reference of this very important inquiry which is going to be conducted by Ombudsman Carnell. The terms of reference are:

- review a selection of the cases that have been identified by the PJC as unfair and ascertain whether there are any deficiencies in the regulation of authorised deposit taking institutions in lending to small business—

As I said, small business is the engine room of this economy. Further:

- refer any matters identified in the review to the relevant authority for further consideration as necessary;
- determine whether the regulatory deficiencies identified by the PJC, or additional deficiencies identified through the inquiry, are being addressed by subsequent Government and industry reforms; and
- recommend whether additional reform measures should be implemented (legislation, regulations, guidance and practices) to ensure products perform in the way they should, taking into account that consumers have a responsibility to accept their financial decisions—

we know that, we appreciate that—

including market losses, when they have been treated fairly, and any impact on the availability and cost of credit to small business.

The government does not support a royal commission into the banking and financial services sector because a royal commission will not benefit consumers or the Australian economy; it will benefit lawyers—the Prime Minister made that point in question time today and question time yesterday.

Critically, a royal commission would just go over old ground and would delay well developed and important reforms, which will strengthen consumer protections and ensure that malpractice is detected and, where necessary, punished, and provide a one-stop shop for consumer complaints. In addition a royal commission would send a signal internationally—that is the last thing that we need—that the government believes that there are structural problems with our banking and financial sector. This would have a significant repercussion
for confidence, for international investment and, of course, for our all-important AAA credit rating.

This motion is a further demonstration that the Leader of the Opposition is not fit to hold his current position. He had the opportunity he was the Minister for Financial Services and Superannuation from the 14 September 2010 to 1 July 2013 and he was the Minister for Workplace Relations from 2011 to 2013. In that time, he did not call for a royal commission into the banking sector. When he was in charge of workplace relations, about the most notable thing that he did was to talk up the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal, a tribunal I might add—

Mr Shorten: Hope you are running the census better than that!

Mr McCORMACK: No, I am talking about the member for Maribyrnong. A tribunal I might add that was going to place Riverina truck-driving family businesses off the road and do the same thing right throughout the nation. It took a gallant effort by the Minister for Employment, Senator Michaelia Cash, and this side of parliament to absolutely strike that out—as we should have, because family truck drivers keep this nation running, and to have them put off the road was a damn disgrace.

The government recognises that the financial services sector has not always lived up to the standards expected by the Australian community. We understand that, and that is why this government is implementing the most significant package of reforms to the financial sector in recent history. We didn't see too much from that side when they were in government. Six sorry years in government just racked up the debt and deficit. They never called for a royal commission—

The SPEAKER: The minister will address the topic of the motion.

Mr McCORMACK: and shouldn't be calling for one now.

Mr Burke: I raise a point of order under standing order 78. Earlier you made a ruling, which, when made, the House did not object to in any way, about whether or not there had been sufficient debate at that point in time. Every single speaker since that time—on government, opposition and crossbench—has given speeches about whether or not the motion from the Senate should be supported. That is not the motion before the parliament.

The motion before the parliament is whether or not we should deal with the Senate motion at the first available opportunity after 5.20 pm. Given that the debate of the House has moved entirely now to the substantive motion, rather than the motion that is before us, there is no doubt that the House is now ready to receive the motion that the question be put, and I therefore move that the question be put.

The SPEAKER: As the Manager of Opposition Business well knows, as Speaker I have a practice when either the Leader of the House or the Manager of Opposition Business makes a point of order, as a courtesy, to hear from their counterpart. I have heard the Manager of Opposition Business—

Mr Burke: Therefore, I will withdraw the motion that I moved and just leave it at the point of order until you have ruled.
The SPEAKER: I was about to address the point of order, but I see the Leader of the House wants to address the point of order and I give him that right. The Leader of the House on the point of order.

Mr Pyne: On the point of order, I think it is quite clear that the members are talking to the substantive issues that face the Senate and the House of Representatives, which is not dealing with that matter now. The reason they are saying we should not deal with those matters now is because of the government's policy with respect to dealing with the banks versus the Labor Party's policy of a royal commission. Of course if you, Mr Speaker, directed the members of this side of the House to speak more to the procedural motion, I am sure they would be quite prepared to do so, but no-one has yet made that point.

The SPEAKER: I thank both the Manager of Opposition Business and the Leader of the House. The point the Manager of Opposition Business makes is that in his view—to be fair there are speakers on both sides, so it includes the Leader of the Opposition in that—we have strayed from a technical reading of the motion. That is his point. You can have that argument. As you know, I tend to try to be practical about these things, because I have sat in this House for a long period of time and seen the consequences when it becomes highly technical.

The substantive point of the Manager of Opposition Business was that because the speakers so far in the debate have had a consistency that he pointed out that, therefore, means that future speakers will adopt exactly the same attitude. That is a very unfair thing to say of future speakers in the debate. I am not at the point yet where I feel that from my original ruling—we have had four speakers on one side and two on the opposition side. If the opposition side does not wish to speak that is their perfect right, but I am going to hear further speakers. Of course, it has been open right through the debate for the Manager of Opposition Business, if he has felt aggrieved by that, to have raised points of order and I would have considered those points of order. Indeed, he could have even raised a point of order on the Leader of the Opposition.

What I am saying is that I have heard him. I am going to hear some further speakers. I respect the fact that he has withdrawn his motion. The minister's time had concluded and I will now call the member for McMahon from the opposition.

Mr Bowen (McMahon) (18:34): For a government which has spent a lot of time saying that there is no problem, they have sure spent a lot of energy trying to find a solution. A government which says, 'There's nothing to see here,' before an election has now found not one, not two, not three but four solutions to a problem they not long ago denied existed. The problem is that none of those solutions will work.

None of the solutions that the government have come up with will work and they know it, because they keep changing the answer. Originally we were told the answer was more resources for ASIC. If we could just give more resources to ASIC they could get on with the job. The problem of course was that they cut the resources before they put more in. So the best they could do is come up with a level of resourcing which they inherited, which is no greater—not a dollar greater—than it was when they came to office. They said that was the solution; that would fix the problems.

Then they realised that actually that was not going to cut the mustard. So then we had the next brainwave: an annual chat by the banks with the member for Banks. The Prime Minister said, 'I assure you: this will change behaviour. This will change the way the banks operate.' If
they get called in once a year to sit, not with a Senate committee, not with a joint committee but with a government-dominated House committee to answer questions that would somehow change behaviour.

Mr Pyne: I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

Opposition members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House is entitled to move that motion, but not while someone is speaking.

Mr BOWEN: So we were told that an annual chat with the member for Banks would change behaviour. And now the latest solution is a tribunal, of which we have no detail and no information—we do not know how it will work with the Financial Services Ombudsman or other tribunals that already exist. We already have some of these tribunals in existence, and now a new tribunal, we are told, will fix it.

And then of course we have the latest solution by the Minister for Small Business, who was such a triumph in the census—such a triumph of public administration. He has now sent a referral for an inquiry to the Small Business Ombudsman, who is the former Chief Minister of the ACT. Now, forgive us for not being blown over and impressed with that little stunt—that that is somehow going to fix all the problems.

The Prime Minister does not want a royal commission into financial services. He has some experience in royal commissions into financial services and they have not gone too well in the past. So no wonder he does not want a royal commission into financial services on this occasion. And the government thinks it is clever to go through some of the scandals and some of the crises that occurred when Labor was in office, and when I and the now Leader of the Opposition had ministerial responsibility. Well, we are happy to talk about that because that is just why the Leader of the Opposition and I know that a royal commission is necessary.

The Leader of the Opposition and I have spent a long time meeting with victims. I spent time in office meeting with victims. I have met with the victims of Trio. I know the victims of Timbertcorp. I know the victims of bad financial advice, and that is why I and this Leader of the Opposition put through the financial advice reforms that we did. And do you know who voted for them? Labor Party members. Do you know who voted against them? Liberal and National Party members, on every single occasion!

And do you know what else Liberal and National Party members did? They went to the 2013 election and said, 'Oh, no. We can live with these reforms now. That's okay.' And then they won the 2013 election, and then they tried to overturn them. In fact, it is worse: they actually succeeded in overturning them for a period of time. They had the numbers in this House and they managed to get the numbers in the other place, and they actually legislated to water down the Labor protections which we had put in while in office. They actually voted successfully to provide less protection to Australian consumers of financial advice.

That was one of their big priorities when it came to financial reform. That was their big agenda: to ignore the lack of mandate, to spend their resources, their political capital and their energy to water down protections on financial advice. But the Senate was awake. The Senate worked it out; cross benchers in the other place knew that they had been had. Then it was put again in the Senate and their repeal was overturned. I say to the government: Shame on you
for trying to water down our protections! Shame on you for leaving victims of financial advice to the vagaries of dodgy advice!

We will talk about the things that happened when we were in office, and that is why we understand—because they are still happening. As good as the financial advice reforms are and as important as they are, we still see scandals. You know what? We know who perpetrated some of those scandals, and some of those people are still working in financial services today. Some of those people are still in the sector, and we know that a royal commission is what is necessary to deal with the culture, with the structure and with the things which bring about crisis after crisis and scandal after scandal. We know that an eminent Australian—or Australians—properly versed in the nature of Australia's financial services system is what is necessary to shine a light. We all know what royal commissions can do and what benefits they can bring. We have called royal commissions in the past, when we were in office, for the right reasons, and thank goodness we did. They had their naysayers. They had people who said they were not necessary. Not many people say they are not necessary now.

We know that the Liberal Party and the National Party have no in-principle objections to royal commissions. They are not slow in calling them when they think it suits their political interests. They do not mind spending taxpayers' money on royal commissions which are designed to further the political interests of those who sit opposite. But they are determined to avoid them when they promote not their political interests but the national interests—the interests of victims of financial scandals.

The Prime Minister lectures and he says, 'The victims of financial scandals do not want a royal commission.' How he would he know? He does not talk to them. How would he know? He does not meet with them. How would he know? He does not engage with the victims of financial scandals. You know what? It is true that some of them say, 'It will not help me.' It is true that some of the victims of financial scandals say, 'The damage is done for me.' But, having been through it, having lost life savings, having in many instances seen their family break up and, in some tragic instances, having lost members of their family, they do not want to see it happen to another Australian. They do not want to see it happen to another family. They know that something has to change. They know that the culture has to change, that the system has to change, and that tinkering will not do it. They know that a royal commission will. They know that a royal commission, properly constituted with the powers and authority necessary, will get to the bottom of what they went through.

How did we find out about the scandals that have occurred so far? Is it because of the banks, financial service providers and financial advisers have come out and said, 'Do you want to reveal to the Australian people we have got a little problem here?' No, it is not. It is because they have been exposed. They have been exposed, in many instances, by investigative journalists. I want, in the House, to pay due credit to one in particular. Australia owes a debt of gratitude to Adele Ferguson, who has pursued these issues with passion and tenacity. It is due to her and her investigative journalism that many of these scandals have come to light.

But Australia should not be relying on one journalist or even on more than one journalist. Australians should not be relying on one media outlet to examine these issues. Australians are reliant on us, on everybody in this House, to do their job and on everybody in the other house to do their job. And they are reliant on us to make sure that the proper procedures are in place.
and resources are given. They know that a royal commission is the way to do that. With all due respect to Adele Ferguson—she is a very fine journalist—she can only do so much and the other investigative journalists can only do so much. These inquiries and scandals have not been brought to light by ASIC—with all due respect to ASIC and the work they do; they have been brought about by people outside the system of government. And that cannot be allowed to stand for one day more. This House has the opportunity tonight to send a message to the government.

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

Mr Burke: Under standing order 78(a), I move that the member for McMahon's time be extended by an additional 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER: That motion is not in order. You can move an extension of time but, if you look to page three of the standing orders, you will see that it cannot exceed half the original speaking times.

Mr Burke: Then I move:

That the member for McMahon's time be extended by the maximum allowed under the standing orders.

The SPEAKER: Which is five minutes. The Manager of Opposition Business has moved that the member for McMahon's time be extended by five minutes. All those of that opinion say aye; to the contrary no.

Question agreed to.

Mr BOWEN: Thanks for the support. I will thank the House more if we actually do the right thing by Australian financial consumers and say to this Prime Minister, 'Do the right thing and call a royal commission.' Only the executive can call a royal commission. Only the executive can determine the terms of reference. Only the executive can advise a Governor-General. That is why it is called a royal commission: because it has to have to assent of the Governor-General. But I tell you what: this House can express its will. This House can say to the elected government of the day, 'This is what we want you to do.' And if this Prime Minister and this Treasurer and this executive ignore the will of this House then they will be showing more than their incompetence. They will be showing more than their lack of willingness to embrace the best interests of Australia's financial consumers. Above all, they will be showing their arrogance through their willingness to ignore the wish of the other place and this place and their willingness and their determination to use all the powers of the executive to ignore the wishes of elected members of the House of Representatives.

Members tonight have an opportunity to look into their conscience, and I say this in all seriousness to people of goodwill on the other side of the House, those who have called and argued for a royal commission in the past; those who have tweeted about a royal commission in the past; and those who have been part of inquiries of this House and the other place that have made the case eloquently and powerfully for a royal commission: now is the time for delivery. Now is the time when you can actually do it. Now is the time when elected members of this House can stand up for this House's rights, for this House's responsibilities and obligations and all of our responsibilities to our constituents.

We all represent Australians who have been the victims of financial scandals. But, even more importantly than that, we represent people who might be the victims of future financial
We represent people who may be subject to this sort of behaviour in the future, and we can stop it happening. We cannot stop the scandals of the past, but we can put in place the laws to stop them happening in the future. How will we feel if we do not? How will those members who have called for a royal commission in the past feel if they do not? When there is another scandal and we have ignored our opportunity tonight to call a royal commission, how will we feel? I know how members on this side of the House will feel. We will feel that we have done the right thing, but we will be angry, as many millions of Australians will be angry, that this opportunity was lost.

We do not detain the House lightly tonight. We do not detain the House because this is something that we want to do for fun. We detain the House tonight because this is a matter of vital national importance. We detain the House tonight because the Australian people are watching and waiting for real action. We detain the House tonight because the time for talk is over and the time for action is now. We detain the House tonight because this House can send a signal to this arrogant Prime Minister that the time has come to put the Australian people first. The time has come to put victims of financial scandals first. The time has come to put possible future victims of financial scandals first by avoiding those scandals, by having a proper and thoroughly constituted and well-resourced royal commission run by eminent Australians, run by people who understand the importance of a well-regulated financial services system. This can be done tonight.

I say to the Prime Minister: sometimes you just have to know when you have lost. Sometimes you just have to know when it is time to recognise reality. Sometimes you just have to know when it is time to say, 'Okay; I might have got this one wrong.' I know it is not in your nature, Prime Minister. I know it is not something that comes naturally to the Prime Minister, but I have to say that I think the Australian people would react well to a Prime Minister who said, 'I've got this one wrong. I've heard the message. I want to work with the Labor Party and the crossbenchers, and I will deliver a royal commission. It might not have been my idea or something that I thought was great, but I have been convinced in the national interest.' This is one where the Prime Minister can actually put the national interest in front of his political interest. This is one where he does not need to listen to the right wing in his cabinet. He can listen to millions of Australians and can say: 'I get it. I hear the message. I will deliver a royal commission, because the Australian people deserve it. I will deliver a royal commission, because the Australian people deserve nothing less—and I will deliver a royal commission, because it is the right thing to do.'

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (18:49): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

A division having been called and the bells being rung—

The SPEAKER: The member for Grayndler on a point of order during a division?

Mr Albanese: Yes, Mr Speaker. The question that is before the House now that you have asked to be put is 'that the debate be adjourned.'

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr Albanese: What has not been determined, and we would ask that it be determined separately, is whether that be adjourned to the next sitting, or whether it can be adjourned to a
later hour this day. That question is not before the House, and, therefore, that is an issue that we would ask needs to be resolved in addition to this. We point this out so that it is very clear to the House what it is voting on.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the House moved 'that the debate be adjourned'. I can put the question that is before the chair, which I have done.

**Mr Albanese:** It is not a criticism of you, Mr Speaker; it is of someone else—to be clear.

**The SPEAKER:** The question is that the debate be adjourned.

The House divided. [18:54]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ays ...................... 73
Noes ...................... 72
Majority ............... 1

**AYES**

Abbott, AJ  
Andrews, KJ  
Banks, J  
Broad, AJ  
Buchholz, S  
Christensen, GR (teller)  
Coleman, DB  
Crewther, CJ  
Dutton, PC  
Evans, TM  
Fletcher, PW  
Frydenberg, JA  
Gillespie, DA  
Hartley, L  
Hawke, AG  
Hogan, KJ  
Hunt, GA  
Joyce, BT  
Laming, A  
Laundy, C  
Ley, SP  
Marano, NB  
McVeigh, JJ  
Morton, B  
O'Brien, T  
O'Dwyer, KM  
Pitt, KJ  
Prentice, J  
Pyne, CM  
Robert, SR  
Sukkar, MS  
Tehan, DT  
Turnbull, MB  
Wallace, AB  
Wilson, RJ  
Wood, JP  
Zimmerman, T

**NOES**

Alexander, JG  
Andrews, KL  
Bishop, JI  
Broadbent, RE  
Chester, D  
Ciobo, SM  
Coulton, M  
Drum, DK  
Entsch, WG  
Falinski, J  
Flint, NJ  
Gee, AR  
Goodenough, IR  
Hastie, AW  
Henderson, SM  
Howarth, LR  
Irons, SJ  
Kelly, C  
Landry, ML  
Leeser, J  
Littleproud, D  
McCormack, MF  
Morrison, SJ  
O'Dowd, KD  
Pasin, A  
Porter, CC  
Price, ML  
Ramsey, RE (teller)  
Sadmalis, AE  
Taylor, AJ  
Tudge, AE  
Van Manen, AJ  
Wicks, LE  
Wilson, TR  
Wyatt, KG
The question now is that the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (19:01): I move:

That the question be now put.

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

Mr Burke interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the House was on his feet.

Mr Burke: We were both on our feet.
The SPEAKER: You were not at the dispatch box.

Mr Burke interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Manager of Opposition Business will resume his seat. I am being as patient as I can with both sides. You were not at the dispatch box. The Leader of the House was at the dispatch box. You cannot take a point of order until you are at the dispatch box, otherwise people could take them from the fourth row out of their chair. The question is that the question be put.

The House divided. [19:03]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes .................... 73
Noes .................... 72
Majority .............. 1

AYES
Abbott, AJ
Andrews, KJ
Banks, J
Broad, AJ
Buchholz, S
Christensen, GR (teller)
Coleman, DB
Crewther, CJ
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hartsuyker, L
Hawke, AG
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A
Laundy, C
Ley, SP
Marino, NB
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O’Brien, T
O’Dwyer, KM
Pitt, KJ
Prentice, J
Pyne, CM
Robert, SR
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Turnbull, MB
Wallace, AB
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Zimmerman, T

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KL
Bishop, JI
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Ciobo, SM
Coulton, M
Drum, DK
Entsch, WG
Falinski, J
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Goodenough, IR
Hastie, AW
Henderson, SM
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
McCormack, MF
Morrison, SJ
O’Brien, LS
O’Dowd, KD
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Price, ML
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sudmalis, AE
Taylor, AJ
Tudge, AE
Van Manen, AJ
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG
Question agreed to.

**The SPEAKER (19:08):** *(In division)* I just reiterate to the tellers that this is a successive division, a one-minute division, and members need to report to the tellers if they are changing their vote or have entered the chamber.

**Mr Pyne:** Mr Speaker, point of order: as you have stated—and the tellers are not actually following your instructions—there is no reason for them to do a full vote. It is a successive division and, as no-one has reported to them, they can report the result to you immediately.

**Mr Burke:** Do you want them to have to start again?

*Mr Albanese interjecting—*
The SPEAKER: The Manager of Opposition Business and the member for Grayndler will cease interjecting. I have made the point to the tellers that it is a successive division and they do not need to do a full count. That is the point of a successive, one-minute division.

Mr Shorten interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Excuse me, Leader of the Opposition. I am not giving the tellers a hard time; I am explaining. The question now is that the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

A division having been called and the bells being rung—

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: you just stated to the House the question on which we are voting. Was that the first time you stated the question?

The SPEAKER: I stated it, and then the closure was moved. We have had the closure—that is done. Now we go back to the question.

Mr Burke: Did you say it?

The SPEAKER: I stated it and you were trying to take a point of order out of your seat when the Leader of the House came to the dispatch box and moved the closure.

Mr Burke: If I am not out of my seat I am not allowed to take a point of order—I can't do it sitting down!

The SPEAKER: We are not going to have a discussion—you have made your point of order. Lock the doors. The question is that the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for the next sitting.

The House divided. [19:12]

Ayes .................... 73
Noes .................... 72
Majority................. 1

AYES

Abbott, AJ
Andrews, KJ
Banks, J
Broad, AJ
Buchholz, S
Christensen, GR (teller)
Coleman, DB
Crewther, CJ
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hartson, L
Hawke, AG
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A
Laundy, C

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KL
Bishop, JI
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Ciobo, SM
Coulton, M
Drum, DK
Entsch, WG
Falinski, J
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Goodenough, IR
Hastie, AW
Henderson, SM
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Leeser, J

CHAMBER
AYES

Ley, SP
Marino, NB
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O’Brien, B
O’Dwyer, KM
Pitt, KJ
Prentice, J
Pyne, CM
Robert, SR
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Turnbull, MB
Wallace, AB
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Zimmerman, T

Littleproud, D
McCormack, MF
Morrison, SJ
O’Brien, LS
O’Dowd, KD
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Price, ML
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sudmalis, AE
Taylor, AJ
Tudge, AE
Van Manen, AJ
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG

NOES

Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burke, AS
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Champion, ND
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Danby, M
Dreyfus, MA
Ellis, KM
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georganas, S
Gosling, LJ
Hart, RA
Hill, JC
Husie, EN
Katter, RC
Kelly, MJ
Khalil, P
King, MMH
Leigh, AK
Leiles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Neumann, SK
O’Toole, C
Perrett, GD (teller)
Rishworth, AL
Ryan, JC (teller)
Shorten, WR
Stanley, AM
Swanson, MJ

Aly, A
Bird, SL
Brodtmann, G
Burney, LJ
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Chesters, LM
Claydon, SC
Conroy, PM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Feeney, D
Freelander, MR
Giles, AJ
Hammond, TJ
Hayes, CP
Husar, E
Jones, SP
Keay, JT
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Lamb, S
Macklin, JL
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
O’Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Sharkie, RCC
Snowdon, WE
Swan, WM
Templeman, SR
NOES
Thistlethwaite, MJ
Watts, TG
Wilson, JH
Vamvakinou, M
Wilkie, AD
Zappia, A

Question agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (19:14): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr Burke: Mr Speaker, I would like to say that we should not adjourn now; we should debate—

Mr PYNE: I move:

That the question be now put.

A division having been called and the bells being rung—

The SPEAKER: The member for Grayndler, on a point of order?

Mr Albanese: The subsequent debate [inaudible] one-minute ring before, so shouldn't it be four minutes?

The SPEAKER: No, I have ruled a one-minute division. There wasn't subsequent debate. The question is that the motion be put.

The House divided. [19:15]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 73
Noes ...................... 72
Majority ................. 1

AYES
Abbott, AJ
Andrews, KJ
Banks, J
Broad, AJ
Buchholz, S
Christensen, GR (teller)
Coleman, DB
Crewther, CJ
Dutton, PC
Evans, TM
Fletcher, PW
Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hartsuyker, L
Hawke, AG
Hogan, KJ
Hunt, GA
Joyce, BT
Laming, A

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KL
Bishop, JI
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Ciobo, SM
Coulton, M
Drum, DK
Entsch, WG
Falinski, J
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Goodenough, IR
Hastie, AW
Henderson, SM
Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
AYES
Laundy, C
Ley, SP
Marino, NB
McVeigh, JJ
Morton, B
O’Brien, T
O’Dwyer, KM
Pitt, KJ
Prentice, J
Pyne, CM
Robert, SR
Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Turnbull, MB
Wallace, AB
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Zimmerman, T

Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
McCormack, MF
Morrison, SJ
O’Brien, LS
O’Dowd, KD
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Price, ML
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sadmalis, AE
Taylor, AJ
Tudge, AE
Van Manen, AJ
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG

NOES
Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burke, AS
Butler, MC
Byrne, AM
Champion, ND
Clare, JD
Collins, JM
Danby, M
Dreyfus, MA
Ellis, KM
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georganas, S
Gosling, LJ
Hart, RA
Hill, JC
Husic, EN
Katter, RC
Kelly, MJ
Kalil, P
King, MMH
Leigh, AK
Marles, RD
Mitchell, BK
Neumann, SK
O’Toole, C
Perrett, GD (teller)
Rishworth, AL
Ryan, JC (teller)
Shorten, WR
Stanley, AM

Aly, A
Bird, SL
Brodtmann, G
Burney, LJ
Butler, TM
Chalmers, JE
Chesters, LM
Claydon, SC
Conroy, PM
Dick, MD
Elliott, MJ
Feeney, D
Freelander, MR
Giles, AJ
Hammond, TJ
Hayes, CP
Husar, E
Jones, SP
Keay, JT
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Lamb, S
Macklin, JL
McBride, EM
Mitchell, RG
O’Connor, BPJ
Owens, JA
Plibersek, TJ
Rowland, MA
Sharkie, RCC
Snowdon, WE
Swan, WM
Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (19:17): The question now is that the House do now adjourn.

The House divided. [19:18]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 73
Noes ...................... 72
Majority ................. 1

AYES

Abbott, AJ  Alexander, JG
Andrews, KJ  Andrews, KL
Banks, J  Bishop, JI
Broad, AJ  Broadbent, RE
Buchholz, S  Chester, D
Christensen, GR (teller)  Ciobo, SM
Coleman, DB  Coulton, M
Crewther, CJ  Drum, DK
Dutton, PC  Entsch, WG
Evans, TM  Falinski, J
Fletcher, PW  Flint, NJ
Frydenberg, JA  Gee, AR
Gillespie, DA  Goodenough, IR
Hartsuyker, L  Haste, AW
Hawke, AG  Henderson, SM
Hogan, KJ  Howarth, LR
Hunt, GA  Irons, SJ
Joyce, BT  Kelly, C
Laming, A  Landry, ML
Laundy, C  Leeser, J
Ley, SP  Littleproud, D
Marino, NB  McCormack, MF
McVeigh, JJ  Morrison, SJ
Morton, B  O’Brien, LS
O’Brien, T  O’Dowd, KD
O’Dwyer, KM  Pasin, A
Pitt, KJ  Porter, CC
Prentice, J  Price, ML
Pyne, CM  Ramsey, RE (teller)
Robert, SR  Sudmalis, AE
Sukkar, MS  Taylor, AJ
Tehan, DT  Tudge, AE
Turnbull, MB  Van Manen, AJ
Wallace, AB  Wicks, LE
Wilson, RJ  Wilson, TR
Wood, JP  Wyatt, KG
Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER (19:20): The House stands adjourned until Monday, 12 September 2016 at 10 am.

House adjourned at 19:20

NOTICES

The following notice(s) were given:

Mr Pyne: to move:

That:
(1) a Joint Standing Committee on the National Broadband Network be appointed to inquire into and report on the rollout of the national broadband network;

(2) until the national broadband network is declared built and fully operational, the committee report to each House of the Parliament annually on:
   (a) rollout progress with particular regard to the NBN Co Limited Statement of Expectations issued by Shareholder Ministers on 24 August 2016;
   (b) utilisation of the national broadband network in connected localities in both metropolitan and regional areas, and the identification of opportunities to enhance economic and social benefits;
   (c) Australia’s comparative global position with regard to residential broadband infrastructure; particularly relative to other large, developed economies;
   (d) national broadband network activation rates, user demand, usage patterns and trends, and any identified impediments to the take-up of national broadband network services;
   (e) any market, industry, or regulatory characteristics that may impede the efficient and cost-effective rollout of the national broadband network; and
   (f) any other matter pertaining to the national broadband network rollout that the committee considers relevant;

(3) the Committee consist of 17 members, 4 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Government Whip or Whips, 4 Members of the House of Representatives to be nominated by the Opposition Whip or Whips, and 1 non-aligned Member, 3 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate, 3 Senators to be nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, 1 Senator to be nominated by the Leader of the Australian Greens in the Senate; and 1 Senator to be nominated by any minority group or independent Senator;

(4) participating members:
   (a) may be appointed to the committee on the nomination in the:
      (i) House of Representatives, of the Government or Opposition Whip or Whips, or any minority group or independent member; and
      (ii) Senate, of the Leader of the Government or Opposition, or any minority group or independent senator.
   (b) shall be taken to be a member of the committee for the purpose of forming a quorum;
   (c) may participate in hearings of evidence and deliberations of the committee, and have all the rights of a member of the committee, except that a participating member may not vote on any question before the committee;

(5) the committee may proceed to the dispatch of business notwithstanding that not all members have been duly nominated and appointed and notwithstanding any vacancy;

(6) every nomination of a member of the committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(7) the members of the committee hold office as a joint standing committee until the House of Representatives is dissolved or expires by effluxion of time;

(8) the committee elect:
   (a) a Government member as its chair, and
   (b) an Opposition member as its deputy chair who shall act as chair of the committee at any time when the chair is not present at a meeting of the committee,

(9) at any time when the chair and deputy chair are not present at a meeting of the committee the members present shall elect another member to act as chair at that meeting.
(10) in the event of an equally divided vote, the chair, or the deputy chair when acting as chair, have a casting vote;

(11) five members of the committee constitute a quorum of the committee provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one Opposition member of either House;

(12) the committee:

(a) have power to appoint subcommittees consisting of 3 or more of its members, and to refer to any such subcommittee any of the matters which the committee is empowered to consider, provided that each subcommittee shall include at least one Government member of either House and one Opposition member of either House; and

(b) appoint the chair of each subcommittee who shall have a casting vote only;

(13) two members of a subcommittee constitute a quorum of that subcommittee, provided that in a deliberative meeting the quorum shall include one Government member of either House and one non-Government member of either House;

(14) members of the committee who are not members of a subcommittee may participate in the proceedings of that subcommittee but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purposes.

(15) the committee and any subcommittee have power to:

(a) call for witnesses to attend and for documents to be produced;

(b) conduct proceedings at any place it sees fit;

(c) sit in public or in private;

(d) report from time to time; and

(e) adjourn from time to time and to sit during any adjournment of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

(16) the committee be provided with all necessary staff, facilities and resources and be empowered to appoint persons with specialist knowledge for the purposes.

(17) the committee has power to consider and make use of the evidence and records of the Joint Committee on the National Broadband Network appointed during a previous Parliament;

(18) the provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders; and

(19) a message be sent to the Senate acquainting it of this resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Mr Zimmerman: to move:

That this House:

(1) celebrates the sesquicentenary of the Sisters of St Joseph and acknowledges the inspiration of St Mary of the Cross Mackillop;

(2) acknowledges the great works that the Sisters of St Joseph do all over the country in caring for the aged, education, supporting woman and families and partnering with Indigenous Australians to achieve outcomes;

(3) recognises that regional communities are a special part-focus of work for the order, since it was founded in Penola in South Australia in 1866; and

(4) congratulates the Sisters of St Joseph for the wonderful works they have done over the last 150 years and looks forward to the continuing works into the future.
Mrs Elliot: to move:
That this House notes that:
(1) families in regional and rural Australia rely on penalty rates;
(2) the take home pay of families in regional and rural Australia would be severely impacted if penalty rates were cut;
(3) cutting penalty rates in regional and rural Australia would hurt workers such as nurses and health care workers, retail and hospitality workers, police, firefighters, ambulance officers, cleaners, services sector employees and tourism and transport industry employees;
(4) members and candidates of the Liberal Party of Australia and the National Party continue to call for cuts to penalty rates on top of their continuous pressuring of the Fair Work Commission to reduce penalty rates in its current penalty rates case; and
(5) cutting penalty rates in regional and rural areas would also have a devastating flow-on impact for regional economies.

Ms Price: to move:
That this House:
(1) recognises the importance of well-developed transport links in regional Australia and the role they play in linking rural and regional communities;
(2) acknowledges the significant role that the Government has played in funding road and rail projects around Australia, especially in the electoral division of Durack;
(3) recognises that the Government is building our future by delivering over $50 billion in critical road and rail infrastructure in 2013-14 to 2019-20; and
(4) congratulates the Government for having a national economic plan that backs growth in our cities and regions.

Mr C. Kelly: to move:
That this House:
(1) recognises the important role that national servicemen played in the defence of Australia;
(2) acknowledges that Australia owes a great debt to these men who underwent military training and served our nation, many of those on foreign soil, in the Royal Australian Navy, Australian Army and Royal Australian Air Force, in the advancement and protection of Australia’s national interests;
(3) further acknowledges that during the:
   (a) first national service scheme between 1951 to 1959, approximately 227,000 men served across the three branches of the armed services, providing an important military capability during a period when Australia faced many international security challenges; and
   (b) second national service scheme from 1964 to 1972, more than 804,000 men registered for national service, of whom more than 63,000 were called up to serve in the Australian Army, and that during this period, more than 15,000 went on to serve in the Vietnam War, with 201 killed and more than 1,200 wounded; and
(4) thanks the ‘Nashos’ for their service and encourages the Australian community to remember the service of these men each year on 14 February which is National Servicemen’s Day.

Mrs Sudmalis: to move:
That this House:
(1) acknowledges that:
(a) improving mobile communications is of critical importance for people living in regional and remote parts of Australia; and

(b) the Government has committed $220 million over three funding rounds to the Mobile Black Spot Programme which will provide new or upgraded coverage to more than 3,000 black spots in regional and remote areas;

(2) recognises that mobile communications are not only essential for commerce, agriculture and education, but also for emergency services and public safety; and

(3) congratulates the Government for committing public funds to this important program to improve mobile communications in regional and remote Australia.