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**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:

- **ADELAIDE** 972AM
- **BRISBANE** 936AM
- **CANBERRA** 103.9FM
- **DARWIN** 102.5FM
- **HOBART** 747AM
- **MELBOURNE** 1026AM
- **PERTH** 585AM
- **SYDNEY** 630AM

For information regarding frequencies in other locations please visit http://www.abc.net.au/newsradio/listen/frequencies.htm
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## Members 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>
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<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, VIC</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>
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<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion, Mr Nicholas David</td>
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<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>Isaacs, 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>Feeeney, 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 Nurreddin</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. Sussan 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'Connor, 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>Pilbara, 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 Meryl 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>Vamvakou, 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>
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### 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 Stefanic
- Parliamentary Budget Officer—P Bowen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Nigel Scullion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Women</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Michaelia Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Secretary</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Arthur Sinodinos AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Public Service</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Michaelia Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting the Cabinet Secretary</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Michael Keenan MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Cyber Security</td>
<td>Hon Dan Tehan MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister to the Prime Minister</td>
<td>Senator the Hon James McGrath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Cities and Digital Transformation</td>
<td>Hon Angus Taylor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources</td>
<td>Hon Barnaby Joyce MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Anne Ruston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister to the Deputy Prime Minister</td>
<td>Hon Luke Hartsuyker MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Hon Julie Bishop MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment</td>
<td>Hon Steve Ciobo MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for International Development and the Pacific</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Concetta Fierravanti-Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment</td>
<td>Hon Keith Pitt MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-General</td>
<td>Senator the Hon George Brandis QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice-President of the Executive Council)</td>
<td>Hon Michael Keenan MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leader of the Government in the Senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Revenue and Financial Services</td>
<td>Hon Scott Morrison MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Small Business</td>
<td>Hon Kelly O'Dwyer MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Finance</td>
<td>Hon Michael McCormack MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deputy Leader of Government in the Senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Minister of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Regional Development</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Fiona Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Local Government and Territories</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Fiona Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Infrastructure and Transport</td>
<td>Hon Darren Chester MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deputy Leader of the House)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Urban Infrastructure</td>
<td>Hon Paul Fletcher MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence Industry</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Marise Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leader of the House)</td>
<td>Hon Christopher Pyne MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Veterans’ Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Centenary of ANZAC</td>
<td>Hon Dan Tehan MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence Personnel</td>
<td>Hon Dan Tehan MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Immigration and Border Protection</td>
<td>Hon Peter Dutton MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Immigration and Border Protection</td>
<td>Hon Alex Hawke MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science</td>
<td>Hon Greg Hunt MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Resources and Northern Australia</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Matt Canavan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science</td>
<td>Hon Craig Laundy MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Health and Aged Care</td>
<td>Hon Sussan Ley MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Sport</td>
<td>Hon Sussan Ley MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Health and Aged Care</td>
<td>Hon Ken Wyatt AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Rural Health</td>
<td>Hon Dr David Gillespie MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Communications</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Mitch Fifield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Arts</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Mitch Fifield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Manager of Government Business in the Senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Regional Communications</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Fiona Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Employment</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Michaelia Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Social Services</td>
<td>Hon Christian Porter MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Human Services</td>
<td>Hon Alan Tudge MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Social Services and Disability Services</td>
<td>Hon Jane Prentice MP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Minister for Vocational Education and Skills</td>
<td>Hon Karen Andrews MP</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

Each box represents a portfolio. **Cabinet Ministers are shown in bold type.** As a general rule, there is one department in each portfolio. However, there is a Department of Human Services in the Social Services portfolio and a Department of Veterans’ Affairs in the Defence portfolio. The title of a department does not necessarily reflect the title of a minister in all cases. Assistant Ministers in italics are designated as Parliamentary Secretaries under the *Ministers of State Act 1952.*
## Shadow Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Shadow Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Indigenous Affairs and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders</td>
<td>Senator Patrick Dodson</td>
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<td><strong>Deputy Leader of the Opposition</strong></td>
<td>Hon Tanya Plibersek MP</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for International Development and the Pacific</td>
<td>Senator Claire Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Senate</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Don Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Special Minister of State</strong></td>
<td>Senator the Hon Don Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Sport</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Don Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>Hon Chris Bowen MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td>Hon Dr Andrew Leigh MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Education</td>
<td>Hon Dr Andrew Leigh MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Women</td>
<td>Hon Dr Andrew Leigh MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Schools</td>
<td>Hon Dr Andrew Leigh MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Universities</td>
<td>Hon Dr Andrew Leigh MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Equality</td>
<td>Ed Husic MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>Tim Hammond MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Treasury</td>
<td>Hon Matt Thistlethwaite MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Minister for Environment and Water</strong></td>
<td>Hon Tony Burke MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Australia</strong></td>
<td>Hon Tony Burke MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Minister for the Arts</strong></td>
<td>Hon Tony Burke MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Opposition Business (House)</td>
<td>Hon Tony Burke MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Australia</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jacinta Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Australia</td>
<td>Julie Owens MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Minister for Families and Social Services</strong></td>
<td>Hon Jenny Macklin MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development</strong></td>
<td>Hon Anthony Albanese MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Housing and Homelessness</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Doug Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Human Services</td>
<td>Hon Linda Burney MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Disability and Carers</td>
<td>Senator Carol Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Families and Communities</td>
<td>Senator Louise Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Minister for Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Hon Anthony Albanese MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadow Minister for Regional Services, Territories and Local Government</strong></td>
<td>Stephen Jones MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Infrastructure</td>
<td>Pat Conroy MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for External Territories</td>
<td>Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Shadow Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Attorney-General</td>
<td>Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for National Security</td>
<td>Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Manager of Opposition Business in the House of Representatives</td>
<td>Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Justice</td>
<td>Clare O'Neil MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
<td>Hon Brendan O'Connor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Employment Services, Workforce and Future of Work</td>
<td>Ed Husic MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Workplace Relations</td>
<td>Lisa Chesters MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Climate Change and Energy</td>
<td>Hon Mark Butler MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Climate Change</td>
<td>Pat Conroy MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Defence</td>
<td>Hon Richard Marles MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Veterans’ Affairs</td>
<td>Hon Amanda Rishworth MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Defence Personnel</td>
<td>Hon Amanda Rishworth MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for the Centenary of ANZAC</td>
<td>Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Cyber Security and Defence</td>
<td>Gai Brodman MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Defence Industry and Support</td>
<td>Hon Mike Kelly AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kim Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Manufacturing and Science</td>
<td>Hon Nick Champion MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Innovation</td>
<td>Senator Deborah O'Neill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Health and Medicare</td>
<td>Hon Catherine King MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Medicare</td>
<td>Tony Zappia MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Indigenous Health</td>
<td>Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Early Childhood Education and Development(1)</td>
<td>Hon Kate Ellis MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for TAFE and Vocational Education</td>
<td>Hon Kate Ellis MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Skills and Apprenticeships</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Doug Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Early Childhood</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jacinta Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</td>
<td>Hon Joel Fitzgibbon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Rural and Regional Australia</td>
<td>Hon Joel Fitzgibbon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Rural and Regional Australia</td>
<td>Lisa Chesters MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Resources and Northern Australia</td>
<td>Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Trade and Investment</td>
<td>Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Trade in Services</td>
<td>Hon Dr Andrew Leigh MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister Assisting for Resources</td>
<td>Tim Hammond MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Northern Australia</td>
<td>Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Immigration and Border Protection</td>
<td>Hon Shayne Neumann MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Finance</td>
<td>Dr Jim Chalmers MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Small Business and Financial Services(2)</td>
<td>Senator Katy Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Opposition Business in the Senate</td>
<td>Senator Katy Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Small Business</td>
<td>Julie Owens MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Communications</td>
<td>Hon Michelle Rowland MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Regional Communications</td>
<td>Stephen Jones MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Ageing and Mental Health(3)</td>
<td>Hon Julie Collins MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Ageing</td>
<td>Senator Helen Polley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Assistant Minister for Mental Health</td>
<td>Senator Deborah O'Neill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each box represents a portfolio except for (1) which is in the Education portfolio, (2) which is in Treasury portfolio and (3) which is in the Health portfolio. Shadow Cabinet Ministers are shown in bold type.
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The SPEAKER (Hon. Tony Smith) took the chair at 09:30, made an acknowledgement of country and read prayers.

DOCUMENTS
Parliament House: Building Condition
Presentation
The SPEAKER (09:31): I present the Presiding Officers report to the parliament on the Parliament House building condition summary.

Parliament House: Media Rules
Presentation
The SPEAKER (09:31): For the information of honourable members, I present an amended copy of the rules for media related activities in Parliament House and its precincts which the President of the Senate and I have agreed to. The amended rules reflect a recent resolution of the Senate regarding photography in the Senate chamber and make consistent the number of photographers permitted in the galleries of both chambers. Also taken into account are references to resolutions of the House and the Joint Committee on the Broadcasting of Parliamentary Proceedings in relation to the broadcast of proceedings which were revised in 2013. The amended rules will replace those issued in November 2012 and will be made available on the Australian Parliament House website.

BILLS
Interactive Gambling Amendment Bill 2016
First Reading
Bill and explanatory memorandum presented by Mr Tudge.
Bill read a first time.

Second Reading
Mr TUDGE (Aston—Minister for Human Services) (09:32): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.

Online gambling has grown with consumers moving away from traditional gambling products to betting online using smartphones, tablets and other digital devices. In 2014, $2.4 billion was spent on online gambling by Australians—which was double the amount 10 years earlier. Australia's high rate of gambling expenditure and strong adoption of digital technologies makes it imperative that there is a strong and enforceable regulatory framework to protect Australians from the adverse effects of illegal online gambling services.

To support this objective, in April this year, the government announced it would implement 18 of the 19 recommendations in the 2015 illegal offshore wagering review in a three-staged process.

The Interactive Gambling Amendment Bill is the first stage of the government's process to implement the recommendations in the review. It will complement the other stages to establish a national consumer protection framework to minimise problem gambling and
consult on other disruptive measures to stop offshore operators from providing illegal interactive gambling services to Australians.

**Key findings of the illegal offshore wagering review**

The review found that the amount of money being spent on illegal wagering services could be as high as $400 million annually with a further $100 million in lost taxation revenue and product fees. Previous estimates found the total amount of money spent on all illegal interactive gambling services was close to $1 billion annually.

Offshore gambling has detrimental effects on the Australian wagering, racing and sporting industries, problem and at-risk gamblers, consumers and government. Offshore gambling operators do not pay Australian taxes, racing or sporting fees; they do not share information regarding suspicious betting activity with law enforcement or sporting bodies, which risks the integrity of Australian sport; they offer gambling services prohibited under Australian law; they can be used for money laundering and other criminal activities; and they provide minimal to no harm minimisation and consumer protection controls, which poses a threat to problem and at-risk gamblers.

The review showed that the rate of problem gambling is higher among interactive gamblers compared to gamblers more generally—2.7 per cent of interactive gamblers are problem gamblers, compared to 0.9 percent of all gamblers. The devastating effects of problem gambling are felt by not just the gambler but also his or her family, friends, colleagues and the community.

The review concluded that the aim of governments should be to reduce the scope of illegal offshore gambling activity and control the associated harms through a range of disruptive and deterrent measures and strong enforcement of regulation.

**Minimal enforcement of the Interactive Gambling Act**

The key piece of legislation to protect Australians against illegal online gambling services is the Commonwealth's Interactive Gambling Act. This act prohibits the provision and advertising of prohibited interactive gambling services to persons in Australia.

Stakeholders informed the review that the existing approach to enforcement of the Interactive Gambling Act was insufficient to deter offshore operators from providing prohibited online gambling services to Australians. There have been no prosecutions under the Interactive Gambling Act since its inception in 2001, despite a considerable number of complaints made by Australians in relation to illegal online gambling services.

The borderless nature of the internet enables Australians to access hundreds of illegal online gambling sites on their computers and smartphones. Stakeholders assert that offshore operators ignore the provisions of the IGA because they are not well enforced.

Criminal prosecution is considered likely to be unsuccessful or ineffective due to the competing priorities of the Australian Federal Police, uncertainty around the legality of services under the Interactive Gambling Act, evidence requirements and the offshore location of gambling operators.

Some of these challenges were highlighted in 2015 when a number of Australian licensed wagering operators launched 'click to call' in-play betting services. The ACMA assessed these services as potentially a prohibited interactive gambling service and referred the matter to the
Australian Federal Police for investigation. The AFP declined to investigate due to competing priorities and ambiguity around the legality of these services under the Interactive Gambling Act.

The bill sets out to address these challenges. It will clarify the law regarding illegal online gambling services and empower the ACMA by strengthening the enforcement mechanisms under the Interactive Gambling Act.

**Reforms to the Interactive Gambling Act**

The bill will prohibit a person providing regulated interactive gambling services to Australians unless the person holds a licence under the law of an Australian state or territory. This amendment will clarify the licensing requirements for interactive gambling services in Australia and will provide a simple to establish key criterion for enforcement agencies when investigating whether to take action against unlicensed services. It is expected that reputable gambling organisations will obtain a licence in Australia or cease providing illegal services.

The reforms will introduce a civil penalty regime to be enforced by the ACMA which will allow the ACMA to be responsible for the entire complaint handling process from receipt to enforcement. The ACMA will be able to issue formal warnings and infringement notices and seek civil penalties and injunctions. This amendment will allow for a quicker and more focused response as formal investigation or prosecution processes will not depend upon the priorities of other agencies.

These penalties will also apply to any person who supports the provision of illegal interactive gambling services to Australians. Criminal offence provisions have been retained in the Interactive Gambling Act to allow the ACMA to refer complaints to the Australian Federal Police for more serious cases.

**Interactive Gambling Act to allow the ACMA to refer complaints to the Australian Federal Police for more serious cases**

The bill will prohibit 'click to call' in-play betting services. These services allow consumers to place a large number of bets in a short period of time, which can lead to serious gambling problems. The government is committed to closing down these services as they undermine the intent of the IGA to limit the scope of problem gambling in Australia.

The reforms will enable the ACMA to notify the Department of Immigration and Border Protection of the names of directors or principals of offending gambling services so they can be placed on the Movement Alert List and any travel to Australia can be disrupted.

These enforcement actions will be combined with a number of measures to build relationships with international regulators and raise awareness of Australian gambling laws and the risks associated with illegal gambling services.

Firstly, the ACMA will be able to notify international regulators of information relating to interactive gambling services. The offshore location of many gambling operators makes it difficult to enforce the IGA. Establishing productive relationships with international regulators to raise awareness of Australian gambling laws and receive assistance in any enforcement actions will assist the efforts of the ACMA to enforce the IGA in relation to foreign entities.
Secondly, some offshore gambling websites deliberately target Australian consumers by using Australian imagery and colloquialisms. Many consumers are unaware that these sites are not licensed in Australia and that there is limited legal recourse if they run into any difficulties obtaining winnings or deposits from these operators. The bill will establish a register to be published on the ACMA website to raise awareness of wagering services that are licensed in Australia to ensure that persons looking to gamble will not inadvertently use an illegal offshore site.

The combination of clearer legislation, stronger enforcement measures and awareness raising activities will assist in ensuring Australians are protected from illegal gambling services.

**Other related amendments to the Interactive Gambling Act**

The bill contains related amendments to complement the ACMA's increased enforcement role, including to simplify and streamline the complaints handling and investigation process to remove mandatory requirements to refer matters to the police and enable the ACMA to handle the entire process from receipt of complaints to enforcement, similar to its complaints handling and enforcement role in relation to other legislation. The bill also contains provisions to clarify the legality of services provided in licensed gambling and wagering venues and for the development of a legislative instrument to determine what constitutes a sporting event for the purposes of in-play betting under the IGA.

As mentioned, this bill is the first stage of a three stage process the government is taking to implement the recommendations in the review.

The government is working with state and territory governments to establish a national consumer protection framework. It is imperative if we are to protect Australians from offshore gambling providers, we must ensure that proper protections exist in our own industry. The government is also consulting with internet service providers and financial payment organisations on technological options to further disrupt the access of illegal offshore gambling services.

**Conclusion**

For too long, the Interactive Gambling Act has struggled in its role of keeping Australians, in particular problem and at-risk gamblers, protected from the risks of illegal online gambling services.

A combination of clearer laws, an active regulator and stronger enforcement measures will send a clear message to operators that Australia is serious about compliance of its gambling laws. Whilst there will remain practical and legal challenges in prosecuting overseas entities, these measures are expected to reduce the provision of prohibited interactive gambling services to Australians.

I would like to thank the Hon Barry O'Farrell for leading the review and the many stakeholders across the wagering, racing and sporting industries, academia, responsible gambling organisations, consumers and government who provided their views to inform the development of this bill.

I commend this bill to the House and look forward to implementing the next stages of the government's response to ensure Australia has a strong and enforceable regulatory framework for online gambling.
Debate adjourned.

Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Authority Amendment (New Governance Arrangements) Bill 2016

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Mr WYATT (Hasluck—Assistant Minister for Health and Aged Care) (09:43): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.

Australia remains a world leader for successful organ and tissue transplantation.

The Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Authority, known commonly as the Organ and Tissue Authority, manages the implementation of the Australian government's national reform program on organ and tissue donation for transplantation in partnership with:

- state and territory governments;
- the DonateLife Network;
- the donation and transplantation clinical and community sectors;
- eye and tissue banks; and
- the community.

Earlier this year, the then Minister for Rural Health, Senator the Hon. Fiona Nash, released the findings of the Ernst and Young Review of the National Reform Program on Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation (the EY Review).

The EY Review was prompted by concerns about the slowing of organ donation rates in Australia, and the need to review organ donation practices.

The EY Review examined the respective contributions to the national reform program of the Organ and Tissue Authority, state and territory governments and the DonateLife Network hospitals and clinicians.

The EY review found that the national reform agenda, which was commenced in 2009, has been broadly effective. However, there is scope for improvement in the areas of governance, transparency and accountability. To improve these areas, the review made 24 recommendations, including endorsing the Australian government's 2015-16 budget measure accelerating growth in organ and tissue donation for transplantation; better training for clinicians; activities that states and territories should consider to better support the implementation of the reform agenda; as well as the fundamental changes to the governance arrangements for the Organ and Tissue Authority.

Stakeholders consulted following the release of the findings of the EY review broadly agreed to EY’s review recommendations, including recommendations 5 to 9, which directly relate to the governance of the Organ and Tissue Authority. The EY review states that the strategic oversight of DonateLife Network as well as the performance monitoring, succession planning and mentoring of the CEO could be improved through the establishment of a board.
of governance. Further, the establishment of a board of governance will foster and encourage a culture of debate within the Organ and Tissue Authority.

This bill seeks to establish the Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Board under the Australian Organ and Tissue Donation Transplantation Authority Act 2008 (the Act). The board will take on the functions currently vested in the CEO under the Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplant Authority Act 2008, including assuming the role as the accountable authority under the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013 (the PGPA Act). Establishing the board as the decision-making body and accountable authority under the PGPA Act will ensure that the perspectives of the organ and tissue donation and transplantation sector are taken into account in succession planning, in overseeing the work of DonateLife Network and in setting the key policy and strategic directions for the Organ and Tissue Authority.

The CEO, whose primary role will be to oversee the day-to-day administration of the Organ and Tissue Authority, will be appointed by the minister in consultation with the board. The CEO will also be a member of the board. This arrangement has been instituted to improve operational efficacy of the Organ and Tissue Authority and will ensure that the strategic and policy objectives of the authority are efficiently integrated in the day-to-day operations and activities. To ensure that the Organ and Tissue Authority remains agile and responsive in a highly complex sector, the board may also delegate some of its functions to the CEO.

This bill retains the ability for the Commonwealth minister to give policy principles to the authority about the performance of its functions. The board will have skills based membership harnessing expertise, experience and knowledge from a broad range of areas, including public administration, business or management; clinical expertise in organ and tissue donation or transplantation; health promotion; community leadership; and health consumer issues. In line with the EY review recommendations, the Commonwealth will nominate the chair of the board. The jurisdictions will nominate the deputy chair, with the remaining five board members to be nominated by the COAG Health Council. All board members will be appointed by the Commonwealth minister. This arrangement will support Australia's nationally consistent and coordinated approach to organ and tissue donation and transplantation.

While there are no existing non-corporate Commonwealth entities currently adopting this model, we are confident that this arrangement is best for the Organ and Tissue Authority and the organ and tissue sector going forward. The act will be amended to abolish the advisory council but leave intact the provisions relating to organ and tissue donation and transplantation, such as formulating and disseminating policies and standards, supporting clinical training and community education, and providing financial assistance.

At this point I would also like to acknowledge the valuable work that the advisory council has done since its establishment. The establishment of the Organ and Tissue Authority Board will improve accountability and transparency and will better support the authority to more effectively achieve its strategic goals: saving lives and improving the quality of lives of more Australians. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned.
Mr McCORMACK (Riverina—Minister for Small Business) (09:50): I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act 1969, the following proposed work be referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for consideration and report: JP500 Phase 2A—Electronic Warfare Operations Support Facility Project.

The Department of Defence is proposing to construct fit-for-purpose facilities and associated infrastructure capable of supporting the new systems installation for current and emerging electronic warfare detection and countermeasure technologies at the Edinburgh Defence Precinct in South Australia. This multiphase project aims to bring the Australian Defence Force’s electronic warfare capabilities in the land and maritime environments up to a level which is commensurate with the ADF’s current air electronic warfare capabilities. The proposed facilities will help ensure ADF platforms fitted with electronic warfare systems can achieve and maintain battle-worthy capabilities. This project will expand the Defence Science and Technology Group’s research and development capability for current and emerging detection and countermeasure technologies.

The estimated cost to deliver the project is $24.91 million excluding GST. This includes construction cost escalation allowances; professional service fees; design, construction and design contingencies; and information technology equipment. Subject to parliamentary approval, construction is expected to begin in mid-2017 with completion expected by mid-2018. I commend the motion to the House.

Question agreed to.

Mr McCORMACK (Riverina—Minister for Small Business) (09:52): I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act 1969, the following proposed work be referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for consideration and report: Proposed fit-out and relocation of the Australian Cyber Security Centre, Canberra in the ACT.

The Department of Defence, on behalf of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, proposes to fit out a suitable building to relocate the Australian Cyber Security Centre within Canberra, in the Australian Capital Territory. The project will deliver a facility which will foster innovation and cyberinitiatives by allowing for greater engagement with industry and academia, and will accommodate future growth.

The estimated cost to deliver the project is $38.8 million excluding GST. This includes construction costs, site preparation, infrastructure service costs, management and design fees, fittings and equipment, and provisions for contingencies, cost escalation and associated professional fees. Subject to parliamentary approval, construction is expected to commence in early 2017, with completion expected by late 2017, with completion of an initial operating capability anticipated by June 2017. I commend the motion to the House.

Question agreed to.
Reference

Mr McCORMACK (Riverina—Minister for Small Business) (09:53): I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act 1969, the following proposed work be referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for consideration and report: Woomera Range Remediation Facilities Project.

The Department of Defence is proposing to deliver new and refurbished facilities and infrastructure capable of facilitating the operation of a new range-safety and -control system at the Woomera Range Complex in South Australia. This project will provide purpose-built facilities which will enable more frequent and more sophisticated trials in support of future testing and evaluation of air platforms and weapons. The project will significantly contribute to meeting a defence capability need for the future use of the Woomera testing range. The proposed works will enhance aerospace testing and evaluation techniques and increase the capacity of the range for future air warfare development.

The works will provide the Australian Defence Force with purpose-built facilities to support the introduction into service of a new, state-of-the-art integrated range control system at the Woomera Range Complex in South Australia. The proposed works include a new range control centre, a communications interface building and a maintenance and storage facility. The works will significantly improve the ADF’s ability to conduct more regular and sophisticated trials. The project also proposes to upgrade and establish new communication sites on the range, which will be supported with road upgrades and the expansion of a fibre-optic network.

The estimated cost to deliver the project is $48.64 million, excluding GST. This includes construction costs; escalation allowances; professional design fees; service fees; design, construction and defence contingencies; and information technology equipment. Subject to parliamentary approval, construction is expected to begin in mid-2017, with completion expected in mid-2018. I commend the motion to the House.

Question agreed to.

Publications Committee

Report

Mr CHRISTENSEN (Dawson—Chief Nationals Whip) (09:56): I present the report from the Publications Committee sitting in conference with the Publications Committee of the Senate. Copies of the report are now being placed on the table.

Report—by leave—agreed to.

BILLS

Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016

Second Reading

Consideration resumed of the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr HAYES (Fowler—Chief Opposition Whip) (09:56): I stand with my Labor colleagues on this matter. We oppose the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016. I want to put this in context. It is true that under the former Labor Prime
Minister, Kevin Rudd, decisions were made in 2013 to ensure the security of borders and to send a message to people smugglers that it would not be easy to put people on boats and bring them to Australia for permanent settlement. On 19 July 2013, we made a decision that anyone who came to this country by boat, seeking asylum, would never be permanently settled in Australia. That is a matter of record. I know that was tough, but it is something that occurred, and we still stand by it.

On 30 October this year, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull announced that the government was preparing legislation to give effect to that Kevin Rudd policy. He said:

… this bill will reflect the Government's long standing position and as we understand it, the bipartisan position initially set out by Mr Rudd and since then confirmed by Mr Shorten. And that position is, and I repeat, that irregular maritime arrivals who have been sent to a regional processing country, that is Papua New Guinea and Nauru at the present time, will never be settled permanently in Australia.

Up to this point, the statement of Kevin Rudd and the statement of the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, are still at one. But that is not the legislation that is before the House. That is not what was in the policies of Labor or in the comments by made by the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, only a few days ago. What the government has bought to this House is something totally different. The bill before us amends the Migration Act and the Migration Regulations and makes all applications for visas invalid where the applicant is part of a regional processing cohort.

The designated regional processing cohort is defined under this bill as persons who are unauthorised maritime arrivals and after 19 July 2013 were taken to a regional processing country and are at least of 18 years of age at the time, or who are declared a transitory person. This is a very broad definition, but it goes on. It also includes asylum seekers who are currently in the regional processing centres at Manus Island and Nauru; those living in onshore detention in Australia in places like Mita, Villawood, Manbymong; those living in community detention in Australia and on bridging visas and on temporary arrangements; those who have voluntarily returned to their own country of origin from either Manus Island or Nauru; and those few refugees who have been offered and accepted resettlement options, including in Cambodia and Papua New Guinea.

The interesting thing—and where this really changes—is that by legislating that all applications by these people are invalid, the bill implements a lifetime ban on any visa under any circumstances for these people to travel to Australia into the future. That is travel to Australia to visit families, that is travel to Australia for tourism purposes, that is travel to Australia for business, or travel to Australia for study. Any of those categories are ruled out by that. When I started my contribution, I talked about what Kevin Rudd had indicated in 2013 and what Malcolm Turnbull had indicated on 30 October this year. They were both talking about permanent resettlement in Australia. This bill is not about permanent resettlement; this bill is about prohibiting anybody who is covered by those definitions from ever setting foot in this country. This has nothing to do with permanent resettlement; this is about stopping people from ever contemplating visiting Australia. I do not know at what stage those in the party room decided to change what the Prime Minister said, or whether the Prime Minister just does not control that party room, but clearly what this bill has in it is not what the Prime Minister indicated on 30 October was going to be in the legislation coming before this House.
Human Rights Watch, understandably, has called this proposal malicious and unnecessary, and I totally agree with that. I understand that from time to time you are going to have a need for travel bans and you may want to stop people coming to our shores in a range of different circumstances. Travel bans should apply to all those people who are likely to cause harm to our community and to those who commit or incite violence. But it should not apply as a blanket ban to anybody, particularly when their only crime might be fleeing violence and persecution. These people are already prevented from coming here. They are already being detained. They are already being processed, in many instances, offshore on Nauru or Manus Island. They are not being resettled in Australia. This is just value-adding to their punishment.

I will get to the reasons the government cites as to why they believe this is necessary a little later, but I further believe that it is highly unlikely that these measures contained in the bill satisfy Australia’s obligations under international law. Australia is a signatory to the refugee convention, and part 2 of article 31 states that:

The Contracting States shall not apply to the movements of such refugees restrictions other than those which are necessary and such restrictions shall only be applied until their status in the country is regularized or they obtain admission into another country.

Clearly we are applying conditions upon people who are already detained. We are putting into perpetuity that they can never set foot in this country. It does not matter about whether they could apply for permanent residency; there is no question that they could not apply for permanent residency. We accept that. We support that. But what we do say is that restricting any opportunity to come to this country under any circumstances, including temporary reasons for visitation, is just value-adding to the level of persecution that is currently imposed on people.

In this parliament we make laws. In making laws we often trample on rights. We understand that. When we do that we need to have a clear purpose in mind. It is incumbent upon a parliament such as this when taking any legislative action to properly identify the circumstances that the law is intending to either remedy or address. In other words, we need to determine the circumstances justifying the special actions or conditions we intend taking. Given that it is conceded that the turn-back policy has largely been responsible for stopping the boats, particularly when coupled with the policy of not allowing permanent resettlement in Australia of any asylum seeker who arrived by boat, the question remains: what does this bill seek to achieve? What is the object of this bill?

According to the minister and others out there spruiking this legislation, this is all about sending a message to people smugglers. Given the fact that boats have stopped—boats have been turned back and we do not see any current arrivals—I think people have got the message that we are serious about border protection. That is something they want to keep relying on—that they are sending a message to people smugglers. They also say that they want to send a message to people currently on Manus Island and Nauru who are waiting for this government to change its policy. There is no indication that the government, nor the opposition, is in any way going to change its policy on border protection. So I do not know where this message is going to go.

They also say that they are closing the back door so that when an asylum seeker settles in another country they cannot then make their way by legal means to Australia. We do hope, and I am sure the government hope—and I trust they are working towards finding another
place for regional resettlement—they are not trying to create second-class citizens. John Key, the New Zealand Prime Minister, made that point. He was quite happy to engage with this government in terms of regional resettlement, but when asked he said that he was not happy to put specific citizenship conditions on people the subject of this so that they would be treated as second-class citizens in his country and could never apply under any circumstances to come to Australia. He was upfront about that. He said he would have no truck with creating second-class citizens in a country such as New Zealand. Yet the government wants to send a message to any resettlement country that this is something they should be considering for resettlement.

They also talk about preventing the 14,000 people in Indonesia getting on boats. I would have thought that a far better way of doing that was not closing off the level of aid that was going to Indonesian agencies to look at this. There is no doubt that there are a lot of people in Indonesia. No doubt many people would like to come to a country like Australia. We do need to apply a regional position to this. We need to ensure that we are playing our role in assisting countries. Earlier this week we were supposed to receive a visit from the President of Indonesia, Mr Joko Widodo. I dare say that this would have been a topic of discussion—there is no question about it.

The proposal here simply does not seem to have any rhyme or reason to it. The boats have stopped. The message has got through to the people smugglers. Now we want to reinforce for those people currently detained or being processed on Manus Island or in Papua New Guinea that they can never come here for a family reunion, study or anything else in the future. Australia has had many refugees come to this country who have gone on to do great things. Hopefully, many of these refugees, when they find their country of resettlement, will do many great things; they may be doctors, lawyers, politicians, community leaders et cetera. Under this act, they will even then require special dispensation from the minister in order to apply to come here. This is just beyond belief.

The Australian Catholic Bishops Conference issued a press release about this legislation. They called it deeply disappointing. His Grace Bishop Vincent Long, the Australian Catholic Bishops Delegate for Refugees and, by the way, a former boat person himself, said:

Seeking asylum even by boat is not illegal. It is a basic human right. Yet not content with demeaning them, the Australian government now want to introduce laws that will ban them from ever coming here. The motives for these measures, in light of the current situation on Manus Island and Nauru, and in light of the bigger challenges facing Australia, are questionable at best and sinister at worst. Domestic advocates and international agencies have been appalled by the conditions under which asylum seekers live and the effects on their health, spirits and self-respect. To single out and punish further a small number of people who came by boat, even if they are found to meet the refugee definition is deliberately cruel and un-Australian. It betrays the tradition, status and character of the country that we are proud of—a richly resourced country with a big heart for migrants and refugees.

I urge all Australians to reject these cruel and unnecessary measures. I stand with the bishops on this. I think they have called it for what it is. We should reject this legislation. (Time expired)

Ms O’TOOLE (Herbert) (10:11): I am very pleased to have the opportunity to rise in this place to speak against the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016. The name of the bill itself suggests that we have missed the point that we are
talking about people. I give thanks that my father's father had the good sense to come to Australia by boat as a 10-pound Pom when it was safe to do so, and I stated this in my first speech.

I am very proud to stand with my Labor colleagues to oppose this bill. I have received numerous emails and countless phone calls from constituents in my electorate. Of all of those hundreds of calls, emails and letters, not one asked me to support this harmful bill. I would like to read two of the emails that I received. One reads:

The ALP must block the proposed bill to ban every person seeking asylum, who the government has imprisoned on Manus Island or Nauru, from ever coming to Australia. The current government has demonstrated that it could "solve the boats problem" by policing our borders and has succeeded in this aim. Most Australians seem satisfied with this outcome; so there is no need to inflict further "punishment" on those few remaining refugees on Manus and Nauru.

Moreover blocking this bill would in some small way demonstrate to the world (and ourselves) that Australia is not totally devoid of humanity and that at some time (in perhaps a far different and distant future), when refugee flows no longer threaten national cohesion, these asylum seekers might be welcomed as visitors or migrants.

Another email states:

I am shocked that the Government is proposing this unnecessary and extreme legislation to further punish people who came to Australia seeking asylum. It is a basic human right to live in safety and freedom, which we here in Australia enjoy. We can and should be extending this opportunity to all people who seek asylum and are found to be refugees. I and so many other Australians are wanting Labor to stand up for decency, and to stop the cruel policies which consign people to despair. Please make this a turning point for Labor, and help us as a nation to find our way back to decency. The people on Nauru and Manus Island deserve our compassion, and we as a nation need to turn away from the policies which are bringing us international condemnation. There is a better way. Together we can and we must find it.

Let me say from the outset that I do not support, I have never supported, and nor will I ever support the exploitation of vulnerable citizens in our troubled world. I do not support systems that give unscrupulous people the opportunity to profit from the misery and devastation of people whose homelands have been destroyed. But there is a huge gap between enforcing legislation that ensures that our borders are safe and that people smugglers cannot operate, and the cruel treatment of those people caught in the middle—people who have had to seek refuge as they are victims of war. We are talking about people, and I ask: when did Australia think it was okay to demonise human beings, as this current bill does?

This bill seeks to amend the Migration Act 1958 and the Migration Regulations 1994 to make any application for a visa an invalid application where the applicant is part of the regional processing cohort. Punishing and demonising innocent men, women and children is not the Australian way. This bill is not about permanent settlement. It prevents a person who may have come by boat and who went on to become a citizen of another country, such as the US, Canada or New Zealand, from visiting Australia for work, tourism or maybe to visit family members in 10, 20 or 40 years time. This is simply ludicrous. This whole time I have thought that this government held such extreme Right views against asylum seekers, but with this legislation it is very clear that they are not just scared of boat people; it appears they are actually scared of the boats themselves.
The government beat their chest and say, 'We have stopped the boats.' Well, one must question that. With this proposed bill, have they really? If they had, the current legislation and processes in place would be working. This proposed bill clearly pokes a hole in the government's argument that they have and are stopping the boats. Otherwise, why would they be presenting such a ridiculous bill? This bill is an overreach by a Prime Minister desperate to please One Nation and the extremists in his party.

Labor is at one with the government when it comes to protecting our borders and shutting down the people-smuggling trade. No individual who seeks to come here illegally by boat will be resettled in Australia, and genuine refugees should be resettled according to a third-country resettlement arrangement. The question is: what is the government doing about that? The government has had three years to ensure durable and credible third-country resettlement options for refugees living in Australian-funded offshore detention centres in Manus Island and Nauru. But it has failed to announce any arrangements and is desperate to distract from that very fact. Just like with everything else, the government has not been able to demonstrate how the proposed legislation would advance these objectives. Absolutely, we need to get refugees off Manus Island and Nauru, and Labor is willing to work with the government to achieve that objective. No country had asked Australia to adopt this legislation to facilitate a regional resettlement agreement, and the government has provided no credible evidence that there are any agreements for resettlement, pending this bill. Asylum seekers have been held in indefinite detention for too long, because the government has failed to secure viable third-country resettlement arrangements. This is cruel and punishing behaviour. Australians expect this government to resettle these people as a matter of urgency. That should be the government's priority, not playing petty politics and imposing lifetime bans.

There are also a number of issues that the government has failed to address in its statements about the bill, including how the new arrangement will interact with our current arrangements with New Zealand. New Zealand citizens are eligible to apply for a special category visa, subclass 444, which entitles them to visit, study, work and stay in Australia. New Zealand Prime Minister John Key is quoted as saying, 'We have got no intention of having separate classes of New Zealand citizens.' It has been reported that Prime Minister Key has ruled out an agreement if refugees granted New Zealand citizenship would be unable to travel to Australia. The Australian government has a robust compliance program in place to prevent, catch and remove people who overstay visas. There has been no suggestion that this program is not equipped to manage future risks associated with issuing short-term visas to members of this cohort.

The UNHCR's regional representative in Canberra, Thomas Albrecht, has raised concerns about the proposal, saying Australia is a signatory to the refugee convention, and part 2 of article 31 states:

2. The Contracting States shall not apply to the movements of such refugees restrictions other than those which are necessary and such restrictions shall only be applied until their status in the country is regularized or they obtain admission into another country.

Ben Saul, Challis Chair of International Law at the University of Sydney, has raised concerns about the bill being in breach of Australia's international law obligations. He argues that it breaches article 31 of the refugee convention, as well as Australia's family reunion obligations under articles 17 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
There are a few other things that the government has not considered in proposing this bill. While ministerial discretion could apply, examples of how this bill would prevent former refugees from visiting Australia could include doctors visiting Australia to perform surgery or for a medical conference, politicians who may wish to undertake a political exchange or study tour visiting Australia or Australia's sister cities, or elite athletes who want to compete in up-and-coming sporting events such as the Commonwealth Games. It could affect Australian Olympic bids in the future, as there is now a recognised refugee Olympic team. The bill could also prevent refugees from visiting their families in Australia, the Great Barrier Reef, Uluru or other tourism holiday spots on a tourist visa. It could prevent business owners or employees from visiting Australia to discuss the expansion of companies and businesses into the Australian market.

I also point out the case of Dr Al Muderis, who is an outstanding specialist in Australia. I personally heard the doctor speak when he came to Townsville to talk about his experience as a refugee. This man has given enormous commitment to this country. He has put Australia at the leading edge internationally when it comes to surgery and assisting war veterans with prostheses to address the fact that they have lost limbs in war.

Dr Muderis talked about the day he went to work in Iraq, into the operating theatre, where 150 people were brought to him. The person in charge of those so-called war criminals ordered the head surgeon to cut off their right ears. The head surgeon actually said that he had taken an oath to do no harm and refused to perform the surgery. So what happened to this young doctor and his colleagues is they were taken out into the car park with the head surgeon and he was shot dead because he refused to undertake the orders that he was prescribed. The other medical staff were asked, 'Does anybody else want to oppose this order?' Of course they did not and they went back into the theatre.

Dr Muderis talked about the fact that he could not in all conscience go and break his Hippocratic oath to do no harm, could not do this surgery, so that began his journey from Iraq. He fled from Iraq in 1999, two years after qualifying from the University of Baghdad. When he was ordered to amputate the ears of the soldiers who had deserted from Saddam's insane regime, when his hospital supervisor was murdered in cold blood before his eyes, he then fled to Jordan before making his way to Java via Abu Dhabi and Malaysia. In Java he boarded a people-smuggling boat crammed with 150 passengers bound for Christmas Island.

Before he made the arrangements to get on that boat, he said he was told that it was quite a luxurious boat with 50 people. He spent the harrowing journey treating his fellow asylum seekers, who included several pregnant women, for severe seasickness. He said:
There was no room even to sit, many people were just standing on deck.

Dr Muderis said that there was nothing special about refugees, who represent a slice of society, including the 'good, the bad and the ugly'. But he said that no-one deserved to be known as a number, as he was for 10 months in Curtin Detention Centre, where he was simply known as 'No. 982'. He said:
People should never be a number, I don't keep numbers, people have names.

After being told by then immigration minister Philip Ruddock that his qualifications would never be recognised in Australia, the young refugee medico emerged into Australian society and worked from Mildura to Canberra to prove his worth. He obtained a job as surgical
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registrar at the Austin Hospital in Melbourne before obtaining placements at Bendigo, Wollongong and Canberra Hospitals. He said:

It was during my time at Austin Hospital that I studied to fulfil my dream to become an orthopaedic robotics limb surgeon; a most fascinating and rewarding profession working with cutting-edge technology to assist those who have lost legs in combat, or through other health and accident reasons. Despite his ordeal and the hurdles he was forced to overcome, Dr Al Muderis said that he felt very lucky to be an Australian.

He hopes to be able to provide his services to Australian soldiers who have lost limbs in war. His first military patient flew for 25 hours, over other clinics in Sweden, Germany and France that conduct the procedure, to be treated by an Iraqi refugee. Dr Muderis brings great credibility to this nation in his work as an orthopaedic robotic surgeon.

Mr WILKIE (Denison) (10:27): Last Saturday morning in Hobart I attended the Doctors for Refugees rally. It was quite a successful event. It was early in the day, and the weather was not very good, but probably some 300 attended that rally. Obviously there were a lot of medical professionals. There were all sorts of doctors, a lot of GPs, nurses, midwives, allied health professionals and a number of other members of the community. It was a very passionate rally, and it was obviously put on so that people could express their concern about the bill that is before the parliament today, the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016.

I heard all sorts of comments from the people at the rally, such as 'excessive', 'silly', 'nonsensical', 'unnecessary' and 'ridiculous'. Clearly the people at that rally understand that this bill is unacceptable and should not be supported. I will not support it, and I can say with a great deal of confidence that the people at that rally in Hobart—and I understand that there were similar rallies right around the country put on by Doctors for Refugees—are clearly the tip of the iceberg. There clearly are a great many people in the community who are appalled, not just at the bill before the parliament today but at this country's treatment of asylum seekers over many, many years. One person came up to me and said: 'You know, Andrew? Sometime in the future they'll write a book—or books—about these days, and they'll be astounded at how we could have been so cruel, not unlike the way these days we talk about the stolen generations and other terrible injustices that have occurred in our nation's history.'

But the people there at the rally on Saturday were also concerned with our response to asylum seekers generally. They understand very clearly that our response to asylum seekers is unethical, they understand very clearly that our response to asylum seekers is illegal and they understand very clearly that our response to asylum seekers is impractical. Every way you look at it, the way this country—the way this government and other governments—have responded to asylum seekers has been completely and utterly unacceptable.

When I say unethical, I regret to say that although many people come into this place and wring their hands and try to look compassionate and act compassionately and talk about stopping deaths at sea, they do not care about deaths at sea. They care about national security. They care about pandering to the xenophobia, racism and bigotry in our community. They care about trying to leverage off those thought lines in our community for their political self-interest.

We are a rich and lucky country. We are one of the most fortunate and richest countries in the world. We have it within our capacity and within our hearts to be compassionate when
people come to our shores and claim to be fleeing for their lives. We have it within our
capacity and within our hearts to give them protection, to hear their claims, and, if their
claims are accurate, to give them a permanent refuge in our fortunate country.

Our response to asylum seekers is downright unethical and it is downright illegal. Over
many years this parliament and previous governments have signed up to a number of
international agreements. We signed up because people realised that those agreements
mattered and that signing them was the right thing to do. We signed up to the refugee
convention. We signed up to the Rome statute. We signed up to the Convention on the Rights
of the Child. We signed up to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. But
now we are happy just to tear them all up and walk away as though those international
agreements do not matter. Yet, when it does serve our interests, we are the first country to
criticise other countries for breaking international law and for not living up to their
agreements.

I will single out one of those: the Rome statute. It is a crime to forcibly transfer people to a
third country. It is a crime to forcibly detain someone indefinitely without trial. It is a crime to
keep people in inhumane conditions. This country, this government, is guilty of crimes in
international law. And what we do is impractical. Over the past four years, from 2012 to
2016, our offshore processing regime has cost $10.3 billion. Over the next four years, from
2016 to 2020, it will cost another $5.7 billion. These are enormous sums of money. And what
about last Sunday, or was it Monday morning, at about two o'clock in the morning, when an
asylum seeker who had been on Nauru for 12 months but had come to Australia for surgery,
was gotten out of bed, some say at two o'clock in the morning, and flown by RAAF aircraft
from Melbourne to Brisbane and then by RAAF aircraft to Nauru? What did that cost the
taxpayer? What an absurd theatre, designed to do nothing more than to punish some poor soul
who did nothing more than make it to Australia and claim to be fleeing for his life. But no
expense is to be spared to punish and to be cruel and put in place a deterrent to other poor
souls—that we would get him up at two o'clock in the morning at Broadmeadows, put him on
a RAAF aircraft, and fly him back to Nauru.

It is for these sorts of reasons that I must move an amendment today. In fact, I will now
formally move the amendment that has been circulated in my name. It is very brief and it is
self-explanatory. I move:

That all the words after 'That' be omitted with a view to substituting the following words:
'the House declines to give the bill a second reading and instead:

(1) acknowledges that the global refugee crisis is for Australia a humanitarian challenge and not a
border security problem;

(2) notes that Australia's response to asylum seekers will inevitably require a genuinely regional
solution involving most, if not all south-east Asian countries, as well as Australia and New Zealand, and
be approved by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

(3) insists that Australia's response to asylum seekers be consistent with all of our international treaty
obligations including the Refugee Convention, the Rome Statute, the Convention on the Rights of the
Child and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and

(4) calls on the Government to develop and implement a sophisticated policy response to this
challenge that as far as possible deals with the situation in source countries, countries of first asylum
and transit countries.'
I do not know whether the government and the opposition will support this amendment. I might still be enjoying the optimism of youth, but I feel in my heart that maybe there is still a chance that the government and the opposition will support this important amendment. I suppose I should not hold out much hope.

What I am about to say is not a criticism of any one individual—there are a lot of good individuals in both the government and the opposition—but collectively the government is happy to play politics with the lives of people, play politics with asylum seekers, is happy to pander to those xenophobes and bigots and racists in our community and is happy to bring on something like this bill today which I fully suspect has little to do with asylum seekers and a lot to do with trying to wedge the opposition. But, to the opposition's credit, it has not fallen for it. I suppose I do not hold out a lot of hope that the government will support the amendment. I hold out a little bit of hope that the Labor Party will support it given that they are opposing this bill today. But I am not going to let the Labor Party get off scot free. I have seen members of the Labor Party standing up here today and yesterday wringing their hands and talking about the horrors of the way Australia treats asylum seekers, the horrors of this bill and how nonsensical it is. They are making some quite good points about how silly it is that we would treat some people in this way, how cruel it is that we would treat some people in the way that this bill would require, but I am not going to let the Labor Party off the hook, because in just about every respect the Labor Party's position or policy on asylum seekers is identical to the Liberal Party's, identical to the National Party's. It was the Labor Party that created mandatory detention; it is the Labor Party that continues to support offshore processing. It is the Labor Party that approves of boat towbacks.

I am not going to let either side off the hook here. You are both peas in a pod; you are both as bad as each other. You are both a black mark on this nation's history. When in years to come they write books about this shameful period in Australian history, they will not let the Labor Party off the hook, because they will put the Liberal Party, the National Party and the Labor Party on the same list—parties that regard this as a border security problem, parties that regard this as a political challenge that, if they do not handle it really cleverly, will backfire on them at the opinion polls. I say to the Liberal Party and to the National Party and to the Labor Party, how about you start treating these poor souls who are fleeing for their lives as human beings, how about you start treating this as a humanitarian challenge? It is not a border security problem for Australia, it is a humanitarian challenge for Australia. How about the Liberal Party, the National Party and the Labor Party starting to see this for what it is and stop treating it as a border security problem? Start acting like real leaders, start standing up in front of the community and fighting for something. Say that this country has an ethical obligation, this country has a legal obligation, to stand for what is right and that when people come to our shores, whether it be by air or by boat, we give them protection, we hear their claim and we give them permanent refuge in our lucky country for as long as they want to stay here. That would be the right thing to do. That would be the legal thing to do—it would be entirely consistent with the refugee convention, it would be entirely consistent with the Rome statute, it would be entirely consistent with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and it would be entirely consistent with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

And how about the Liberal Party, the National Party and the Labor Party put their heads together for once and stop being so confrontational and start acting in a collegiate way—I am
sure the crossbench will be happy to work with you in a collegiate way—and develop a sophisticated response to asylum seekers and look at ways to settle the situation down in source countries? They should look at ways to give real assistance to countries of first asylum—countries like Pakistan and Iran, who currently get next to no aid from us—and at working cooperatively with countries in our region, yes to clamp down on the people smugglers but also to develop a genuine regional solution. Nauru is not a regional processing centre. Nauru is a gulag. It is a failed state and it is a gulag no better than the hulks we used to put convicts on. How about we put our heads together and come up with a genuine regional solution that is approved by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, where people who come into our region are taken into care, are processed quickly and are given asylum in a number of countries, including this country.

I make the point again: we are one of the richest and most fortunate countries in the world. If anyone can do this right, it is us. Yet we are a pariah. We are not setting an example for the rest of the world. The minister comes in here and the Prime Minister comes in here and talks about how in Europe they are envious of us and they are impressed by the way we deal with asylum seekers. What rot! No-one can be proud of the fact that we have mandatory detention, that we have offshore processing, that we have boat towbacks, that we treat these people like criminals. We even call them illegals. They are not illegals; they are human beings. They are irregular immigrants and they are asylum seekers, which means they are trying to get to refuge. We should bring them in, give them protection, hear their claims and give them permanent refuge in this country, if their claims are fair dinkum. If they are not fair dinkum, send them back. But most of them are fair dinkum.

It is about time we started acting like an ethical country that has respect for the rule of law. It is about time the Liberal Party, the National Party and the Labor Party all stopped worrying about political self-interest and started acting like leaders. I tell you what: if you started acting like leaders, your political self-interest would probably improve, because all of a sudden people would stop holding you in contempt and they would start respecting you. Crikey, you might even get people to vote for you. No wonder people are supporting people like the member for Melbourne, the member for Indi and the member for Mayo. (Time expired)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Brian Mitchell): Is the amendment seconded? The member for Indi will need to seek leave, because she has already spoken on this bill.

Ms McGOWAN (Indi) (10:42): I seek leave to second this amendment.

Leave not granted.

Mr BANDT (Melbourne) (10:42): I second the amendment. The Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016 is a bill that Donald Trump would be proud of. This is Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull's equivalent to saying he will not allow Muslims into the country. This is Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull's equivalent to saying he will build a wall to keep people out. This is a shameful attempt from a Prime Minister—who should know better, but is failing in the polls—to try and fan the politics of fear to recover his political stocks. This is a shameful attempt from a Prime Minister who is rapidly becoming the poor man's member for Warringah—the poor man's Tony Abbott. This is a shameful attempt from a Prime Minister to use the politics of race in an attempt to win votes.
Let us have a look at what our immigration system is like at the moment. Our immigration system, alone in the world, takes people who come here seeking our help and puts them in mental-illness factories in countries that are less able to deal with the problem of people movement than us. It takes people, including children, and puts them in detention until they break. It takes people who just want to live a better life and puts them in a situation where they are exposed to abuse, to sexual abuse, to rape and to the degradation of their mental health to the point where they feel that the situation that Australia put them in is even worse than the situation that they fled. The immigration system that we have at the moment is one that costs us, according to the Australian National Audit Office, $570,000 per person per year to keep someone locked up, when we could be spending that money on schools and hospitals.

We have a government and an opposition that defend an immigration system that most right-thinking people, as well as international observers, say is not the way that you treat people who come here seeking our help. And what happens? Do the government come here and say, 'Let's try and improve our immigration system so that people who are just coming here seeking a helping hand can get processed quickly and fairly and, if they are found to be genuine refugees, we'll take them here and we'll resettle them?' No. The government come here and say that they want to permanently ban people who come here seeking our help from ever coming to the Australian mainland, no matter how good their claim is, no matter how bad the situation of war, torture or persecution they are fleeing and no matter what might happen to them if we send them back. In a naked attempt to try and win votes, because they have run out of anything positive to say and because they are dropping in the polls, they dredge this one up from the bottom of the barrel. The Prime Minister, who ought to know better, came in here and gave it his full support.

So what do we have? At the moment, we have an immigration system that does not treat boat people like people. It treats people who have committed no crime like criminals. It says that, rather than do what we know is done elsewhere around the world, we will spend over half a million dollars a year per person to lock someone up until they break. What could we be doing instead? There is a glimmer of hope in Australia, because, when I look around my electorate of Melbourne, I am reminded every day that this country used to do things differently. When I look around the electorate of Melbourne and I see, in Richmond, the very strong population that came here from Vietnam 40 years ago—and in the time in between—I am reminded that, if we did then what this government and the Labor party are doing now, we would not have the Vietnamese community in Richmond or across Australia. Those people would be sent back, their boats would be turned back or they would be locked up. That is what is at stake.

I am reminded that, a few decades ago, we used to do it differently. If someone was coming here seeking our help—especially if they were fleeing from a country where we might have sent Australian troops to get involved in that conflict and said, 'The situation there is so bad that we need to put our troops in harm's way'—there was a recognition that perhaps we have an obligation to take some of the people who are coming here seeking our help, assess whether they are genuine refugees and, if they are, settle them here. There was a recognition, 40 years ago, that we needed a regional approach to deal with it. That means you talk with other countries, you work out what is the fair share for countries like Australia or, potentially,
other countries to take and then you say, 'If someone is waiting somewhere, we will take you in.' If you want to, in the government's and in Labor's words, stop the boats, the way of stopping the boats is for Australia to turn around and say: 'We understand that there are lots of people on our doorstep in Malaysia and in Indonesia and that they have been waiting in camps for decades and decades and decades, even though they have been found to be genuine refugees. What we will do is we will take a chunk of those people and bring them to Australia.' That would send a message to the people in the camps that, if they have been found to be a genuine refugee, Australia is taking people again.

There is a lot of talk about the people smugglers' business model. I will tell you one thing, Mr Deputy Speaker: the people smugglers' business model is based on the desperation of people who have often been found to be genuine refugees, who are languishing around the world, including in camps, who do not see any other way of getting to places like Australia. Along comes someone who says, 'Give me a bit of money and I'll pop you on a boat,' and they do it and they take the chance. I will tell you what, Mr Deputy Speaker: if I saw that Australia was turning back boats, if I saw that Australia was building up a wall around it and turning away people in the way that Donald Trump likes to talk about doing in his country, if I saw that and if I knew that the only glimmer of hope of getting out of a situation of war, the only way to protect my family, was to pay someone some money to jump on a boat, I would probably do it. I would bet my bottom dollar that most people in this chamber would as well. If you thought that was your only way out, you would take it.

If you really want to break the people smugglers' business model, so-called, what you do is you offer hope to the people who are languishing in the camps. That means Australia must immediately substantially lift the number of people that we are bringing in, and it means that we must immediately take a chunk of people from camps in neighbouring regions. When you start to do that, it sends a signal that Australia no longer has the closed-door policy that it had in the past, and it sends a signal that, if you wait, there is now a queue. We hear a lot of talk about queue jumpers. The reality is, when you are stuck in one of those camps, and the waiting list on average is 67 years, there is no queue. That is why people jump on boats. If we were serious about stopping deaths at sea, that is what we would do. We would work with neighbouring countries and we would say: 'Where there are lots of people waiting, we will take a chunk in. We will do it in an orderly fashion and people won't have any motivation to get on a boat.'

So there is an option, there is an alternative, but no; Labor and Liberal have been in lock step to say: 'We are going to disregard international law and our international obligation that we have signed up to. We are prepared to lock people up indefinitely. We are prepared to make the situation in Australia worse than the situation that people are fleeing, so that they might choose not to come to this country.' Well, I do not want Australia to become a country where we make life so bad for people that they think they would be better off returning to a war zone in Afghanistan or in Syria. That is not what I want Australia to become.

We are faced with a choice here. I am pleased that this clumsy attempt at a wedge from the government has been so badly handled. When the Prime Minister tries to dredge the bottom of the barrel and pull out a Donald Trump-style wedge, he cannot even do it properly. I am pleased that it has woken the Labor opposition from their close and cuddly relationship with the government on immigration policy, to oppose this. I hope that the opposition continue to
oppose it, even if the government announce that they have done some agreement to send
people off to a third country or that they are now all of a sudden open to amendments. We
should not only oppose this. If it is the start of opposing mandatory detention then I welcome
it. If it is the start of opposing boat turn-backs then I welcome it. But I suspect that it will not
be.

The reality is: if you are looking for a genuine alternative that takes what former Prime
Minister Malcolm Fraser did and updates it, you will find it in the policy that I have been
outlining, that the Greens have been advocating—and I know a number of other people, like
the member for Denison, the member for Indi or even the member for Mayo, will have
variations on that policy. There is a better way, but it requires leadership. It requires going to
the Australian people and saying: 'We can do it differently to the way that Donald Trump does
it. We can look at the best in Australia's history, rather than the worst, and we can work out
how to bring a decent number of people here—much more than we are taking now—in an
orderly way that stops the deaths at sea and does not require us breaking women, men and
children.' The suggestion that somehow we need to have what is in effect child abuse as some
necessary part of an immigration policy is a reprehensible one, but that is the suggestion that
the government puts forward. The government says we need this. The opposition says we
need mandatory detention, including of children, where appropriate. That is wrong. Our
choice is not between child abuse and deaths at sea. We are better than that. We are able to
find a third way.

This ought to be an opportunity for Australia to make a choice: are we going to follow the
Donald Trump-style approach of building a wall around us and continue to ramp up an
incredibly cruel policy or are we going to say, 'This is an opportunity to go a different way'? If
there is one lesson that we can learn from the election result in the United States, and from
Brexit, it is that, when faced with significant dislocation and the realisation that everything we
have been told by Labor and Liberal about free-trade policies and the benefits that they
supposedly bring people is actually wrong, there are two ways we can go. We can either
choose the path of fear that turns up the dial and say, 'We are going to become even more
isolationist, we are going to close our arms and, to the people who come here seeking a
helping hand, we will show a closed fist,' or we can say, 'Now is the time to take stock.'

Maybe the orthodoxy from Liberal and Labor over the last 30 or 40 years that has told us
we have to privatise everything, deregulate everything, make everything user-pays, stop
funding education properly and make students graduate with more debt, and make houses less
affordable was the post-truth politics that started 30 years ago, and maybe it is time to call it
out. Maybe it is time to say, 'Parliaments and governments need to put the community first
again.' It is time for us to start creating a society that we feel proud of—a society that says,
'There is enough money in this wealthy society to make sure everyone gets an education'; a
society that says, 'It is not beyond our wit to give everyone affordable housing'; a society that
says, 'Perhaps we can have secure work again, instead of deregulating and increasing the pace
of casualisation.' That is the opportunity that we have.

And then we can add to that the recognition that a successful society and a successful
Australia will be built on multiculturalism. A successful Australia will be built on acceptance
of our diversity. That means understanding that a refugee or migrant is not a criminal who
needs to be locked up or barred from Australia for life but the person who married into your
family, the person who works in your workplace, the person who lives down the street from you—because we are a nation that is populated by people who have come from everywhere. That is the story that we can tell and that is the story that the Prime Minister should be telling, instead of aping Donald Trump.

Many Australians know that there is a better way. I seek to table a petition that the Petitions Committee has found to be in order, from many people in Victoria who are calling for better treatment of people who come here seeking our help, and calling for, in essence, boat people to be treated like people. Let us stop the dehumanisation. Let us stop the gutter wedge tactics from the government. I seek leave to present this petition, and I urge everyone in this House not only to vote against this bill but to find a better way.

Leave granted.

_The petition read as follows_—

To the Honourable the Speaker and the Members of the House of Representatives

The Petition of certain citizens of Australia draws to the attention of the House the urgent need for more compassionate and less punitive government policies towards asylum seekers and refugees.

Your petitioners therefore request the House do all in its power to: 1. Immediately provide adequate basic living requirements for asylum seekers in all detention centres, including adequate medical and psychological help. 2. Abolish off shore detention and replace with community detention in Australia. 3. Release from detention into Australian community, all children and their families. 4. Implement assessment of refugee claims within six weeks of arrival by increasing funding to United Nations High Commission for Refugees by $10 million. 5. Cease the practice of returning refugees before professional processing.

Petition received.

_Mr WATTS_ (Gellibrand) (10:58): We live in a time when the world is more interconnected, more globalised, than ever before. The impact of events on the other side of the world quickly wash up on our own shores. Australia might not share any land borders with any other countries, but we are not an island. We are 23 million people whose prosperity, security and moral outlook are heavily influenced by what the eight billion people beyond our borders are doing. That is the reality. Many people do not like it, but it does not change the fact that the currents of international events shape and impact our choices domestically.

The way that we engage with the international movements of people that are underway is a prime example of this. According to the UNHCR there are currently more than 65 million people worldwide who have been forcibly displaced. That is a six-million-person increase from last year and the highest number since the UNHCR was formed in the wake of the asylum crisis after the Second World War. There are more than 21 million refugees under the UNHCR mandate today, and more than half of them are under the age of 18. They are children. This is a global humanitarian crisis. When people are forced to flee their homes by conflict or persecution they are often forced to cross international borders in search of safety. The vast majority do not want to uproot their lives and start again permanently in another country. They seek refuge in the closest countries of safety and wait it out, hoping for the dangers in their own home countries to pass. Think of it this way: if there were a civil war in Australia, most of us would prefer to wait out the conflict in New Zealand rather than move to
Finland and start our lives again in a country with a different language and culture to the one of our families and friends.

That is what the millions of refugees in the countries around Syria are currently on: waiting it out in hope of being able to return to their past lives. But there is a limit to this. Unless these temporary refugee camps are able to provide the essentials of life—physical security, food, shelter, medical treatment—people will move on, quickly, crossing more international borders in order to survive. Unless these temporary refugee camps are able to provide the essentials of hope—education, dignity, meaning and a realistic pathway to enduring safety, either a return to their previous lives or international resettlement—people will move on, too, crossing international borders in the process.

With 65 million displaced in the world today, these limits have been met repeatedly in recent years. In the wake of the Syrian refugee crisis we have seen an exodus of people walking and sailing from the region to Europe in search of immediate relief. But we have also seen refugees who have spent literally decades waiting in refugee camps like Dadaab and Kakuma in Kenya, or in refugee camps on the Thai-Myanmar border in our own region. They are people who tire of waiting and cross international borders on their own initiative in search of permanent resettlement. We have similarly seen refugees in limbo states, not in formal camps but not a full part of the community they live either, in transit countries like Pakistan or Indonesia. They tire of waiting and try to find their own way to permanent resettlement through the use of people smugglers.

It is clear that these people movements are an international problem. The actions of individual countries influence the decisions of people and shape the international movement of people in a direct sense. If we do not provide adequate support to the UNHCR to provide an adequate standard of life in refugee camps, more people will move on seeking survival, safety and security. If we do not provide legitimate pathways through formal resettlement programs for refugees who are never able to return to their past lives, people will seek a permanent resolution to their plight through illegitimate means.

Yes—if in Australia we were to open our borders and say, 'Let them all come', in an age of cheap international travel, social media and tens of millions of displaced people, very large numbers of people would respond to this message and come to Australia. We have seen more than enough evidence of this in Europe to know what the consequences of this action would be. This is the interconnected world in which Labor's asylum policy has been developed. Our policy understands that there are international consequences to our actions, and that when we are responding to complex global challenges of this kind we must always ask, 'What happens next?' How do our actions shape the decisions of those tens of millions of asylum seekers around the world. That is why Labor plans to play a leadership role in South-East Asia and the Pacific to build a regional humanitarian framework to improve the situation of asylum seekers in our region. That is why Labor's policy provides for significantly increasing annual funding to the UNHCR for its global work program and its work in South-East Asia and the Pacific, in particular. At a time when the global humanitarian need is greater than ever, Labor will provide $450 million over three years to support the important work of the UNHCR. We do this not only because Australia has a moral obligation to do so—to do its share to help respond to this unprecedented humanitarian crisis—but also because it directly shapes the
decisions of refugees in UNHCR camps around the world. It helps give them better choices than paying an extortionate price to a people smuggler for a very risky journey.

It is also why Labor has committed to almost doubling Australia’s annual humanitarian intake to 27,000 by 2025. Again this is a policy that directly contributes to giving refugees seeking permanent resettlement better options than seeking out a people smuggler. This is also why Labor maintain our clear policy position that those who seek to come to Australia using a people smuggler will not be resettled permanently in Australia. It sends a clear message to people weighing up their options not to choose to risk their own lives, or the lives of their children, by taking a very dangerous boat journey to Australia. There is simply no point in it, as you will not receive permanent settlement in this nation as a result.

Again, a commitment to offshore processing and regional resettlement directly shapes the choices being made by refugees around the world and by asylum seekers around the world. There are other ways in which the interconnected world in which we live shapes our engagement with this issue. In countries around the world populist, anti-immigrant rhetoric has been growing in influence as the scale of the international humanitarian crisis has deepened. In Europe—in Germany, France and the United Kingdom, especially during the Brexit referendum—and much of Eastern Europe asylum seekers are being used by populist demagogues as scapegoats for increasing economic and cultural anxiety in the community. We saw this centre stage in the recent US presidential election campaign.

President-elect Trump’s ascension is something that we as a nation will manage in a strategic sense. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, our shared interests and enduring national values transcend individual leaders. I am sure that we will be able to work with President-elect Trump in the future. However, the very similarities that many of us see between Australia and the United States mean that the extraordinary nature of the recent US presidential election campaign will have ramifications for our own politics.

Whatever the causes of Trump’s election success, the rhetoric that he legitimised during the campaign will have an impact on the Australian political debate. That campaign and its result threaten to throw open a social and political schism. That result will be a clarion call for all of those who wish to divide us. We have already seen One Nation and the extremists in the coalition party room responding to this call. This is a dangerous moment. It is more important than ever that people of goodwill in this country do not go down this path of division. We know where it leads.

If the emboldened reactionaries and extremists confront the vacuum of leadership that has existed in this government over the last 12 months, it will grow in influence. If the genuine anxieties of many in our community are not engaged by leaders willing to listen to their legitimate concerns, there will be no shortage of opportunists waiting to offer them up a scapegoat and sell them snake oil. We need to build trust with those in our community who are anxious and alienated. Without that trust—trust that our political institutions are accessible to them, that they will be listened to and that our institutions will respond to their legitimate concerns—the efficacy of our political system will flounder because the reality is that the challenges we confront of growing inequality, economic insecurity, climate change and the international asylum crisis are complex. Solving them requires judgement and nuance in the face of uncertainty; incrementalism and moderation in the face of complexity; and, yes, negotiation and compromise in the face of starkly conflicting interests. They cannot be solved
by simplistic scapegoating or snake-oil politics. In addition to being immoral, this will only feed alienation as these approaches too fail to address the things that people are really concerned about in our community.

I implore the Prime Minister to think again about bills like this one. Prime Minister, you know that bills like this one before the House will do nothing to help address the challenges facing our nation. Prime Minister, do not allow yourself to be led by the nose by your immigration minister and Senator Hanson. Do not reduce yourself, Prime Minister, to the politics of scapegoating.

If the Prime Minister rides this tiger's back in the current environment he will soon be eaten. We need to engage with the complex international asylum crisis in the principled, nuanced way that it requires. I say to the Prime Minister: do not demand that the Labor Party supports bills sight unseen. Do not accuse us of weakness for wanting to see the legislation that we are being asked to support. Explain why you are doing what you are doing with bills like this, not just to us but to your colleagues, too. It does not instil much confidence when your own ministers are contradicting you about the application of this legislation. It does not build much trust in the community when the government's own MPs cannot articulate the problem that this legislation is trying to address, as the member for Chisholm found on the doors this week. Those opposite need to be able to answer the question: what is the point? Why are we trying to stop the tourists, stop the businessmen and stop the Commonwealth Games athletes? What possible signal does this send to the rest of the world?

For our part, the Labor Party takes a principled approach to this issue. I am proud that since I came into this chamber Labor has taken a consistent, principled approach to asylum seeker policy. We have said that a future Labor government will ensure that Australia does its bit to help the unprecedented number of people seeking asylum around the world, both through supports to the UNHCR and through an increased international humanitarian intake. We have said that we will act with decency towards asylum seekers under our care, ensuring that there is the accountability, transparency and oversight of Australian-funded facilities, implementing that offshore processing and regional settlement program.

We have been very clear in saying that we will do what is necessary to discourage people from using people smugglers to undertake dangerous sea journeys. The message will be clear in that respect. This approach, these principles, have led us to oppose misguided government legislation on this issue in the past, including, notably, the government's legislation to introduce temporary protection visas, and we will continue to stand by our principles on this issue in the future. We will support sensible policies to enable a third-country settlement of the people currently living in a limbo state of indefinite detention on Manus Island and Nauru. But we will not be dictated to by an immigration minister who is so out of his depth that he cannot even run an effective political wedge. At this dangerous moment for Australia we need better from this government.

I say to the Prime Minister that we will support you if you want to start tackling the issues of alienation and inclusion in our communities. If the Prime Minister wants to start tackling issues like secure work and ensuring that all Australians are getting reward for their labour, we will support that. If the Prime Minister wants to do something about wages growth being the lowest on record, breaking that nexus in the Australian community between effort and reward, we will support him. If the Prime Minister wants to do something about the endemic
workplace exploitation of temporary migrants that is taking place in this country, we will support that. That is a national shame on our character, and its consequences flow through our entire community. If the Prime Minister wants to do something about addressing the liveability issues in our communities and the infrastructure demands that are keeping my constituents away from their families as they sit stuck in traffic—

Ms Henderson interjecting—

Mr WATTS: The member for Corangamite knows this well, because the Melbourne metro rail tunnel is one of the biggest beneficiaries in my community. The Sunbury line will reach capacity in 2020, and this government is arguing about whether we should be building a new station in South Yarra. This is the kind of politics that drives people mad in this country. So I say to the Prime Minister, put away the political games. Stop playing games with people's lives like this bill. Be genuine about addressing the legitimate concerns of people in our community and we will support you.

Ms Henderson interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Corangamite to be quiet.

Ms VAMVAKINOU (Calwell) (11:14): I rise to speak against the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016. I do so because I strongly believe that this bill has no policy value whatsoever other than to detract from the government's failure, after three years, to secure third-country resettlement options for the refugees on Manus and Nauru. I oppose this bill because, at heart, it is an appeasement and a dog whistle that simply goes too far in the wrong direction. In opposing it I am now drawing a line in the sand on an issue that has challenged, troubled and conflicted me for over a decade. I came into the Australian parliament during the 2001 'children overboard', Tampa election. It was an election that was largely fought at the expense of refugees and their children, an election where the government of the day unleashed a shameless campaign that broke with traditional bipartisanship and ruthlessly exploited an issue it knew would deliver it votes at the election.

I well remember Tampa. I also remember as a candidate having to field questions about my own migrant background. There were many callers to my campaign office at that time wanting reassurance that I was not Arabic or Muslim. Such was the hysteria, that one caller demanded proof that I was not Muslim. When I said to him that my name was Maria he said: 'I did not ask you your name. I asked you if you were a Muslim.' It had been a long time since my own identity as an Australian had been challenged and I must say that it did shock me. It shocked me that I too was being hunted because I had a foreign-sounding name. It made me realise that the fight for an inclusive Australia can never be said to be won. It also taught me that appeasement and dog whistling, as it was then as it is today, are the single biggest threat to our social cohesion.

Our social cohesion is the basis upon which we have built our country. Our greatest strength is our multicultural society. The Prime Minister is absolutely right when he says that—he is absolutely right. But, Prime Minister, our successful multicultural nation has been built by tolerance and inclusion, by access and equity, by political and community leadership that has worked to bring people together with courage and foresight, leadership that has rejected and defied dog whistling and appeasement, leadership that would have understood that the men, women and children on Nauru and Manus are not to blame. They are not a
threat. They have failed. In fact, this government has failed, and anybody who supports this absurd thought-bubble of a bill has missed the point altogether.

We are facing a global humanitarian crisis. It is a crisis that we need to deal with in a serious, thoughtful, humane and collective way. We do not deal with this crisis in this way.

I am a migrant—I have said that many times in this place. My husband is a refugee from Cyprus. I proudly represent one of the most multicultural constituencies in Australia. The federal seat of Calwell is home to one of the largest Muslim communities in Australia. It is also home to the biggest emerging refugee community from Iraq, and that community is predominantly Christian. I have worked and continue to work very hard in my local community to build relationships and promote can social cohesion. In particular, in my electorate at this very minute we are receiving hundreds of refugees from Syria, and my own Iraqi community works hard not only to integrate itself into the broader community that has become its home but also to help those who are coming from Syria at this moment.

I believe passionately in multiculturalism. I believe in an Australia that has an Indigenous inheritance, a country built by successive waves of migrants, my own parents included. I believe in an Australia that is compassionate, hardworking and fair, where the persecuted, the displaced and the stateless have in the past and will continue in the future to find sanctuary and understanding and be given a chance and an opportunity to build a new home and a future for themselves and for their children, a future that is safe from the horrors of war and violence. This is why I am drawing a line in the sand and opposing this bill.

This bill goes too far. Its attempts to ban from ever visiting Australia those genuine refugees who go on to become citizens of other countries, all because they once came to this country seeking refuge, is ludicrous and offers no real solution to the global movement of people.

There are, as my colleagues before me have said, 65 million people on the move globally. I understand, and we all understand, that we face a major humanitarian issue that is complex and challenging and one that we have to find a solution to. But this bill is not the solution. Labor recognise and understand the complexities and the challenges of the refugee issue, and we have supported the government in trying to deal with this issue. We have supported a policy that combines offshore processing and regional resettlement as a way of managing a process that is driven by circumstances, factors and forces beyond our control. We know that the people-smuggling business is a horrific trade in human trafficking, a cruel and ruthless exploitation of human anguish and desperation. We are all too familiar with the fact that hundreds and thousands of migrants and refugees have lost their lives or the lives of loved ones, drowning in our seas and in the Mediterranean.

So we do support the government in its attempt to stop the people smugglers and to stop the deaths at sea. Let us have a look at those attempts and what they have in fact stopped. The turn-back policy that the government has championed has been effective. The 2015-16 summary statistics of the Department of Immigration and Border Protection stated that zero people-smuggling ventures reached Australia within that period. So, yes, that particular policy has been effective. I would say that the government would think that they had done a very good job. The job has done what was intended. So the question is, what is the actual purpose of this bill?
In question time yesterday the Prime Minister said, amongst many other things that he said, that it is necessary in order to protect us from the huge number of people who will make their way across to our side of the world if the people smugglers get a whiff of any opportunity. The Prime Minister also told us in question time yesterday about his meetings with European leaders and the concerns they expressed to him about the tsunami of people who have flowed into Europe and who remain a threat to them and to us. I have been watching Europe for about a decade, and my response to that is that the Europeans have no-one to blame but themselves. If there are 65 million or so people on the move globally, we as an international community are to blame. We cannot deal with this issue by simply warning each other to stay vigilant and batten down the hatches. This is not a solution. This bill is certainly not a solution, and the Prime Minister in particular should be embarrassed about championing this pettiness.

Let me remind the chamber that this country has been here before. There have been similar issues in decades past. However, we are a country that has a significant history of receiving and settling refugees. We have one of the largest numbers of refugee settlements per capita. Our settlement programs are deemed to be among world's best practice. We did not achieve this through pettiness and dog whistling. On the contrary: we achieved it in spite of the pettiness and dog whistling. In defending this bill, the government points out—again, amongst other things, because it is very hard to work out what exactly the point of the bill is—that this bill is not founded on fear. Perhaps not—perhaps that is true. But the government, through this bill, certainly seeks to exploit fear. A policy without a clear purpose runs the risk of becoming a device that serves deviant ends. And let me remind the Prime Minister that vindictive politics seldom makes for good policy.

I oppose this bill because it fails to address in a meaningful and serious way a global problem that cannot be dealt with by focusing on the idea of keeping out or moving on. All this bill does is use innocent human beings as a political football in order to detract from the government's failure to fulfill the other part of its policy, and that is to secure third-country resettlement options for the people on Nauru and Manus.

Mr FEENEY (Batman) (11:24): I am proud to rise and speak against the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016, and I am proud that Labor came together unanimously to express our disgust and opposition to the government's absurd asylum seeker lifetime ban. From the very beginning, it was clear that this was a disingenuous and desperate act—an act by a Prime Minister keen to give in not only to the Right of his own party but also to One Nation. It was a measure designed to try and distract Australia and Australians from the fact that this is a government that has done so little to address the largest humanitarian crisis in history since World War II.

This legislation would make any application for a visa an invalid application where the person applying was processed offshore after July 2013. This legislation would cover anyone in regional processing, anyone living in onshore detention, anyone in community detention, anyone who has voluntarily returned to their own country, and anyone who has been resettled in a third country, if they were taken to Manus or Nauru.

It is a ridiculous proposition for the government to make that none of these people would ever be able to return to Australia to work, to study, to visit family or to visit this country through the normal visa application processes for family reunions and spousal visas. I am
fortunate to live in an electorate that is incredibly diverse; we have migrant and refugee families from all over the world. These families can and do apply for visas to reunite their families—mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters, who join our community and become new Australians. Are we to deny that right to the refugee families who form part of the cohort the government has now targeted and wants to permanently deny visas? Are we to deny the right of business people, doctors, athletes and students who want to visit Australia and who the government now seeks to permanently deny entry to Australia? What a nonsense that in decades hence a person is unable to visit the country as a tourist because they form part of this cohort targeted by the government! I think the answer is clear and the government's position is ridiculous.

Ben Saul, Challis Chair of International Law at the University of Sydney, argues that this legislation breaches article 31 of the refugee convention as well as Australia's family reunion obligations under articles 17 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Minister Dutton, the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection, has sought to make the argument that he has a broad discretion to waive these provisions in the public interest for either an individual or a class of persons specified in a legislative instrument. However, he does not have a duty to consider whether to exercise this discretion in any given circumstance. As I have said previously in this place, are we truly going to trust this minister to make fair and logical decisions when this is the kind of legislation he is prepared to put forward to this parliament? Are we truly ready to trust these decisions to a minister who has overseen a mismanaged regional processing system that has been the subject of repeated allegations of physical, sexual and psychological abuse and a minister who had to be forced by Labor into an inquiry about those very allegations?

Among the many and varied reasons the government has given for this legislation is that it is necessary in finding viable third-party resettlement solutions and Minister Dutton has said that this measure is aimed primarily at getting people off Manus Island and Nauru. Yet there is no evidence that the government has lined up a third-party resettlement option. They have not acted on this for three years, and there is no evidence that they have started acting now. To pretend that this legislation is linked to or even necessary for resettlement options is ludicrous and it is a political deceit. There is no evidence that it will make finding a third-party resettlement easier, but there is evidence that it will make it more difficult.

New Zealand Prime Minister John Keys is quoted as saying: We've got no intention of having separate classes of New Zealand citizens. He has recoiled at the notion that persons settled in his country would be denied rights that others in his country enjoy. It has been reported that Prime Minister Keys has ruled out an agreement if the refugees granted New Zealand citizenship would be unable to travel to Australia. To ask other countries to create a two tiered and unequal system of citizenship is unfair and unlikely to be agreed to. This is a government that is making the resettlement of persons on Manus and Nauru more complex and more controversial than it already is.

The government has allowed people to languish in offshore detention for three years, and without a resettlement option that detention remains indefinite. This is a government that needs to make resettlement of those persons a priority—a matter of urgency.
Labor have said repeatedly that we do not want to see a repeat of the horrendous loss of life at sea when people smugglers were selling a perilous journey. I was a member of parliament at that time and, like many of my colleagues, I feel the loss and indeed the sense of responsibility that comes with that loss of life. I, like my colleagues, am determined to never allow that to happen again.

But that is not what this legislation is about. This legislation goes well beyond preventing any suffering. Instead, it seeks only to increase it. Labor have never supported indefinite or punitive detention. We have called on this government again and again to find a third-party solution and to act to ensure the health and safety of those in our regional processing systems. The challenge that we face is great, but we must not face it with fear, hate or a lack of empathy. For too long the government has used the language of fear to denigrate asylum seekers and to seek to treat them as less than human. We must not and will not allow that narrative to continue.

This legislation is not about good public policy. There have been zero successful people-smuggling ventures in recent times. It is not about resettlement. It makes the resettlement of these persons more difficult, not less difficult. Sadly, what this legislation is about is politics. It is about polls. This is the Turnbull government seeking to consolidate itself in a post-election phase. It is seeking to return to those debates that it failed to prosecute during the federal election that it has now judged are useful to it. This is cynical politics at its worst. This is the kind of conduct that promotes and builds despair in the Australian population about how politics is done in this place.

Instead of embracing this course of action, we must seek to bring about structural change so that we can bring more people here safely. That is Labor's policy. We have never supported indefinite detention. It has always been Labor's policy that those on Manus Island and Nauru should be resettled as soon as possible. Under the former Labor government, we worked with the UNHCR to establish what was described as the Malaysia solution, a plan which would have achieved that goal for so many asylum seekers. However, history tells us that that plan was voted down by the coalition, in concert with the Greens party. So Australia now finds itself in a situation where no solution has been found for three years.

We have never supported punitive detention, where the deterrent is the cruelty of the processing centres rather than being limited to preventing resettlement. This government has been responsible for the egregious mismanagement of our regional processing system. Labor have pushed at every opportunity for the government to care for the physical and mental health of detainees, but they have refused to listen. I believe that everyone in regional processing should be provided with the level of education, health care and safety that we would expect for our children in Australia. This legislation is nothing more than dog-whistle politics and should be treated as such, and by Labor it is being treated as such.

The government need to do much more than simply abandon these politically demonstrative pieces of legislation. They need to listen to the people of Australia and they need to achieve third-party resettlement of refugees as soon as possible to end indefinite detention. They need to embrace Labor's plan for doubling Australia's humanitarian intake. They need to embrace Labor's plan for Australia's annual contribution to the UNHCR to be built to $450 million over three years so that we are once again engaged with the world in managing this humanitarian crisis. The government need to implement fast and fair
processing of claims, including reintroducing the 90-day rule scrapped by the coalition government.

The government needs to implement independent oversight of Australian funded processing facilities and empower the Commonwealth Ombudsman to provide independent oversight for onshore processing facilities. This is critical to the transparency and the conditions of those places and is critical to the reputation of our great Commonwealth. The government needs to appoint an independent advocate backed by resources and a statutory authority to pursue the interests of children.

We need to take a leadership role in our region to establish a regional approach to addressing this humanitarian crisis. This includes working with our neighbours to ensure that asylum seekers and refugees in transit countries like Indonesia and Malaysia have access to work rights, education and health care. We need to take on the task that failed once in the Malaysia solution but should not be abandoned as a way forward.

In closing, I would like to thank all of the people in my electorate who have called, who have emailed and who have written to me to join with Labor in opposing this legislation. I am proud to come from an electorate where I have received countless calls agreeing with Labor and our approach on this legislation and none that have disagreed. I hope that together my community and I can continue to pressure the government towards a refugee and asylum seeker policy that reflects the compassion and humanity of the Australian people and, I might say, the people who call Batman home.

Ms CHESTERS (Bendigo) (11:35): I rise to speak against the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill. When the government first announced this bill my reflection was the same as that of many in my electorate—the bill was ridiculous, ludicrous. I was very proud when the Leader of the Opposition came out and used those exact same words. This bill is ridiculous, it is ludicrous. It is about distraction and it is about division. It is not something that this place or this parliament or the Prime Minister should be proud of.

I speak as a member who represents a diverse electorate. When I say 'diverse' I mean politically diverse. After I was preselected in 2012 I held one of my first listening posts at the shopping centre in Epsom, and an older gentleman came up and berated me for Labor's policy on asylum seekers. He was ashamed; he was disgusted. He wanted Labor to be more compassionate and show respect for asylum seekers. The very next person who came up to me was a mum who had three children, and she said, 'Lisa, we should blow up the boats—don't let them come here.' That is the diversity of views in my electorate, and it has taught me a lot about how we engage with people.

To the mum with three kids I said, 'Okay, let's talk about what is happening in Syria.' At that stage we were talking about hundreds of thousands of people having lost their lives. Bendigo's population is 100,000. I said to this young mum, 'What if everyone in your town, in Bendigo, had been killed—what if every building had been bombed? What would you and your family do? You would run and you would seek asylum in a country where there were not the killings, there were not the bombings.' It was at that moment that that young mum stopped and looked at me and said, 'Maybe you've got a point, Lisa.' It is through engagement and talking to people that we can turn this debate around. When the government are tanking in the polls, when they are freaking out about their own jobs, they have yet again put forward a
ludicrous and ridiculous policy of banning people who have tried to arrive in this country by boat; who were tricked, who paid lots of money, who were promised citizenship, who were promised that they would be brought to this lucky country. They have proposed the most ludicrous ban to try to save themselves.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge the work of Love Makes a Way. They had a protest out the front of my office not that long ago, and I have brought in some of the notes from that. They plastered cut-outs of little human figures on my windows with messages. I have brought some of them here today to read into Hansard to acknowledge their thoughts and their views. One states:

All persons are entitled to dignity and respect. It is not illegal to seek asylum by boat.

Another says:
Lisa, our prayers are with you. Be a voice for compassion.

One more message says:
Love makes a way/It's time for the government to stand up and to show compassion.

Yet another one says:
I believe it is time for justice to flow to those who are not lucky enough to be born here but to everyone.'

These are just a few of the little figurines that were posted on my window that day.

Since the government has announced this shocking legislation, I have also been contacted by a number of people who live in my electorate. I would like to take a moment to acknowledge their words and read them into Hansard. Solway Nutting of Castlemaine said:

I know you hate that asylum seekers are incarcerated, their lives wrecked, and that indefinite detention does not "stop the boats".

The brilliant asylum seeker student I tutored in order to help her do well in Year 12 could go on to contribute greatly to whatever community she works in (provided she doesn't get sent back to unquestioned danger in her country of origin).

She also says that the minister's proposed bill to ban every person seeking asylum from ever coming to Australia is wrong. Lynette Bourke from Kennington said:

I feel so distressed about the way our government is treating people seeking asylum in our country.

I am disgusted to think that the Coalition is planning to introduce a bill which will ban every person seeking asylum who the government has imprisoned on Manus Island or Nauru from ever coming to Australia.

Please Ms Chesters will you block this bill.

Blocking this bill would open the way to push for an actual resolution that will allow people to rebuild their lives in safety.

Alan Reynolds from Castlemaine said:

The move proposed by Minister Peter Dutton to ban refugees on Manus and Nauru from ever entering Australia is vicious and cruel ... This is also deeply offensive. To never allow a person into Australia is not what was proposed by the Rudd-government and we should not let Dutton twist it into this.

This bill must be blocked. It is another contravention of our support for the refugees policy of the UN.

Sue Williams from Kangaroo Flat said:
Please work hard to block the bill preventing asylum seekers on Manus Island and Nauru from ever coming to Australia.

These people have been through so much and taking away their hope is cruel and inhumane. I am finding it more and more difficult to feel proud of being an Australian as our government continues with its heartless policy on refugees.

This bill will add to the suffering of people already traumatised, and shows a complete lack of compassion.

I ask Labor to stand up and block the bill, representing the many Australians who believe that all human beings deserve a chance for a safe, happy and healthy life.

Merran Gibson from Newbridge said:

I wish to register my disgust at the treatment of asylum seekers and refugees by the Australian government in the name of border security.

… … …

On a recent overseas trip—12 days ago in Paris—my daughter and I were challenged … over our government's … treatment of asylum seekers and refugees. This is a worldwide issue, we are on the world stage for the wrong reasons …

As I said, this bill is about division. It is about distraction. It is about a government that is desperate and is tanking in the polls. They are trying to use an old political tactic that they have successfully used in Australian politics since 2001.

Who are the people they wish to demonise and target? My office has been working closely with about 15 asylum seekers who came by boat, arrived in this country and moved to Bendigo before this government came to power. At the moment, this government is blocking their applications to become Australian citizens. Since arriving in Bendigo and our community, they have made an amazing and wonderful contribution to our community, and it should be celebrated. I have changed their names because—I have to be honest—I do not trust this minister and this government. I would hate to think that anything that I say in this place could impact on any of these particular individuals who have sought help from my office.

John came into my office seeking advice. Heartbreakingly, John's three-year-old daughter is in Pakistan, and he has never met her. He also has an 11-year-old son. He currently works at Hazeldene's, which is a chicken manufacturing and processing company in my electorate. He talks to his family regularly via Viber—as often as he can.

Also working at Hazeldene's is Michael. I first met Michael as a workplace delegate. He is a delegate—he stands up for his workmates and makes sure that they have a safe workplace. He is a leader within his workplace and his community. In fact, quite a number of these asylum seekers, who are now permanent residents in Australia, work at Hazeldene's. All of them are hoping that this government has a heart and allows them to become Australian citizens so they can bring their families here.

I also met and am working closely with Richard. The first time I met Richard was at the New and Emerging Communities Leadership Program forum. He is a leader of his community. The Victorian government granted him a sponsorship to do this community leadership program, and yet this government says that he is not worthy to be an Australian citizen. This government will not process his claims and will not allow him to bring his wife here. Workplace leaders; community leaders; people working in food processing manufacturing; people who are part of our cricket teams and who are CFA volunteers; people
who are contributing so much to our communities, who arrived by boat in 2011, 2012 and 2013, under this policy would be banned from even coming to Australia and setting foot on Australian soil. These are the people that the government wishes to demonise and target. These are the people that the government, under this policy, wants to ban from ever coming here.

The member for Denison, in his contribution, made an attack on Labor and our policy. I would suggest to the member for Denison that he actually read Labor's policy. I am very proud of large parts of it. Labor have said that we want to increase funding to the UNHCR by $450 million to help refugees in countries of transit and countries of origin have their claims processed. There is a UN refugee processing centre in Indonesia, but it does not have the funding it requires to process asylum seekers. When you have this conversation with people in the electorate, they say, 'That just makes sense—that is good policy: save some money with offshore processing, fund the UN to do it properly.'

Labor have also said that we want to see asylum seekers' applications processed in 90 days. Labor have said that we want to increase the number of refugees that we take into our country, because we do have the capacity and the capability to support more people. Labor has a policy that is about compassion. It is about maintaining respect for asylum seekers and refugees. Labor's policy is about being inclusive. It is easy politics for those on the left to belittle us and to say that we are just the same as the others, but it is simply not true. If you are on the left side of politics and, having read Labor's policy, still stand in this place and say that we are exactly the same as the Liberal Party, then you too are being dishonest.

Our policy on asylum seekers is different. We believe in regional processing. We believe in funding the UNHCR. We believe in supporting people claiming asylum. So it is wrong for those on both the left and the right to continue this divisive politics. What I know from people in my electorate that I speak to regularly about this issue is that they want the games to end. They want to go back to what happened in the 1970s and 1980s, before John Howard tried to save himself during the 'Tampa election', before the Greens used this as a way to wedge Labor. They want this country to return to its obligations under the UNHCR. They want to see the people I have mentioned processed. Perhaps if their names were John, Paul or Richard their citizenship claims would have been processed by now. Perhaps, if the names of the people on Nauru and Manus Island were John, Paul and Richard, we would not be debating this policy.

I call on the government to end this division. I call on the government to be honest, to look into their hearts and to cross the floor on this ludicrous and ridiculous policy. It is wrong to ban somebody from ever coming to this country just because they got tricked into getting onto a boat. They were promised a life here in Australia—a life that we are all so fortunate to have, whether we came here, whether our parents came here or whether we were born here. Do not punish them; embrace them and give them the chance to come and be part of our community.

Mr STEPHEN JONES (Whitlam) (11:50): The Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016, which would amend our migration laws so that certain asylum seekers would never be allowed to enter Australia, is not about securing our borders. It is not about the integrity of our immigration system. This bill is not about relieving the congestion in our cities. It will not improve our trains or our buses and it will not make the traffic flow. It will not help us to get to work on time. It will not give a pay rise to a low-paid
worker, struggling to meet the rising cost of living. It will not make their jobs more secure and it will not help the jobseeker find a job.

The bill will not help families who are struggling to pay their mortgages or a single mum who is struggling to find a place to rent. This bill to ban certain foreigners from entering Australia will not help anyone fill their car with a tank of petrol or their shopping trolley with groceries. The bill—a bill to shut out certain asylum seekers—will not save a single worker’s job. It will not protect an industry or a struggling business attempting to keep its head above water in the face of cheap import competition. It will not stop the dumping of subsidised steel or fruit into Australian markets. It will not stop unfair trade.

This bill is a bill in search of a policy purpose. It will not bring back Holden. It will not bring back Ford. It will not bring back Toyota or Mitsubishi. It will not resurrect the car industry in Australia. This bill will not stop the mad, evil terrorists who murder innocents in the name of God and it will not make it easier for us to track down these murderous, godless people and remove them from our midst. This bill will not ease the concern that foreigners are buying Australian farmland. It will not stop enterprising, industrious or entrepreneurial migrants from starting a small business with an unfamiliar name in our once-familiar neighbourhoods. It will not increase the pension. It will not fix Medicare or improve our hospitals. It will not reduce taxes. It will not bring stability to the dizzy blur of constant change and disruption that leads us all to wonder, 'Is there anything safe and certain anymore?'

It will not do any of these things, but it is about all of them. Its singular purpose is to ask Australians to suspend their concerns about all these things and focus for that moment that you have in your busy lives on a few wretched souls languishing in captivity on Manus Island or Nauru. It begs us to fix our gaze upon these poor wretched souls and say, 'If these people never made it to Australia, somehow our lives would be better, our borders would be more secure and our nation would be greater.' We know that this is simply not true. The truth is that no country ever became greater by becoming smaller, and so it is with its people. I know that the Australian people are bigger than all of this. They are better than the government that seeks to trick them with legislation such as this. They deserve so much more. We will not support the bill. We call it out for what it is: nothing more than this.

Dr LEIGH (Fenner) (11:54): Those of us who sit in this House are here because people put their faith in our undertaking to represent their best interests. This bill, the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016, would permanently exclude any person who comes here by boat from ever entering Australia. In proposing this measure, the government has made a political gesture that is in no-one’s best interests—not those sitting in Manus and Nauru, not those refugees who have come to Australia in the past and not those Australians who are concerned to see that our tax dollars are spent wisely and our migration program is an orderly one.

This is gesture politics at its worst, with all of the effectiveness of the pledge by candidate Trump to build a wall along the Mexican border and make Mexico pay for it. That is how effective this proposal would be. It asks people to make peace with the pettiest and meanest instincts, by dressing up those instincts as strength and certainty. It trades on fear and demonisation of the other, aiming to set up a dichotomy between us and them, hoping that Australians will forget the refugees who have come here in the past, who have helped to make
Australia richer, more diverse and more interesting; refugees—from Anh Do to Frank Lowy to Les Murray—who have enriched our country.

It is a bill that demeans the elements of the coalition who have instigated it, and it is a bill that has incensed my electorate. As one of my electors wrote to me:

I was so disheartened today to read of Mr Turnbull's plans to introduce legislation to the Parliament in the next session that any person seeking asylum who has travelled to Australia via a boat will be banned from ever entering this country.

One of our dearest friends, who sadly died last year, was a boat person. He, with his family, escaped Hungary in the 1950s and made his way to Australia.

Please do not bend to the far-right bigotry that is holding this government to ransom and do not vote for this ghastly piece of legislation.

Another constituent wrote to me:

I was appalled at this new proposed legislation. I am sure you will oppose it but want to add my voice to your list of people who are very concerned about this.

One of my best friends is a boat person from Vietnam who arrived in an era when refugees were welcomed. They are a wonderful family—all now adult children and University educated and in good jobs mostly public service. I teach her grand-daughter the piano and have very close links with the family.

I feel sad to think of the many lives being persecuted at the moment by the Turnbull government. There must be a better way to stop people smugglers than by ruining so many lives that have the potential to contribute to our society.

As an economist, I am acutely aware of the contribution that Fred Gruen made. He was one of the Dunera Boys, who came to Australia as Jewish refugees after World War II. Aboard the Dunera were many others, including Henry Mayer, who enriched Australian academia, business and the community sector. Fred Gruen was the head of the economics program in the Research School of Social Sciences, and I had the honour at the Australian National University of following in his footsteps as the final head of that economics group. His sons, Nicholas and David, have made an extraordinary contribution to economic policymaking in Australia. Our macro economy would be poorer had we denied Fred Gruen the chance to come to Australia as he did, by boat, on the Dunera.

Canberra's north side is an increasingly diverse and vibrant community. People choose to come here from all over the world, and we are better for that. No Australian government should be looking for ways to needlessly obstruct that inspiration and integration that make for an enterprising and adaptable nation. I was struck earlier by the words of the member for Whitlam, who said that no country will prosper by shrinking. They are words that remind us that Australia's migration program has been a source of strength. As George Megalogenis noted recently in *The New York Times*, Australia's economic growth has had as one of its principal engines the strong immigration program in this country.

I am an unabashed believer that the challenges of migration, whether they be challenges around housing affordability, traffic congestion or pollution, are best met through direct instruments to tackle those challenges rather than through putting up the walls. But the
conversation about migration must always be a conversation grounded in decency and humanity. This is what is so lacking in the Turnbull government's pantomime of authority, with an immigration minister who not only was ranked as the worst health minister ever by Australia's doctors but also, in his time as immigration minister, has sought to sow division and discord rather than unity.

This is a posture, not a policy. I would encourage this government not to seek to fuel the fires of hatred which we can see burning in so many parts of the world, from the far Right parties—Marine Le Pen in France, Norbert Hofer in Austria, the UKIP movement in the United Kingdom—and, indeed, from the wall builders in the US Republican Party. We in Australia need to be better than that. We have benefited from migration, and when we demonise refugees we sow division and doubt about our broader migration program, of which humanitarian arrivals are only approximately one-tenth. We need to cease the approach of doing One Nation's bidding. I notice that Senator Hanson was particularly proud of the introduction of this bill, taking credit for it. Instead, we need a government that will focus on resettling people out of Manus and Nauru. Those 1,600 people who have been languishing in those facilities for over three years, in many cases, need to have an opportunity to begin a new life through third-country resettlement. This bill will not achieve that third-country resettlement. It will not resettle a single refugee. Instead, it will potentially, as the member for Scullin points out, hurt the process of resettlement.

John Key has very clearly said that he does not have an interest in setting up two classes of New Zealanders—a class of regular New Zealanders who have the freedom to travel and live in Australia and another class of refugees resettled from Manus Island and Nauru who are banned from ever entering Australia. So this bill would make it harder to carry out refugee resettlement through New Zealand. It is likely that the same holds true for countries like Canada, Britain or the United States, who would have less interest in taking refugees from Manus Island and Nauru if they needed to then ensure that those refugees could never enter Australia, could never come to compete in an Australian sporting championship, could never come to Australia for a conference if they were to become a successful surgeon or engineer and could never come to Australia to check out the Great Barrier Reef and Uluru as a tourist, having laid down roots in their new country. The Australian government already has a robust compliance program to prevent, catch and remove people who overstay visas. We do not need this sort of dog-whistle politics in order to maintain border security.

As the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees regional representative in Canberra, Thomas Albrecht, has noted, Australia is a signatory to the refugee convention. Part 2 of article 31 of that convention states:

The Contracting States shall not apply to the movements of such refugees restrictions other than those which are necessary and such restrictions shall only be applied until their status in the country is regularized or they obtain admission into another country.

Ben Saul of the University of Sydney has raised concerns about the bill being in breach of Australia's international law obligations—not only article 31 of the refugee convention but also articles 17 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. I see that the Minister for Justice, who is at the table, is laughing at the notion that Australia might be in breach of international law, and that is so sadly typical of this government's unwillingness to think about our compliance with international law, which is so fundamental to Australia's
international diplomacy as a middle-sized power. We are at our strongest when we stand up for international norms, not thumb our noses at them.

This week in parliament we have seen the strength that comes from diversity. We have joined Australian Hindu communities in celebrating Deepavali, the Festival of Lights. That vibrant Hindu community is just one of many multicultural communities that give strength to the Bush Capital. It reminded me of a ceremony a few years back in which we celebrated Deepavali, or Diwali, as it is also called, in Parliament House, where one of the speakers was Tim Soutphommasane, now the Race Discrimination Commissioner. Tim is the child of Chinese and Laotian parents, and in his book Don't Go Back to Where You Came From he notes that multiculturalism is 'an ideology that draws on both egalitarianism and liberalism'. It should, therefore, naturally be appreciated by those of us on this side of the House, whose wellsprings are egalitarianism, and those of the other side of the House, whose party is named after 'liberalism'.

The genius of Australian multiculturalism is something everyone in this House should be proud of—the way in which successive waves of migrants, from Greece, Italy, Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, China and the Middle East, have enriched Australia. I have spoken about migrants here in the ACT such as James Savoulidis, who brought pizza to Canberra in the 1960s and, along the way, taught Gough Whitlam Zorba's dance. It was James Savoulidis's sons who set up the local Wilbur's Cafe Bar in my home suburb of Hackett and who have helped to build that cuisine we called 'Modern Australian'. Modern Australian is not just a cuisine, though; it is a way of life—a natural way of life in a country where a quarter of Australians were born overseas, and half either are born overseas or have an overseas-born parent. That includes my three boys, given that my wife was born in Ohio.

Canberrans welcome new migrants into our city. I want to pay tribute to Canberra Refugee Support, to Multicultural Youth Services, to Companion House and to Big Bang Ballers, a basketball group in Belconnen that offers Saturday night basketball to new Sudanese and other newly arrived migrants. As a Welcome to Australia Ambassador I am proud of the work that Welcome to Australia does—to tell a great story of Australian generosity.

We are also reminded that the strength of migration is not just on the social side; it is on the economic side as well. Migrants do not just bring mouths to feed. They bring muscles to build and create, and minds to innovate. So many of the new innovations around the world, if you look at places like Silicon Valley, Tel Aviv or indeed Sydney, come from migrants bringing their minds into service of their countries.

Australia is at its best when we are building bridges, not walls, and when we recognise that migrants enrich our society. We on this side of the House have a strong track record of arguing that our policies on asylum seekers can be fairer and more decent. At the last election we pledged to increase the Australian contribution to the UNHCR by $450 million, to double our refugee intake by 27,000, to reintroduce the 90-day rule to the Migration Act, to restore references to the UN refugee convention in the Migration Act, to implement independent oversight of Australian funded processing facilities, to abolish temporary protection visas and to establish an independent children's advocate to ensure the safety of children in offshore processing facilities.

We do not want to see people drowning at sea as they come to Australia, but we do believe that the coalition has mucked up Australia's asylum seeker policy and that our refugee policy
can follow a better route. That is why we are opposing this bill, which does nothing to resettle refugees but seeks only to do One Nation's bidding in sowing Trump-style discord and difference in Australia.

Mr CRAIG KELLY (Hughes) (12:09): It was very interesting to hear the member for Fenner say that the coalition have mucked up our refugee policies. It would be hard to find a more inaccurate statement made in this chamber than 'It was the coalition that mucked up our refugee policies.' As I have listened to this debate on the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016 I have got a sense of deja vu, as I am sure most Australians who remember the history of our recent policies on refugees have. It is worth going through the recent history to show how naive and mistaken the comment was that it was the coalition that mucked up our refugee policies.

I remember well that during the John Howard government, the previous coalition government, we had an influx of people making a sea voyage from the island of Java to Christmas Island as a way of shortcutting our process of selecting refugees. They paid people smugglers up to $10,000 to get them a visa outcome. The Howard government had to put in some tough and hard policies to stop that trade. On every single policy it was members of the Labor Party and the Greens who criticised, vilified and called members of the Howard government racist for bringing in such policies. But we know it was successful—the boats stopped.

When the Howard government lost the election to Labor in 2007 there were fewer than four people who had come in illegally in detention in the whole nation. Then we had the Labor Party thinking that they were morally superior and that they knew better. Again they unpicked that policy. Every time they unpicked it the coalition said: 'You're doing the wrong thing. This will result in the recommencement of the people smuggler trade.' No, Labor and the Greens knew best! They went ahead and unpicked those policies.

We all know what happened—50,000 people arrived unlawfully. They travelled through Java to Christmas Island. They left the island of Java, where they were in no physical danger. They may have fled from their original homeland but when they left Indonesia they were fleeing from nobody. They were simply looking for a better economic outcome. I do not blame them for one second. If I were caught up in the Middle East or in many parts of Asia, I would do every single thing I could to get my family to Australia. So I do not blame those people.

With the Labor Party's policies the people smugglers were put back in business. There were 50,000 arrivals, over 800 boats and an $11 billion blowout. That $11 billion could have been put into our health system, education and aged care. It could have been for kids with disabilities. It was a blowout of costs because of Labor's policies that were soft on border protection.

Worst of all, we know that there were over 1,200 souls lost at sea—there were 1,200 drownings. We saw Labor oversee the grossest policy failure this nation has ever witnessed. It took the coalition in opposition to formulate policies that would stop the boats. Again, every time we put forward those policies the Labor Party said, 'No, this can't work,' and the Greens said: 'These are terrible racist policies. They won't work.' They said we could not turn the boats back. We know the history. The coalition won the election and with a mandate from the Australian people we put those policies into place. Against all predictions from those on that
side of the chamber the policies were successful. The boats stopped dead. We were able to clear the detention centres. We were able to get the children out of detention.

What I find most amazing about the issue of children in detention is that it was the Labor Party that put 8,000 children in detention and locked them up. When that happened, what did we hear from the human rights industry? Crickets! We heard not a single peep out of them. When the Labor Party locked up 8,000 kids and put them in detention we heard not a single peep from those people that had complained, protested and marched in the streets against the Howard government's policies. It was only when the coalition came into office and started to get kids out of detention that those people found their feet, found their voices and were attacking the coalition about how terrible it was and what had to be done to get the kids out of detention. We were successful. We got those kids out of detention. There is not a single child in detention on the mainland of Australia, because of the policies of the coalition government.

With that success you would think that when it comes to refugees and border protection the Labor Party and the Greens would just be completely silent and they would admit that they got it wrong, not once but time and time again. In fact, every time the Labor Party and the Greens have had to make a decision in this area they have got the policy tragically wrong. And here we go again—coming back into this chamber, the Labor Party know better; they are more compassionate; they know what is needed and they are against the 'evil coalition' that is forced to make the hard decisions.

In coming to the decisions that we are making in this bill and the policies that are needed, it is important to go back to the first principles of migration in this nation. Every single Australian can be proud of how successful our immigration program has been and proud that we have taken migrants and refugees from all parts of the globe and settled them in Australia. It becomes a beacon for other countries to copy. It is something we should be very proud of. But in setting those policies the first decision that we have to make is do we have open borders? I know there are many over there on the Labor and Greens side who would like to have a policy of open borders and that anyone who wants to come to Australia can just walk in the front door; there is no need to show their documents and there is no need to check if they have been a recent fighter in the Syrian conflict—just let them all in. But, in today's world, that is not a credible policy. We to have to set a limit on how many people we will allow to migrate to this country and we have to determine how those people will be chosen. It is for the Australian government to decide and for the Australian people to decide what the number will be and how they will come in. It is not the job of people smugglers to do that. Once we set those principles and we set those numbers, we have to have that determination process. That determination process is allowing the coalition government, with the support of the Australian people, to increase the number of refugees that we are taking. We are taking an additional 12,000 refugees from the Syrian conflict. That has only been able to be achieved with popular support from the Australian people, because we have been successful in stopping the boats.

We need to maintain the integrity of our border protection policies, because even though we have had such successful migration outcomes for millions of people over so many years, there are some things in our multicultural society that are fraying at the edges. We see an increase in the number of child brides in this country, something that is completely against every principle we believe in. We are seeing an increase in female genital mutilation in the
suburbs of Sydney. We are seeing an increase in people who have no allegiance whatsoever to this country who are going overseas to fight against Australian forces. And we are seeing an increase in people wanting to commit violence and criminal acts against our own police forces, both in New South Wales and Victoria, because their allegiance is not firstly to Australia. If we are going to maintain the successful multicultural society that we have developed, we must maintain the integrity of our borders. We must maintain our border protection policies.

That is where we come to with this bill. We now have a situation where we have people on Manus Island and Nauru who will need resettlement in some third country. Part of the suite of measures—and this is what the Labor Party said previously, when they were in government—is that people who have come through the people-smuggler supply chain will not be able to settle in Australia. One of the ways they can is that if they are currently on the island of Nauru and then get settlement in a third country and then are able to get a visa to Australia. That will create an incentive for people smugglers to get out there and start their trade up again, saying, 'This is the way you get to Australia.' That is what we are trying to close down, as hard as it possibly seems.

In this debate we have heard a great deal of nonsense from members of the Greens and the Labor Party. They have said that once people are on Nauru and they get resettlement to a third country they can never come to Australia—therefore, if they go to New Zealand and are selected for the All Blacks they could then not come to Australia. But they have overlooked a simple fact. Under this legislation and existing legislation there is ministerial discretion. To say that there is a total blanket ban on people coming to Australia is wrong. There is ministerial discretion.

This policy is needed because we know there are currently estimated to be 14,000 people in Java in the people-smuggling supply chain, and the people smugglers are trying to tell those people, 'We can get you into Australia. You just have to sit on Nauru, then go to a third country, and then you can apply for a visa to get to Australia.' That is what they are being told now and that is why this legislation needs to be introduced. We have successfully stopped the boats but this legislation is needed to ensure that the boats remain stopped. It can easily be seen as a harsh policy, and I am sure there are many people out there in our community who look at this policy and say that it is harsh. But we have been through this before. Sometimes we need policies that appear harsh from the outset, but they are needed to ensure that the boats remain stopped. The least compassionate thing that we can do for everybody is to let the people-smuggling trade start up again. That is why this legislation is so important. We hope that members of the Labor Party and the Greens will realise their mistakes from before—that they will realise their policy in this area has been wrong every single time and they will support this legislation. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr PERRETT (Moreton—Opposition Whip) (12:24): I rise to speak on the Migration Legislation Amendment (Regional Processing Cohort) Bill 2016. I want to give just a bit of history before I move into the legislation in detail. I came into this place in the magnificent class of '07—as I am sure you would agree, Mr Deputy Speaker Irons! I have seen a few things take place over the years in this area of migration and asylum seeker legislation. We can go into the long history, go back to 1788 and the ships arriving in that migration program. Obviously there had been a 40,000- or 50,000-year migration program before that. But in
terms of modern history, we would look at the arrivals coming into Australia from the Vietnamese conflict. And then, I think it would be true to say, Paul Keating was instrumental in setting up the original detention centres, which were continued by John Howard. Then under Labor, under Kevin Rudd, there were significant changes.

I have in front of me the Report of the expert panel on asylum seekers of August 2012, put out by Air Chief Marshal Angus Houston, Paris Aristotle and Professor Michael L'Estrange, which has informed much of my thinking. The other thing that particularly informed my thinking about asylum seeker legislation and responses was the inquiry into the Christmas Island tragedy, which was a horrific inquiry to be part of. I know that the minister at the table, the member for Stirling, was part of that inquiry as well. Seeing the video footage was truly disturbing. Standing on the cliffs on Christmas Island and hearing the evidence was a very moving experience. It moved all of the people who were involved in that committee inquiry. So, the Labor Party has had a long journey. I note that the member for Scullin is at the table as well. I know it has been a difficult journey for many in the Labor Party, particularly those who in other lives worked as lawyers representing asylum seekers and the like. I remember being a member of Labor for Refugees before the 2004 election and the 2007 election and then seeing how things have changed.

But I mention that little bit of history because I want to put it into context. Regarding this piece of legislation that is sitting in front of us in the House, I need to state up-front—as an MP representing a very multicultural community from a state that has some economic challenges, in a nation with serious economic challenges—that this piece of legislation will not create a single job. This piece of legislation is indicative of the fact that this government is devoid of vision and ideas. We have a government that cannot even fill debate topics in the Federation Chamber. If they did not have constituency statements going on, they would have no agenda whatsoever. That is indicative of a greater problem in Australian politics, and this legislation is only part of it.

I should state up-front Labor's policy since 19 July 2013—and there was a difficult journey—when Prime Minister Kevin Rudd clearly indicated that no asylum seeker who arrived in Australia by a maritime process would ever be settled in Australia. I could go through chapter and verse of the difficult arguments, challenges and debates that went into the Labor Party position, but that has been the Labor Party position ever since that date. That is what has meant that there were not significant numbers of people arriving after that date. So here we are in the fourth year of the Liberal-Nationals government and we have a piece of legislation that is a solution in search of a problem. Speaker after speaker opposite has said, 'The boats have stopped.' That is the reality. They can trumpet their cruelty, they can talk about evil people smugglers and they can talk about deaths at sea. We could trawl over history, but the reality is that the number of boat arrivals has halted since 19 July 2013, when Prime Minister Kevin Rudd articulated the change in the Labor Party position.

Mr Robert: What a load of rubbish; you are a goose.

Mr PERRETT: They are the facts. You can look on your own government and you will see that. We have a voice in the wilderness trying to present a truth, but that is the reality since 19 July 2013. We have a guy opposite who is prepared to do anything in pursuit of power. I am only prepared to tell the truth, and that is that, since 19 July 2013, we have not had a problem. This nation does not have a problem.
As I point out, Labor would never let the people smugglers back in, but this piece of legislation is not a message to the people smugglers; it is a dog whistle, or a dog trumpet, to the people of Australia. It is not a message to the hordes of people smugglers that are wandering around Indonesia waiting to set up business and send people to Australia; what we have is a message, because we have a government in trouble—a Prime Minister who is floundering and a government without vision that is not able to set an economic agenda and, more importantly, cannot get its economic agenda through either house intact.

So Labor have made it clear that we will never let the people smugglers back in business. Having been on those inquiries looking into the asylum seekers who drowned at sea—the Christmas Island tragedy in particular—I remember the 1,200 deaths that occurred after that. I have seen members of the Liberal and National parties standing up with tears in their eyes—I think it was Joe Hockey talking about 'not on his watch' et cetera—when they were political mercenaries, to block the Malaysian solution, which was recommended by the *Report of the Expert Panel on Asylum Seekers*, because of political opportunism and because they did not have the courage to do something in the national interest; instead they did something in the Nationals', and Liberals', interests. It was a disgraceful bit of political expediency, and history will condemn those opposite for being a party to that piece of political trickery.

I know the detriment that comes with allowing people smugglers back in business, because they are criminals and they will do anything to make money, and that means they will traffic in human misery. I have heard some opposite actually acknowledge the fact that they would do anything for their children, as any parent would. They are saying it is a horrible thing that someone would pay $10,000. Well, I would pay millions. I would do whatever I could for my children, as any parent would. Any parent would do what they could to get their children out of harm's way and perhaps even to give their children some economic opportunities as well.

Obviously, under the international treaty that we have signed, people cannot seek asylum because they are starving to death or because their island home is being capsized by climate change. People do not have the right to seek asylum if their crops have failed and they are about to starve to death. That is cruel, but we are still a party to a treaty that says that, if you are being persecuted because of your religion or your sexuality, we will process your request. I think we had five minutes when the now Treasurer and former immigration minister suggested that we back away from that treaty, but thankfully that never took traction with those opposite.

The real issue here is that this government is now in its fourth year of office, and I know they have had a turnover of ministers and prime ministers and they have been in disarray, have lost control of the parliament, have agreed to motions condemning themselves and all that sort of thing. But their main failure is that they have failed to find a resettlement option for the more than 2,000 refugees in offshore detention centres in Manus Island in Papua New Guinea, and in the nation-state of Nauru. This piece of legislation before the chamber is a political stunt to distract from their incompetence.

I particularly call out the foreign minister for her incompetence in this. In her fourth year as minister, she has not been able to track down a country that would resettle these more than 2,000 people. Obviously, it is hard to negotiate with our neighbours when you have cut nearly $12 billion in aid from them and from around the world. It is a bit hard to negotiate when you are a wealthy country in your 25th year of economic growth and you are saying to the
countries nearby that are struggling: 'Hey, guess what? Can you take a couple of people because we don't want to see them?' Let us be honest about that. When we say, 'The boats have stopped,' what we are saying is, 'You don't have to suffer in our sight.' That is really what we are saying. Let us unpack this slogan from those opposite. When you say, 'The boats have stopped,' you are saying, 'You will suffer somewhere away from me,' you are saying, 'You can be tortured somewhere away from me,' you are saying, 'You can be taken outside and beaten up by the people that do not like your religion, your sexuality or whatever it is you are being discriminated against for,' and you are saying, 'Do that away from here.'

Obviously, we are protected because of the fact that we are an island continent. We are protected by geography more than anything, but I remind those opposite that there has been a distinct lack of ability when it comes to dealing with our neighbours or other countries that might be able to resettle the people on Manus Island and Nauru. We had that incredible circumstance where the now Treasurer had a $45 million glass of champagne in Cambodia, clinking it saying, 'Well done.' Did he resettle one person? That would be the most expensive glass of alcohol in the history of the world—$45 million for nothing! So how did we reward him? We made him the Treasurer. What a joke!

This legislation before the chamber will actually cause more problems. We have had the Prime Minister of our closest neighbour, New Zealand, saying that he did not want two different classes of New Zealand citizens to be processed according to their history. Those opposite have suggested that a former asylum seeker who becomes a successful person and wants to visit Australia decades from today would somehow be able to apply to the minister—as if that is a process that would be realistic. For those genuine refugees who have resettled in third countries such as Canada and the United States, it would not be realistic. As I said up front, this is not a message to the people smugglers in Indonesia; it is a message to the right wing of the Australian voting public. It is trying to say to them, 'Give me some support.'

I need to remind those opposite that asylum seekers are not criminals. They have a right to seek asylum. The history of this piece of legislation goes back, sadly, to World War II when people were displaced—millions and millions of people—and we had boats arriving in Australia where they were turned away. The world said, 'Don't listen to your darker angels. We need to recognise that humans have that infinite capacity to be cruel, but let's be better. Let's create a process to grant asylum when it is warranted.'

Obviously, where asylum seekers are found to be genuine refugees, they have a right to live their lives to the fullest. All Christians, all people with a heart and all people who care about their fellow humans would agree with that. We should not be crueling the very hope that drives these desperate people to seek asylum from evils that we cannot imagine.

Mr Robert: Really, you're speaking on behalf of the entire church now?

Mr Rob Mitchell: Read your Bible.

Mr Perrett: We know you are not familiar with it. We have sent our ADF to fight for over 100 years for the very values that this legislation, I would suggest, is attacking.

I can give you many stories of refugees who have been extremely successful, but I am particularly proud of those people in the quiet suburbs of my electorate who are just getting on with paying their taxes, raising their children, sending them to school and contributing to
make this country a great nation. Why would we want to ever prevent successful refugees who have been resettled in other countries and who have risen to the top of their chosen field from coming to Australia to share their knowledge or skills?

As I said at the start, this is crass politics. We have a Prime Minister slipping on the red budgie smugglers and finding that they fit perfectly! We know that no country has made this a prerequisite for doing a third-country settlement deal. We have a Prime Minister who has become a hollow man. All those values that he used to have when he was a small-L Liberal have been hollowed out. Now he is just a servant to that emboldened hard right. I condemn this piece of legislation and will not be supporting it.

Mr Keenan (Stirling—Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Counter-Terrorism) (12:40): I move:

That the motion be now put.

The Speaker: The question is that the motion be put.

The House divided. [12:44]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes ...................... 73
Noes ...................... 68
Majority ................ 5
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Frydenberg, JA
Gillespie, DA
Hartsuyker, L
Hawke, AG
Hogan, KJ
Irons, SJ
Katter, RC
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
McCormack, MF
Morton, B
O'Brien, T
O'Dwyer, KM
Pitt, KJ
Prentice, J
Pyne, CM
Robert, SR

Alexander, JG
Andrews, KL
Bishop, Ji
Broadbent, RE
Chester, D
Christensen, SM
Coulton, M
Drum, DK
Entsch, WG
Falinski, J
Flint, NJ
Gee, AR
Goodenough, IR
Hastie, AW
Henderson, SM
Howarth, LR
Joyce, BT
Keenan, M
Laming, A
Laundy, C
Ley, SP
Marino, NB
McVeigh, JJ
O'Brien, LS
O'Dowd, KD
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Price, ML
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Sudmalis, AE
AYES

Sukkar, MS
Tehan, DT
Turnbull, MB
Wallace, AB
Wilson, RJ
Wood, JP
Zimmerman, T

NOES

Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burke, AS
Butler, MC
Chalmers, JE
Chesters, LM
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Ellis, KM
Fitzgibbon, JA
Georganas, S
Gosling, LJ
Hart, RA
Hill, JC
Husic, EN
Keay, JT
Keogh, MJ
King, CF
Lamb, S
Macklin, JL
McBride, EM
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

Question agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The original question was that this bill be now read a second time. To this, the honourable member for Denison has moved, as an amendment, that all words after 'That' be omitted, with a view to substituting other words. The immediate question now is that the amendment moved by the member for Denison be agreed to.
A division having been called and the bells having been rung—

The SPEAKER: As there are fewer than five members on the side for the ayes in this division, I declare the question negatived in accordance with standing order 127. The names of those members who are in the minority will be recorded in the Votes and Proceedings.

Question negatived, Mr Bandt, Ms McGowan and Mr Wilkie voting aye.

The SPEAKER: The question now is that this bill be read a second time.

The House divided. [12:53]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes .......... 73
Noes ............. 69
Majority......... 4

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
Hartley, L  Hastie, AW
Hawke, AG  Henderson, SM
Hogan, KJ  Howarth, LR
Irons, SJ  Joyce, BT
Katter, RC  Keenan, M
Kelly, C  Laming, A
Landry, ML  Laundy, C
Lee, J  Ley, SP
Littleproud, D  Marino, NB
McCormack, MF  McVeigh, JJ
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
Zimmerman, T

---

CHAMBER
Question agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Mr KEENAN (Stirling—Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Counter-Terrorism) (12:58): by leave—I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The SPEAKER: The question is that this bill be read a third time.

The House divided. [12:59]

(The Speaker—Hon. Tony Smith)

Ayes .................73
Noes .................69
Majority .............4
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
Irons, SJ
Katter, RC
Kelly, C
Landry, ML
Leeser, J
Littleproud, D
McCormack, MF
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

Albanese, AN
Bandt, AP
Bowen, CE
Burke, AS
Butler, MC
Chalmers, JE
Chester, LM
Collins, JM
Dick, MD
Elliot, MJ
Feneley, D
Freelander, MR
Giles, AJ

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
Joyce, BT
Keenan, M
Laming, A
Laundy, C
Ley, SP
Marino, NB
McVeigh, JJ
O’Brien, LS
O’Dowd, KD
Pasin, A
Porter, CC
Price, ML
Ramsey, RE (teller)
Taylor, AJ
Tudge, AE
Van Manen, AJ
Wicks, LE
Wilson, TR
Wyatt, KG
Question agreed to.
Bill read a third time.

**Broadcasting Legislation Amendment (Television and Radio Licence Fees) Bill 2016**

*Returned from Senate*

Message received from the Senate returning the bill without amendment or request.

**Counter-Terrorism Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 1) 2016**

*First Reading*

Bill received from the Senate and read a first time.

Ordered that the second reading be made an order of the day for the next sitting day.

**Social Security Legislation Amendment (Youth Jobs Path: Prepare, Trial, Hire) Bill 2016**

*Second Reading*

Consideration resumed of the motion:
That this bill be now read a second time.

to which the following amendment was moved:

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

"Whilst not declining to give the bill a second reading, the House notes that the Turnbull Government cannot guarantee that, under Youth Jobs PaTH (Prepare, Trial, Hire):

(1) jobs will not be displaced by cheaper labour;"
(2) wages will not be undercut and some participants will be paid below minimum award wages;
(3) participants’ safety will not be compromised and that adequate insurance arrangements will be provided;
(4) participants won’t be used to help businesses sidestep unfair dismissal protections; and
(5) it will prioritise using small to medium enterprises in PaTH because they have a demonstrated track record of employing more job seekers through the jobactive programme”.

Ms LAMB (Longman) (13:03): Another concern that I have with this proposal is that, while it is designed to give young people a job, it could, in fact, negate the need for existing employees to work at certain times and certain industries like retail or hospitality or construction. In 2013, this was foreshadowed by the Fair Work Ombudsman in a report titled: ‘Unpaid work arrangements: exploitation or experience?’

One of the key findings of the report was that a significant number of workers, particularly young workers, were asked and required to undertake unpaid job trials or unpaid training internships which actually went beyond any sort of reasonable training period. The report found that such arrangements, similar to the one being put forward by the government, effectively allowed for the performance of work on an unpaid basis when that work would normally have been undertaken by a paid employee. It should also be remembered that we are currently seeing a radical change in the landscape of our country’s workforce. In August, Morgan Stanley flagged that under employment had hit a record in 9.3 per cent. Every month we are seeing the increased casualisation of our workforce, with fewer full-time jobs and a growing trend towards part-time and casual employment.

This internship proposal risks further fuelling that increasing trend, replacing young full-time and part-time workers with cheaper sporadic labour. For me, this represents a grave danger to the future prosperity of young Australians entering the workforce today. Too often I hear stories of exceptionally qualified young Australians struggling to find a job, whether it is a university graduate, a TAFE student or another enthusiastic young person who just wants to enter the workforce. Right across the nation, there are 272,400 young Australians who are out of work. We have a youth unemployment rate that is more than double the national average, but I reject the notion that the way to fix this issue is by introducing an intern program that will see more young people being paid below the minimum wage and performing roles that could have been filled by employees being paid a proper wage.

As I said earlier, Labor have always supported meaningful investment and initiatives that give young people a pathway towards long-term, stable and fulfilling employment. We acknowledge that there is a real need for investment and initiatives to help tackle our youth unemployment. I know this because in Longman, where I am from, there is nothing more important to local people than having a decent job. I have been at school award ceremonies and I have been in the local community in the last few weeks, and I have listened to parents talk about their aspirations for their children—aspirations like those I hold for my four sons. But if we allow this proposal to go through unchecked, we will run the risk of creating a situation like that in the United States, where employees are forced to compete against one another in what the Fair Work Ombudsman has described as a race to the bottom on wages.

What we need right now from this government is greater clarity and tighter regulations to protect young workers from exploitation. We need greater restrictions in place to ensure that businesses simply cannot keep churning through young interns at the expense of other
workers being paid a proper wage. This is not only about ensuring that we protect workers; it is about accountability and making sure the taxpayers are getting value for money.

To conclude, we will await the outcome of the Senate inquiry into the broader implications of this policy. We will evaluate the outcomes in good faith and will propose sensible amendments that we believe are necessary to protect the interests of young Australian workers. But what we will not do is blindly follow the lead of the Turnbull government, because this is another example of their inability to properly formulate policy. There are no details and there is no substance—just empty words and slogans. We know that this is not good enough. We will keep holding those opposite to account in the national interest.

Mr HOWARTH (Petrie) (13:07): I rise to express my support for the Social Security Legislation Amendment (Youth Jobs Path: Prepare, Trial, Hire) Bill. Let me be very frank: this bill is about jobs. It is very interesting to hear the member for Longman opposite talk about this issue and what is wrong with this bill when there are people in her electorate—in Morayfield and Caboolture—who have been on Newstart for years and who are just waiting for an opportunity, a chance, to get into the workforce.

This bill is about increasing job opportunities for Australians. It builds on the success of the coalition government's Work for the Dole program. This bill will give effect to the Youth Jobs PaTH Program, which Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull announced in North Lakes, in my electorate of Petrie, on the very first day of the July election campaign. I was very pleased that he came to announce this. I thought it was a great practical program that would help further reduce youth unemployment. In the last three years—since the government was elected in 2013—youth unemployment in my region has fallen significantly. I will repeat that: it has fallen significantly in the last three years. This legislation will help to make it fall even further, I believe.

I make an effort to get around my electorate and meet many people from all walks of life. I also make an effort to get out and meet small-business owners and middle-sized business owners as well because they employ a lot of people. The feedback is valuable, and I pass it on here to different people. But one of the things that small business owners mention to me is staffing, and having good staff, and the fact that young people often do not have a good understanding of the values and behaviours that are expected in the workplace and in the recruitment process.

In a couple of weeks I will be running my fourth Job Seeker Boot Camp in the electorate of Petrie. It is a great program, and I would encourage other members in this House, from both sides, to perhaps take it up. I get employers from different fields. They might be from hospitality, manufacturing or trades. They might be professionals. I invite all the unemployed from my electorate to the Job Seeker Boot Camp. It is an opportunity for those employers to say, 'When I'm hiring, this is what I look for; when I'm hiring, we want people to turn up to work on time, to look the part.' I ran a small business before I came into this place, employing 15 people or so. I had a guy come in awhile back. He turned up and said, 'Have you got a job for me?' and he was wearing a Tupac shirt—I do not know whether you know who Tupac is; he is a deceased rapper, and he was on the shirt and holding up his middle finger. I said, 'There's nothing going at the moment', and he was about to walk out the door and I grabbed him, took him out the back and gave him a bit of advice that, if he is looking for work, then wearing a shirt with Tupac with his middle finger up is probably not a good way to turn up.
The Job Seeker Boot Camp is an opportunity for employers to say directly to those people on Newstart: if you are serious about work, here are some real tips that will help you. One of the other things employers say is that they look at the resume and if the jobseeker has moved around a lot, if they have been in a job five months here and six months there and nine months there, it often does not get too far. These are important tips that we can pass on to jobseekers who are on Newstart in all of our electorates. At the end of the day, I am sure those opposite and those on this side of the House want to see people have work. And the member for Longman is right when she says that jobs are important to people in her electorate. They are important to people in my electorate as well. People need a place to go on Monday morning.

Employability skill training through the PaTH program will give young people the opportunity to learn these vital skills and develop the attitude they should bring to the workplace. The first three weeks of training will help young people build practical industry skills, with a focus on concepts like working in a team, presentation and communication. The next three weeks will centre on advanced job preparation and job-hunting skills. The trial part, the second part of the PaTH program, is about the internship for four to 12 weeks. Internships are common. Many people opposite—including the member for Fenner, who I think has had 100 or so through his office—offer internships. Internships are often in unions and political offices. Why can't they be applied to business, where a person who has been on Newstart can come into a business with five, 10, 20 or 30 employees who have KPIs, who have goals, who are dressed ready for work every day? How will that rub off on that person who has perhaps been on Newstart for six, 12 or 18 months? I think it will rub off in a very positive way, a very practical way that will prepare that young person to land a job—that will see them in the workplace for years to come, paying income tax for the government to invest in essential services and perhaps doubling or tripling their Newstart income.

There will be some 120,000 placements over four years. These placements will help young jobseekers who have been in employment services for six months or more to gain valuable work experience within a real business. We will also provide an extra $200 on top of the welfare payment they already receive. This is an incentive payment. Those opposite talk about $4 an hour as though it is some sort of wage. That is not correct. They know that as well. This is an incentive payment on top of their Newstart payment. It is a little bonus, so to speak, that says to them: 'Look, come on: here's an opportunity. You pick the industry that you'd like to get involved with and we'll help you find an employer for you to get involved with. And here's an extra $200 a fortnight on top of Newstart to help you.' It is not an employment payment. It is an incentive payment.

I think it is a very practical way to help those young people, when we know high youth unemployment right around this country exists. It has been like that for years. This is an opportunity for the crossbenchers, for the Senate, for those opposite and for those on this side of the parliament to say, 'This is new. Let's give it a go.' How can it hurt? How can it hurt when young people have a real opportunity to get the valuable experience that employers often say they are looking for?

'Hire' is the third part. Businesses that decide to take on a PaTH program participant will receive a wage subsidy of between $6,500 and $10,000. This bonus is a smarter way of leveraging what taxpayers would otherwise spend on welfare payments. Of course, this occurs only in the hiring stage. In that third stage they are in the job for six months. It is not like 'you
start tomorrow and here is the money'. It is a matter of working through this and, if you decide after the four- to 12-week period you want to move to stage 3 and hire this individual, and they work out, great; you offer them a full-time job. It is very practical.

On this side of the House we in the coalition government believe that the best form of welfare is a job. The ultimate goal is to break welfare dependency before this turns into lifelong dependency, and to move people into states of self-reliance so that when they wake up on Monday morning they have a job to go to, they have purpose and they can be participating in a very practical way, like the rest of us in this place are doing.

Australia cannot afford to leave thousands of young people to a lifetime of welfare dependency. We know that once a young person becomes unemployed for the long-term, and from what I understand it is particularly around that mark when they have been on Newstart for five years, their chances of successfully finding employment decline drastically.

The Youth Jobs PaTH program will not just prepare young Australians for work; it will provide them with real work experience and give employers incentives to take the jobseekers on. When you get someone who is new and has had no experience and has perhaps been on Newstart for six months or more, it is not like you bring them in on day one and they are actively producing in the company. Often you have to get another staff member to train them for four or five weeks to get them to where they need to go. Of course, not all businesses would be willing to do that, and that is why the incentive payment is there. The Youth Jobs PaTH program will not just prepare young Australians to work but give them the experience they need.

Importantly, the program will also help young people gain confidence both in themselves and in the fact that there are jobs out there. Do you know how many young people—and I guess older people, but in this case it applies to young people—have applied for jobs, saying they have sent off hundreds of resumes and they do not get anything back? Some employers do not even give them the courtesy of a letter back to say they have been unsuccessful. Can you imagine what this will do to those young people as far as confidence goes—to give them the confidence to turn up to work every day with other people who are actively employed full-time? I think it will be an enormous boost to their confidence, I really do. It will incentivise their transition into employment.

Labor's six years in office saw more than 500,000 jobs lost in small businesses alone. Now they have the audacity, when we have a plan for jobs and growth, to oppose the company tax cuts we want to implement and the extension of the instant asset tax write-off, which I believe will play such an important part in creating jobs. In the election campaign, what were the arguments the Leader of the Opposition put up? All he could say was that billion-dollar companies would be the winners from this and that all the profits would go to overseas investors. That is what it was. He spoke only about billion-dollar companies; he did not speak about small business or medium business, and that is where the potential is in relation to company tax cuts and increasing the instant asset tax write-off—the companies that turn over between $20 million and $50 million and employ perhaps 140 people. If you can increase their workforce by 10 per cent, that is 14 people.

I know there is a lot of talk about a small businesses turning over less than $10 million or whatever. Well, those businesses employ only about 20 people. So, if you increase the workforce there, you end up getting two extra. Where the jobs will make a difference is in
those medium businesses. And I would say to the senators and to the crossbench that they need to look at that personally. I think it will make a real difference. We cannot improve jobs in this country if we cannot legislate the plan that we have, that we took to the election, in order to help people.

I have been out to some of the Work for the Dole trials in my electorate. There have been a number of them—Deception Bay Police-Citizens Youth Club, Redcliffe Police-Citizens Youth Club and some places in Margate. I have been out to visit the people who are involved in that program and to encourage them to tell me what they want to do when they get to work and to have some goals and to achieve them. A couple of them say, 'You know we don't want to be here, Luke.' And I say: 'Well, look at it this way: when you go for your next job interview you can say you've been working on this, this and this or that you've been volunteering for the local PCYC or helping this organisation. It will only help you get to where you want to go.'

I believe this PaTH program will play a big role. I ask members to open their eyes in relation to this. Let's test this—see how it goes for a few years. I believe it will have great results. We live in a country of tremendous opportunities. I believe it is so important for people to identify what it is that they want out of life and to go for it. I call upon both the House and the Senate—everyone in here—to support this plan for jobs and growth. Thank you.

Ms BURNEY (Barton) (13:22): I rise on behalf of the Labor opposition to speak on the Social Security Legislation Amendment (Youth Jobs Path: Prepare, Trial, Hire) Bill 2016. I say at the outset that Labor's position is not to oppose this bill in the House but to refer it to a Senate inquiry. I am the shadow minister for human services, and this bill will be administered by the agency of Centrelink. But it is important to put on record that this government does not care about welfare recipients. And while this bill promises action to help people find work, given the way the government treats age pensioners, disability support pensioners and the thousands of unemployed people across the country who want to work I have very little faith that it will do that. Ask anyone in a Centrelink office, 'Do you think the government wants to help you find a job or live with dignity?' and their response—after waiting, in many cases, for several hours on the phone or for many months for processing claims—will be universal: of course the answer will be no, they do not.

This bill is more of the same rhetoric from this government. All those who are unemployed, even through no fault of their own, are referred to as leaners and are characterised, as we heard from the member for Bowman the other day, as people who are deliberately trying to rip the system off, deliberately trying to undermine the welfare system in this country. Of course, that attitude is completely unacceptable. Members of this place, even on the other side, know that is not true when we see these people in our electorate offices almost every day—people who are long-term unemployed, people who are relying on the social security net that we have in this country and that we should be very proud of. The worst thing about this bill is that it does not actually seem to fix the problem, and it may even create a raft of new issues for people who are long-term unemployed, particularly young people.

From the outset, I have to note the incredibly bad acronym that has been chosen for this piece of legislation. It frankly makes no sense. That is always a bad sign. The acronym is:
PaTH. For the illumination of those opposite, there is no 'A' in the title 'Prepare, Trial, Hire'. This speaks to what this bill appears to be—an election campaign thought bubble. I want to focus on that for a little while. It was announced throughout the election campaign and it was clearly announced without much thought, without much consultation and without any consideration given to the implications of such a scheme, which have been well enunciated by the member for Longman.

PaTH is allegedly designed to prepare young people for work by giving jobseekers pre-employment training and voluntary internships of four to 12 weeks. Jobseekers will receive an additional $200 per fortnight on top of their current payments while participating in this program. That all sounds fine, except there is nothing to back up that rhetoric. Businesses will be paid $1,000 to take on an intern and a subsidy of up to $10,000 if they hire them at the end of the internship, except there is no guarantee in this legislation that there will be a job at the end of this internship.

The previous member who spoke referred to the importance of giving people the experience of being employed, and no-one would disagree with those sentiments. But this legislation gives businesses the potential opportunity to use young people as cheap labour, as labour that can displace other workers who are employed, and to exploit this scheme by having people work for them who will cost them nothing. That is a very great risk under this legislation. This very risk underpins the fact that very little thought has been put into this legislation.

There are serious concerns about this program, both on this side of the chamber and out in the community. Programs like Work for the Dole are already hopelessly failing young people. In fact, only 10 per cent of participants end up in full-time work three months after exiting the program. No-one in this place on either side of the House likes to think that many, many thousands of young people somehow find themselves being long-term unemployed. It is really interesting that the government talks about unemployment rates being in single digit figures. In many electorates, particularly on the Central Coast and in the Hunter, which I am very familiar with, and I am sure in many other parts of this country, the unemployment rates for young people are not five or six per cent, not nine or 10 per cent but in fact 11 to 17 per cent, and even more in some places.

This policy has absolutely been developed on the run. It sounds good at first blush, but once you look into the detail the problems are exposed. According to the Interns Australia, the peak body for interns in this country, only one in five internships will lead to a job. This is not a good statistic. Has the government done its cost-benefit analysis on this so-called investment?

The 271,000 unemployed young people across Australia need help getting into jobs—we all agree with that. That means giving them the best possible education when they are at school and making sure that they have access to the best possible training. It also means creating new jobs. We heard a lot about jobs and growth at the last election, but we have not seen much in terms of action. The government's record is very poor on all these points. Our VET and TAFE systems are in trouble. We have seen widespread rorting by private colleges and providers. If you want young people to get into the workforce, why not start here? Why not start by helping create some new jobs?
Schemes like this have not worked in the past. The government's own figures show that, when it comes to Work for the Dole programs, nearly 90 per cent of participants are not in full-time work once they exit the program. The sad truth is Australia's youth are counting the cost of the Turnbull government's failure to develop a real jobs plan for the nation. If this is being put forward as a real jobs plan then it fails on all counts. Under the PaTH program, the opposition is concerned that young people will be forced to pay an even heavier price through the program's apparent flaws.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): The debate is interrupted in accordance with standing order 43. The debate may be resumed at a later hour. The member may have a chance to complete her speech later today.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS
Prime Minister's Literary Awards

City of Fremantle TAG Hungerford Award

Mr JOSH WILSON (Fremantle) (13:30): I would like to acknowledge the winners of the Prime Minister's Literary Awards announced this week. As someone who has given writing a go at various times and is the representative of an electorate with a strong literary and publishing heritage I want to recognise the sustained effort that is required to craft and tell important Australian stories. I would like to particularly mention Meg McKinlay, who won the young adult fiction category with her book, *A Single Stone*. Meg is a writer and poet from Fremantle who has made a significant contribution through her art. I also acknowledge Lisa Gorton, who won in the fiction category for her debut novel, *The Life of Houses*. Lisa is already an award-winning poet. She is a close family friend and the granddaughter of former Prime Minister Sir John Gorton.

It was also wonderful to see the great Sally Morgan win the children's book prize for *Sister Heart*, a verse novel about the experiences of the stolen generations. *Sister Heart* was published by Fremantle Press, which last week celebrated its 40th birthday. I was very happy to attend the celebrations with the member for Brand. I attended as the plus-one for my wife, Georgia, who is the fiction and nonfiction publisher at Fremantle Press.

The birthday event doubled as an opportunity to announce this year's winner of the City of Fremantle TAG Hungerford Award—Jay Martin, for her novel, *Learning Polish*. I congratulate CEO Jane Fraser; the entire crew at Fremantle Press; and all the writers who laboured over a manuscript that was ultimately considered for these literary awards, whether they entered, were short-listed or won— *(Time expired)*

Remembrance Day

Mrs SUDMALIS (Gilmore) (13:31): I rise today to speak of Remembrance Day tomorrow, for each one of us will be commemorating Remembrance Day at the 11th hour on 11 November. It is a most important moment for all of us.

Recently, I had the unexpected privilege of going to the Bomana Cemetery in Papua New Guinea. I was accompanied by a member from the other side who is in the chamber today, Damian Drum from the Nationals. We stood there in complete reverence, looking across an amazing sea of white headstones for many of our Australian servicemen—and the one-odd servicewoman—who had served in PNG for our nation. It was unexpectedly special. We
stood there, side by side, and laid wreaths to commemorate the lives of these service men and women.

I would ask that all of us remember tomorrow that it is about more than just laying a wreath at a commemorative ceremony. It is about remembering those who were there for us at the behest of our governments, so treat it with some solemnity. If you are not able to go to a ceremony then take time out in your workplace to think for a few minutes about the losses that some of these families sustained. Some of those lost died at the age of 22. We need to remember this loss. Lest we forget.

**Wyong Hospital**

**Ms McBRIDE** (Dobell) (13:33): There will be a debate in the New South Wales parliament today on the future of Wyong Hospital. It is a debate that the Baird government did not want and would not allow but now has to have. More than 20,000 local people signed the petition to keep Wyong Hospital in public hands. It is because of them that the Premier, the health minister and the New South Wales government will today be forced to justify that decision. It is a decision that breaks their $200 million promise to upgrade the hospital, that affects the largest employment sector on the Central Coast and that will have ramifications for thousands of health workers at Wyong Hospital, and their families. It is a decision that has the potential to compromise patient care, research and training at the major metropolitan hospital on the northern Central Coast. We were given no warning or explanation. We deserve better.

My state Labor colleagues David Mehan, David Harris and Yasmin Catley will be in the parliament today taking part in this debate, but they are not alone. They represent thousands of Central Coast residents, the members of the New South Wales Nurses and Midwives Association, the Health Services Union and the Australian Salaried Medical Officers Federation. Patients deserve answers. Workers deserve answers. Wyong is our community hospital; it is not the government's to sell.

**Temporary Sponsored Parent Visas**

**Mr SUKKAR** (Deakin) (13:34): In contrast to many other countries, one of the great success stories in Australia over many decades has been the ease with which we have been able to integrate new migrants and their families into the life of our nation. The Deakin electorate, for example, is home to many large migrant communities, including those from Chinese, Italian, Greek and Indian backgrounds, just to name a few. Part of the success story has been that we run a robust and orderly migration program, which really is the envy of the world. One of the failings of our system has been highlighted recently—the great difficulty that migrants to this country face should they wish to spend considerable time with parents who are still overseas.

Under the current system wait times for temporary visas often blow out to 30 years. This is hardly suitable for elderly parents who want to spend some significant time with their children and often grandchildren. This is why the government committed before the election to introduce a new temporary sponsored parent visa. Last week I was pleased to welcome to the Deakin electorate the Assistant Minister for Immigration and Border Protection, Alex Hawke. We hosted a roundtable discussion with members of the Chinese and Indian communities as part of this government's consultation process to ensure that this new visa stream will be
practically able to be used. I commend the minister and thank him for visiting the Deakin electorate. I commend the government on this policy.

Defence Facilities: Chemical Contamination

Ms MADELEINE KING (Brand) (13:36): Tomorrow on Remembrance Day the Rockingham community will welcome home the 192 service women and men who have spent the last months on deployment aboard HMAS Perth in the Middle East. On Sunday I will stand with the families and work mates of the personnel of HMAS Arunta who will be departing Fleet Base West at Garden Island on their long deployment. We extend our gratitude for their service.

These service men and women do their duty to our country. It is shameful that the government, in its decision to keep the results of the preliminary sampling program of the impact of legacy firefighting foam contaminants under wraps, has not treated them with the same respect. It is shameful that, instead of informing people about potential contaminants in their workplace, the government has chosen to keep them in the dark. It is shameful that, instead of making the community aware of the positive test results on HMAS Stirling, which has recorded one of the highest levels in the country, the government has chosen to keep quiet. It is especially shameful that, even now with the results known, the government is still keeping quiet on when exactly it will get around to starting the detailed environmental testing at defence sites around the country.

There are 2,300 service women and men, 600 defence civilian employees and 500 long-term contractors stationed at HMAS Stirling on Garden Island in Rockingham. With three government defence ministers surely one could have taken the time to talk with the community about what is happening on Garden Island. Surely one government defence minister could tell the truth to our dedicated service personnel.

Forde Electorate: Park Ridge State School

Mr VAN MANEN (Forde—Government Whip) (13:38): I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the students at Park Ridge State School for taking out the Goethe Verse Speaking Competition for the seventh year in a row. A contingent of 20 year 5 and 6 German language students competed at the University of Queensland against hundreds of other students. They had seven weeks to prepare for the competition. They even gave up their lunchtimes to practise with their language teacher, Chriso Paradissis. The students had to choose from several different poems and were judged on their pronunciation, expression, intonation and presentation, as they had to also use a prop for effect. In the qualifying rounds the students had to perform their chosen poem in front of a panel of three judges. Then the winners were selected and asked to perform in front of a large crowd.

Park Ridge State School's language teacher, Chriso Paradissis, said all the students showed a lot of enthusiasm and excitement for the competition and their win brought joy to the whole team. I would like to congratulate the school and the students on their tremendous success. It is an outstanding achievement to come back to school with the winner's plaque for the seventh year in a row. Well done to all concerned.

Defence Facilities: Chemical Contamination

Ms O'TOOLE (Herbert) (13:39): I rise in this place today to talk to an incredibly serious issue that the Turnbull government is silent about but which I will not be. This week we saw
the PFAS investigation and management report released and it raises some huge concerns for the Townsville community. In Townsville, some of our drinking and recreational water has levels of PFAS that are more than 30 times the safe limit.

For any government authority, these numbers would raise alarms—but not the Turnbull government. This government has been sitting on this report since September and only decided to make the report public this week. I received a letter from the Minister for Defence, Marise Payne, on 7 November, which states:

… investigations will commence in 2017 and will take approximately 12 months to complete.

I ask: when in 2017—31 December? This is not good enough. This is my community's health at risk. The day that the government received this report, I should have had a phone call, an email—even a carrier pigeon would have done—stating these concerns and we should have started working together. I will not allow Townsville to become the next Williamtown or Oakey, where the government's lack of action has created huge and unnecessary anxiety and fear.

It is clear this government has no idea about addressing this issue. Its policy is actually a copy and paste of Labor's. I demand the following immediate action from the government: start the next round of testing, invest in resourcing Defence, communicate and consult with the community, appoint a community liaison officer, and don't add to the already existing uncertainty, stress and anxiety of these communities. (Time expired)

Fisher Electorate: Maleny Dairies

Mr WALLACE (Fisher) (13:40): I rise to inform the House of a home-grown local business success story that has become an icon on the Sunshine Coast. Employing 50 locals and producing 190,000 litres of fresh Maleny milk weekly, Ross and Sally Hopper and their team at Maleny Dairies have grown their business 74 per cent over the past six months and are now investing another $4.1 million in their plant and equipment to meet the demand.

While Maleny Dairies is riding a wave of sustained success, it was formed out of necessity in the face of the deregulation of the industry 16 years ago. Great-grandfather Hopper purchased the land in 1948. In 2000 the dairy industry was facing an uncertain future, with deregulation forcing thousands of farmers around Australia to close down their farms. This impacted significantly upon Queensland and Western Australian dairies.

Maleny Dairies bucked the trend and grew into a sustainable business. It began sourcing local milk from other farmers in the district. By owning their plant and equipment, Maleny Dairies are able to pay a higher rate per litre of milk, enabling each farmer to keep their cattle healthy and their family farms viable. Today Maleny Dairies has partnerships with eight farms in the region that supply their milk for processing into Maleny Dairies products. I congratulate the Hopper family for their vision and their willingness to take a risk and invest their own money in a venture that is benefiting our broader local community. (Time expired)

Lyons Electorate: Beaconsfield Mine and Heritage Centre

Mr BRIAN MITCHELL (Lyons) (13:42): Most Australians will remember the Beaconsfield Mine and Heritage Centre in my electorate from its days as a working mine. It is the site where, on Anzac Day 10 years ago, Larry Knight tragically lost his life in a rockfall and where Brant Webb and Todd Russell were rescued after two weeks trapped underground. It has become an iconic Australian site, synonymous with courage, mateship and sacrifice.
The mine has long since ended its days as a working operation, but it has been reborn as a heritage tourism centre, attracting 40,000 people a year to the West Tamar, many of whom go on to sample wineries and other attractions. Unfortunately, the mine had to close in September due to subsidence, and the repair bill is $1.2 million. The Tasmanian state government has come to the party. It is funding $600,000 and the federal government is being asked to fund the rest.

I was very disappointed that the Prime Minister did not take the opportunity when he visited Tasmania on the weekend to announce funding for this very important project. The Beaconsfield Mine and Heritage Centre is an iconic site. It needs to reopen. We need to get this site open again to drive tourism in this region. I really hope the wheels are only turning slowly and that the funding is on its way. If not, that really stands as an indictment of this government's priorities.

**O'Connor Electorate: BLAST Youth Group**

Mr RICK WILSON (O'Connor) (13:44): Last Friday night the Minister for Indigenous Affairs, Senator Nigel Scullion, and I had an absolute blast when we were invited to join Linden Brownley and his BLAST youth group at Maku Stadium in Kalgoorlie for their weekly get-together. 'BLAST' stands for 'building lives around sound truth', and their aim is to engage Indigenous kids in team sports and Bible study, keeping them off the streets of Kalgoorlie-Boulder at night. BLAST runs an early session after school for kids up to 11 years of age and a later one for those up to 18. Many have troubled backgrounds and poor attendance at school.

We arrived at 7 pm, just in time to catch a boisterous bunch of almost 50 teenagers playing basketball. After working up a sweat, the kids took time out to compete in a team quiz and a game of reverse charades, with volunteer MC, Heather, and helpers, Linnene and Shekinah. Pastor David Dala Momo showed us through the Maku kitchen, where we met volunteers from the Moonga Gudoo-Gu congregation, who were cooking up a storm for the hungry hordes.

Chatting with BLAST founder, Linden, and coordinator, Stephen Morrison, we identified that one of the critical elements of their program was transporting kids to and from the group safely. To this end, I am pleased to announce that Minister Scullion has secured funding for a bus for BLAST. I congratulate Linden Brownley on his eight years of dedication to getting BLAST off the ground, and his volunteers for helping to keep at-risk Indigenous youth safe at night.

**Defence Facilities: Chemical Contamination**

Mr GOSLING (Solomon) (13:45): Tomorrow in Darwin I will be meeting with veterans and their families. Not only is it Remembrance Day, it is also an important opportunity for me to speak with those members of our community about issues that are important to us. One of the things they are going to be asking me about is the contamination coming out of some of our Defence bases. The Minister for Veterans’ Affairs and Minister for Defence Personnel, many months ago, way back in May, said there was no interest in having any blood testing for people who are extremely worried about the impact of this on their lives and the lives of their kids and families.
Did he do anything about it? What happened is that it took four months to release the results and to tell the community what happened. And do the families of Darwin and Palmerston now understand what the results mean for them? Do they understand what they can do and whether they can still go fishing in the creeks and rivers that come from RAAF Base Darwin and Robertson Barracks?—no. No explanation has been gone into, and we do really know what the various ministers of defence are doing in relation to this issue.

It is about time that Malcolm Turnbull stood up and got these defence ministers to start doing their day jobs and to inform our communities of what is happening with this contamination issue.

Sutcliffe, Ms Audrey Jean

Mr TIM WILSON (Goldstein) (13:47): Today we honour Goldstein resident and centenarian, Audrey Jean Sutcliffe. Known by her second name, Jean was one of Goldstein’s modest souls, despite her lifetime of service. During the Second World War, Jean served as a lieutenant, as a theatre nurse, at a clearing station in Finschhafen, Papua New Guinea. Like so many others, Jean saw some truly terrible things, for much of the fighting around Finschhafen was done in the jungle—hand to hand and often with bayonets.

On coming home, she learned that the Japanese had taken the life of her fiance, and for many years she wore her engagement ring on a chain around her neck. She was loved by her community. She recently held her 100th birthday at the Beaumaris Bowls Club, with a large contingent of friends and family who turned up to celebrate with her. I was very privileged to be there on that day and to celebrate with her family and friends and community members.

I was particularly honoured to be able to present to Jean her congratulatory message from the Queen of Australia. It is fitting that, on the last parliamentary sitting day before Remembrance Day, we pay recognition to Jean and her life. She is gone from us, but her life and service to our community and country will never be forgotten, and we miss her already.

Local Council Elections: Victoria

Ms McGOWAN (Indi) (13:48): It gives me great pleasure to report to the House on some very productive and positive news from north-east Victoria, regarding the local government elections that have recently taken place.

The VLGA’s program called GoWomenLG2016 reports that in Victoria we had an average of 38.1 per cent of councillors being women. I am delighted that in north-east Victoria, in my electorate, 40 per cent of the councillors are women.

Today, I would like to give a call out in Wodonga to Anna Speedie, Kat Bennett and Libby Hall—well done. In Indigo, to Jenny O’Connor, Sophie Price, Barb Murdock and Diane Shepheard—well done. In Towong, well done to Jennifer Star. In Alpine Shire, well done to Kitty Knappstien and Sarah Nichblas. In the Wangaratta shire, well done to Ruth Amery. In Benalla, well done to Barbara Alexander. In Mansfield, well done to Margaret Attley. In Murrindindi, well done to Sandice McCauley, Rebecca Bowles, Jackie Ash, Charlotte Bisset and Margaret Rae.

I have to say in these times of trouble around gender and politics it was so good to see the VLGA taking a lead role in all the work that they did before the elections: having forums, supporting people, acting as mentors and providing really practical advice. I want to acknowledge the work of the VLGA in doing that, but I particularly want to acknowledge the
people in my electorate who put their hands up to be a councillor. Thank you for your work.

(Time expired)

Molyneux, Mr Cyril

Mr WOOD (La Trobe) (13:50): It is with great sadness that today I rise to speak of Mr Cyril Molyneux, a long-term resident in my electorate of La Trobe who recently passed away at the age of 98. At the outbreak of the war in 1939 Cyril joined the 6th Heavy Brigade, Royal Australian Artillery, which had been called up to man the forts at Port Phillip Heads, Port Nepean and Queenscliff. He was also involved in the defence of Darwin.

The concept of community volunteerism is something at which Cyril excelled. I recognise and acknowledge Cyril's enormous contribution to the townships of Berwick and La Trobe. Cyril's involvement in community affairs is an example to all of us. He was a life member of the board of management of the Berwick Bush Nursing Hospital, a justice of the peace for over 60 years, a past president and life member of the Berwick RSL for 50 years, a member of the Rotary Club for 30 years, and a life member of the Liberal Party for over 50 years. Cyril was Mayor of the City of Berwick for 10 years. Amazingly, Cyril was a member of the Hawthorn Football Club for more than 80 years.

I cannot do justice, in such a short time, to this man's tremendous contribution to our community. Cyril leaves us his legacy and his memories. He shall never be forgotten. Cyril, we miss you greatly. Again, thank you for your huge contribution to Australia and our community.

Western Australia: Craft Beer

Mr KEOGH (Burt) (13:51): Tomorrow marks the start of the 15th annual WA Beer Week—a celebration of WA's burgeoning craft beer scene featuring dozens of events across Perth and Western Australia. I am sure many in this place will have heard of some of WA's finest brewers. Little Creatures in Fremantle, Feral Brewing in the Swan Valley and Matso's up in Broome all spring to mind.

But today I would like to pay tribute to one of WA's finest brewers, which people may not have heard of—the Last Drop Pub and Brewery in Canning Vale in my electorate. Last Drop operates a brewery in the Armadale Hills that was brought over from a Bavarian village in the 1990s and finishes off its premium draught beers at its Canning Vale site. Last Drop's hefeweizen took out the gold at the Australian International Beer Awards in 2011, adding to a swag of awards for this fantastic local small business. I promise this is not just a bid to follow in the member for Grayndler's footsteps by having a local brew named after me!

Outside of the pleasure of drinking a local drop, small businesses brewing locally create decent paying jobs for local people. As the recent disgraceful actions of Carlton & United Breweries have shown, backed by international conglomerate SABMiller, there has never been a better time to check out your local brewers. So this week I would encourage Western Australians not only to drink responsibility, as they always should, but also to drink fresh and drink local.

Hearing Impairment

Mr ZIMMERMAN (North Sydney) (13:53): Hearing loss and deafness affects over 3.5 million Australians, or the equivalent of one in six. With our population ageing, that number
is predicted to increase to possibly one in four Australians by 2050. Hearing loss not only affects the personal lives of so many but also has an economic impact—a cost of almost $12 billion to the Australian economy, according to some experts. Ensuring that we as a community are supporting people with hearing loss through research, education, testing and the provision of medical services is therefore vital.

As the new chair of the House Standing Committee on Health, Aged Care and Sport, I am pleased that our first inquiry in this parliament will be to consider hearing health and wellbeing. The inquiry commenced this week and I want to encourage all those with an interest in this area to make submissions, which close on 23 December 2016.

In many ways Australia is a world leader in the support given to those with hearing loss. For example, the committee will be commencing the inquiry with a visit to the Shepherd Centre in Sydney, which does such incredible work supporting children. We will also meet with Cochlear, one of Australia's great success stories in medical technology and innovation.

Just in my own electorate, I am proud of the innovative work of Carolyn Mee and Sound Scouts, who have developed an easy online game to allow parents and practitioners to test the hearing of their children. We must ensure that we are leading the world in supporting those with hearing loss so that they are able to fully participate in the life of our community, and I hope the work of this committee will deliver that.

**Defence Facilities: Chemical Contamination**

Ms SWANSON (Paterson) (13:54): Today I advise that I have submitted notice of a motion to be debated in this House calling on the Turnbull government to immediately address the toxic PFAS contamination around RAAF bases in Australia. This week it was revealed that firefighting chemicals that have contaminated my community in Williamtown, New South Wales, and the Oakey community in Queensland have also contaminated 12 other bases throughout Australia.

The government has said investigations to determine the full extent of contamination in these communities will take 12 months. That is too long. Has this government learnt nothing from my community in Williamtown who have been living under this cloud for 14 months? My community is stressed and stranded. They are worried for their health, their families, their businesses and their futures. Their idyllic rural properties are devalued, not usable and not saleable. Blood testing is only just beginning after we have fought so hard for it. One farmer has told me that his PFAS blood level is sky-high at 150 parts per billion. That blood level, he explained, is what you might see in firefighters who use these chemicals every day and at least 10 times what you might see in the general population. What is he to do? What are these communities—my community, the communities around Australia—to do? This government must step up. This Prime Minister must not put my community and others through another Christmas of hell.

**Grey Electorate: South Australian of the Year Awards**

Mr RAMSEY (Grey—Government Whip) (13:56): I am pleased today to speak about some fine young winners who live in my electorate. The South Australian nominees for the Australian of the Year awards were announced this week, and I am delighted to say that the winner of the 2017 SA Local Hero—Rural Community Champion award was Wharminda resident Sarah Powell. Sarah, who I know very well, was the winner of Rural Woman of the
Year last year and deservedly is now being recognised in the SA honours list. Returning to Darke Peak on Eyre Peninsula after a decade away, Sarah was concerned to see the decline in her once thriving community. She established the Champions Academy to teach young people the skills and confidence to become the next generation of rural leaders.

I also must congratulate the SA Australian of the Year, Kate Swaffer, who is a former Eyre Peninsula resident. Kate has become the voice of dementia sufferers after being diagnosed with the condition before her 50th birthday. Since her diagnosis, Kate has completed three university degrees and is currently undertaking her PhD. I am proud of both of these awards winners and wish them very well at the national awards to be announced in January.

**Defence Facilities: Chemical Contamination**

Mr SNOWDON (Lingiari) (13:57): Mr Speaker, this afternoon you have heard from the members for Herbert, Brand, Solomon, Paterson and now me, the member for Lingiari, about the contamination from the legacy of aqueous film forming foam contamination, PFAS. What we know in this place is that the government has failed to respond to legitimate inquiries and expectations of communities to have their concerns addressed properly and appropriately by the Minister for Defence. This is an issue which goes beyond the politics of this place. This is an issue about people's quality of life, where they are living, how they live, the places they live on, the values of their property and the health of their children and their communities, yet we are hearing nothing from the government. There is no process for consultation, no process for engagement, no process for liaison and no process for answering the responsible questions of these communities.

In my own electorate of Lingiari, Tindal is affected by this. There is one property already where contamination has been identified and the drinking water has been so contaminated that it cannot be used. There has been no discussion about what the future holds for the person who owns that property in terms of how any costs incurred will be addressed, if the property can be rehabilitated, what science is going to be used in future testing, and when the future testing will start. When will the legitimate answers to the questions from these communities be given by you the government? Prime Minister, could you request and direct your Minister for Defence to do the right thing by these communities? *(Time expired)*

**Remembrance Day**

Mr ANDREWS (Menzies) (13:59): Tomorrow at 11 am we mark the 98th anniversary of the Armistice, the end of that bloody, terrible conflict now known as World War I. This year we particularly remember those Australians who died in battles at Fromelles, where 5,000 casualties from Australia occurred, and at Pozieres, where there were some 23,000 Australian casualties, almost 7,000 of whom were killed. The Australian war correspondent and historian Charles Bean wrote that Pozieres Ridge marked 'a site more densely sown with Australian sacrifice than any other place on earth'. We pause tomorrow to remember those brave Australians who went in the name of the people of Australia on this parliament's advice. Lest we forget.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with standing order 43, the time for members' statements has concluded.
Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:00): This morning I spoke with President-elect Donald Trump and offered the Australian government's congratulations on his election victory. Mr Trump spoke warmly and admiringly of Australia and reaffirmed that the Australia-America alliance is one of enormous importance to the United States and would always remain so. We also offer our best wishes to Secretary Hillary Clinton for her participation in a very hard-fought campaign. As many Australians have observed over the last 18 months, this was a long and gruelling campaign, certainly by our standards. As President Obama said overnight, campaigns are hard, and sometimes contentious and noisy. He added:

A lot of our fellow Americans are exultant today. A lot of Americans are less so. But that's the nature of campaigns. That's the nature of democracy.

It shows the enduring strength of the democratic system, where the power to choose the government resides with the people. There has been perhaps no greater demonstration of that process than in the United States. More people voted in this United States election than in 2012, with voter turnout up nearly five per cent. That is a very good thing for democracy. It was noticeable that, despite an intense and at times very confronting campaign, President-elect Trump immediately reached out to bring Americans together in his victory speech, and in doing so praised and thanked Secretary Clinton for her public service.

I can assure the House and the Australian people that my government will continue to work closely with the administration of the United States when it is installed in January to advance Australia's national interest, for this is the ultimate role of national leaders, of prime ministers and, indeed, of presidents. I will ensure that we work effectively and constructively with America's 45th President. It is in our nations' mutual interests to maintain the strongest and closest ties between the United States's and Australia's defence forces—a relationship that has seen American and Australian troops fight side by side in every major conflict in the last century. Indeed, tomorrow, Remembrance Day, we will commemorate the day 98 years ago when the guns fell silent on the Great War—a victory won in no small measure by the brilliance of Australia's General John Monash and the courage of the Australian, British and American troops that he led into battle.

Australia has close, indeed intimate, security arrangements with other friends and allies, but our alliance with the United States is unquestionably our single most important security relationship, underpinned by our mutual security pact, the ANZUS Treaty, concluded between Australia, New Zealand and the United States in 1951. The ties that bind Australia and the United States are strong and profound. They are based on the experience, on the engagement, of millions of Australians and Americans; but, above all, they are based on our enduring national interests. Americans know they have no better ally, no better friend, than Australia. Above all, our relations are underpinned by the values that we share: a dedication to democracy, freedom and the rule of law. As I have said before, the United States has, for decades, been the bedrock of regional prosperity and security so vital to Australia and its partners. The Pax Americana of the last 40 years and beyond has been the basis on which we have seen the most remarkable transformation in economic growth and living standards, raising billions of people out of poverty in our own region. That is why my government—and,
I believe, every Australian government—will continue to advocate for a strong, ongoing role for the United States in the Asia-Pacific.

Australia will always be America's constructive, solid and committed partner in peace and stability in our region. We will continue to work together to confront the global challenges that face us, whether they be combatting Daesh, ISIL and terrorism; supporting the maintenance of peace and security in Afghanistan; standing in solidarity against North Korea's missile testing; or upholding respect for the rule of law in international affairs. We will also cooperate closely on trade and investment, with our own free trade agreement with the United States delivering significant benefits to both our nations. I remind the House that, in 2015, two-way trade was worth $70.2 billion, up 68 per cent since the Australia-US Free Trade Agreement commenced, while two-way investment was $1.45 trillion. For all these reasons, our nations will continue to be united in our objectives of global stability, security and prosperity.

Let me take just a moment to acknowledge President Obama and his team, including Vice President Biden, Secretary of State Kerry and Secretary of Defence Carter. We have had a very good relationship with the current administration, one that has seen the strength of the Australia-US alliance—our partnership—continue to grow and to deepen in every respect. President Obama has served the world well as the leader of the United States and he has advanced the common interests of both our nations. We will continue to work closely with the Obama administration in the transition period between now and 20 January.

The decision in the United States election has been a great and momentous one, and we wish President-elect Trump and his administration all the best in their work in the future. The fate of the world, the future of the world, depend on strong American global leadership. America has been the bedrock of global stability, of peace in the world, and we look forward to a strong America, a committed America. Australia will be—as it has been in the past—a strong and committed ally, as America stands for peace in the world today.

Mr SHORTEN (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): I thank the Prime Minister for the address he has just given. One of the longest and most divisive US election campaigns in living memory has come to a close. I want to briefly say to the Prime Minister and to all members of this place that, as fierce and as hard as we fought this year's election, I believe we can be proud of the standards and the relative civility which we held ourselves to.

Now, the American people have spoken. They have made their choice. As common believers in democracy and as servants of the people ourselves, we respect their decision. On behalf of the Australian Labor Party, I congratulate President-elect Donald Trump on his victory. Seasoned pundits and pollsters underestimated his electoral appeal and the resonance of his message.

I offer my commiserations to Hillary Clinton. As Secretary of State, as a senator, as First Lady and as an advocate for equality, she served her country with honour. In this campaign and throughout her public life, she has fought with dauntless courage, and the example she set, particularly for women and girls, will live long in the memory of the world. I hope this House will set aside another time to congratulate President Barack Obama on his dignity, his moral courage and the policy leadership of his administration these past eight years.
Every time the people of the United States choose their new president, it has most significant consequences for the world and for Australia. But the partnership that John Curtin and Labor forged with President Roosevelt in the United States in the darkest days of the Second World War was never about personalities. Even then, it was bigger than those two giants who occupied the White House and the Lodge. It is, and always will be, more than a coalescing of common interests. Ours is a friendship built on shared sacrifice, as the Prime Minister has observed. From the mud of the Western Front to our fight for freedom in the Pacific, from the jungles of Vietnam to the skies and sands of Iraq and Afghanistan, ours is a partnership between two nations which look at each other and see something of themselves—the frontier and the bush, spacious skies and boundless plains, the fair go and the American dream.

The abiding friendship between our nations is strong enough for honesty; in fact, true friendship demands nothing less. It is never acceptable to mock people for their disability. It is never acceptable to ridicule prisoners of war for their service. When this parliament sees women being disrespected, we have an obligation to speak up. When this parliament sees people being discriminated against because of the colour of their skin or because of their religion, we have an obligation to speak up. The US alliance does not mean trading away our shared values; it means standing up for them. It does not mean changing who we are or what we believe. It does not mean selling ourselves short or settling for less. It is our responsibility to be the ally that America needs, not just the ally it wants. We owe that to the United States, and, more to the point, we owe it to ourselves, to our character and to our qualities as Australians.

Last night the new President-elect promised 'to bind up the nation's wounds'. Those words, of course, come from Lincoln's second inaugural address. So too does Lincoln's famous healing promise to govern 'with malice towards none, with charity for all.' 'Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray,' for that spirit, for that wisdom, for an America that can heal itself and lead the world.

MINISTERIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:11): I inform the House that the Treasurer will be absent from question time today for personal reasons. The Minister for Revenue and Financial Services will answer questions on his behalf. The Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science will also be absent from question time today for personal reasons, and the Minister for Defence Industry will answer questions on his behalf.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Climate Change

Mr SHORTEN (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Prime Minister. This morning on social media the member for Hughes said, in response to Donald Trump’s plan to cancel the Paris Agreement on climate change: 'Paris is cactus.' Is this comment from the member for Hughes consistent with the Prime Minister's announcement today that Australia has ratified the Paris Agreement?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:12): The government has indeed ratified the Paris Agreement, and Australia is now the 104th country to do so. One hundred and ninety-six nations have entered into the Paris Agreement. It has been in force since earlier
this month. My government is committed to meeting its international obligations under the Paris Agreement. We will meet and beat our 2020 target, and we are on track to meet our 2030 target. We are committed to ensuring that Australians' energy is secure, reliable, affordable and that we meet our international emission reduction obligations. That is our commitment. That is the commitment of the government. It has been made responsibly. It has been made with a full understanding of the costs that are associated and of the means to achieve it. The Paris Agreement was an enormous watershed in climate policy. For the first time, all nations made commitments which will enable us to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions and, in doing so, ensure that temperature rises are limited to not exceed two degrees Celsius. That is the critical objective of the Paris Agreement. I was proud to enter into that agreement on behalf of Australia. My government is committed to it. We have ratified it. Ensuring that we maintain energy security, maintain energy affordability and meet emissions reductions is not a matter of ideology. It should not be a matter for political game-playing, as we have seen from the other side.

It is a chance for us to meet our obligations, and we will do so, unlike the Labor Party, which is utterly unable to separate its obligations to provide secure, affordable energy and to meet emissions reduction. Unable to do any of those, the Labor Party retreats to ideology. We focus on the task ahead, and we are getting on with the job.

United States Election

Mr TIM WILSON (Goldstein) (14:15): My question is to the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister update the House on the US presidential election and what this means for Australia's longstanding strategic partnership with the United States of America?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:15): I thank the honourable member for his question. This morning I was able to speak with President-elect Trump and, as I noted earlier, offered him congratulations. In our discussion we canvassed the importance of a strong American presence in the Asia-Pacific, and I underlined the importance of maintaining that strong American commitment to our region, because it has been the very foundation of the stability, the peace, the prosperity, that has flowed from that over the last 40 years. The President-elect described to me his commitment—

Mr Brendan O'Connor interjecting—

Mr TURNBULL: to increasing investment in America's defence capabilities and, in particular, his commitment to expanding the United States Navy, of such enormous significance in our region. I described to the President our government's commitment to our naval shipbuilding program, where—notwithstanding the neglect, over six years, of the honourable members opposite—we have committed to commissioning 54 new naval vessels as part of the largest naval shipbuilding program in our history. We discussed the importance of us continuing to work closely together in our region, and we recognised the importance of our enduring alliance and our enduring defence relationship. We discussed the challenges that we face globally, against Daesh. The President-elect described his commitment to eliminating ISIL, eliminating that terrorist scourge, and of course we discussed the way in which we are working together in the Middle East and indeed around the world. We discussed the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and I observed to the President-elect that Australia regarded the TPP as a very important strategic commitment by the United States to the region, and we
continue to encourage the Congress to ratify it. It was a very warm discussion, a very frank
discussion. The President-elect, of course, is a businessman. He has been a deal-maker all his
life. He will approach the challenges of his office with pragmatism and with the practicality
that comes from a life in business. We will continue to work together in the cause of peace
and stability. Our enduring national interests will compel that. The alliance between Australia
and the United States will always be strong and will, I am sure, become stronger yet in the
years ahead.

*Mr Champion interjecting—*

*Dr Chalmers interjecting—*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Wakefield is warned, as is the member for Rankin. I
refer members to the remarks I made yesterday and the day before. If they have forgotten
them already, I suggest they get a copy of the *Hansard*. I will not tolerate endless
interjections.

**Climate Change**

**Mr BUTLER** (Port Adelaide) (14:19): My question is to the Prime Minister. How can the
member for Hughes possibly remain the chair of the coalition committee on the environment
and energy when he is promoting a position which undermines the central plank of the Prime
Minister's policy on climate change? Will the Prime Minister now sack the member for
Hughes from this position, or is the Prime Minister preparing for yet another backflip on
climate change policy?

*Mr Wood interjecting—*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for La Trobe will cease interjecting.

**Mr TURNBULL** (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:19): The honourable member's
question seems to overlook a salient fact, which is that the government has today ratified the
Paris Agreement—that is a fact. The significance of that and the importance of that agreement
is one which I will invite the minister to now address.

**Mr Butler:** Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Port Adelaide will resume his seat. What has occurred
is perfectly in order. There is extensive practice on it. If he wishes to argue with me, he can do
so after question time. The minister has the call.

**Mr FRYDENBERG** (Kooyong—Minister for the Environment and Energy) (14:20): As
the Prime Minister said, we have ratified the Paris Agreement, which will leave Australia to
reduce its emissions by 26 to 28 per cent by 2030 on 2005 levels. We are doing it with
effective policy mechanisms, like the Emissions Reduction Fund—for which the cost per
tonne of abatement has been at $12.10—our renewable energy target as well as our National
Energy Productivity Plan. The gall of the member for Port Adelaide, who comes from the
state of South Australia, to get up at this dispatch box when he is not worried about the fact
that his state went into the black. He is not worried about his state, which has the highest
electricity prices in the National Electricity Market. This is what the South Australian Council
of Social Service said:

We have the highest electricity prices in the nation in South Australia. We have the highest
unemployment in South Australia and that's no coincidence.
The Labor Party should know that its ideological—

Mr Butler: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Port Adelaide has already risen to try to take a point of order. I hope you know which one it is—can you state it?

Mr Butler: It is on direct relevance. I asked about the suitability of the member for Hughes as the chair of the coalition committee on the environment and energy.

The SPEAKER: The member for Port Adelaide will resume his seat. I listened very closely—

Mr Chester interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport is warned. The minister has the call.

Mr FRYDENBERG: In the member for Port Adelaide's own words, he wants to kickstart the closure of coal fired power stations. This will only send electricity prices up and will reintroduce issues about the stability of the system. Yesterday we heard from Graham Richardson. We should remind the House what he said about Labor's 50 per cent renewable target.

Mr Conroy interjecting—

The SPEAKER: The member for Shortland will leave under 94(a).

The member for Shortland then left the chamber.

Mr FRYDENBERG: Then I want to add the words of Tony Maher, the national president of the CFMEU, who wrote to all members opposite in 2015. He said about the Leader of the Opposition's 50 per cent target:

… an increased Renewable Energy Target (RET) of 50% by 2030 will increase the cost of electricity for manufacturing and ordinary households while being a poor tool to reduce Australia's overall global warming emissions.

Only the coalition can introduce energy efficiency, energy security— (Time expired)

Foreign Affairs

Mr MORTON (Tangney) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Will the minister update the House on the importance of working constructively and managing relationships with significant security and economic partners?

Ms JULIE BISHOP (Curtin—Minister for Foreign Affairs) (14:23): I thank the member for Tangney for his question. The Australian government has congratulated President-elect Donald Trump on his victory and, as the Prime Minister has described, he had a very positive discussion with President-elect Trump this morning.
The coalition government has been working hard to ensure that we are ready to engage closely with a new Trump administration. Indeed, we have been engaging with members of the Trump teams and with the Republican Party. I have met with senior figures from the Trump transition team, as has Ambassador Hockey and our diplomats in Washington. We are prepared for a Trump administration under the new President. We place the highest priority on a positive relationship with the United States, because it is our strategic ally, it is our most important defence and intelligence partner, it is our largest source of foreign investment and it is our second-largest trading partner. It is in our national interest for Australia to have a positive and productive relationship with the new President and with the new Trump administration. But compare and contrast the behaviour of the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of a major political party in Australia, a person who holds himself up to be the alternative Prime Minister of this country. In his roles he has a responsibility not to damage or undermine our relationship with the United States.

Ms JULIE BISHOP: And while we were closely engaging on building relationships with both the Clinton team and with the Trump team, the Leader of the Opposition chose to hurl personal insults at one of the candidates in a presidential election in the United States describing the president-elect as 'demeaning' and 'disgusting' and calling him 'barking mad'.

Ms JULIE BISHOP: But not content with the personal vitriol, he went even further and denounced the president-elect by saying that he was in entirely unsuitable to be the leader of the free world. And then, by publicly predicting a Trump loss, he showed utter disregard for the people of the United States and their democratic process. Now with his mealy mouthed address today trying to deflect from the fact that he was undermining the relationship with the United States he once more showed his flawed judgement and his reckless immaturity. He is not fit to lead this country.

Trade with United States

Ms PLIBERSEK (Sydney—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Prime Minister. Yesterday, speaking about the US election, the Minister for Foreign Affairs said:

I do not expect there to be any change to the Australia-US Free Trade Agreement. It has not been mentioned.

Is the Prime Minister aware that Donald Trump's campaign has actually committed to renegotiating all US free trade agreements? What preparation has the government undertaken in relation to our own free trade agreement with the US and was it raised in your phone call today?
Mr Turnbull (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. Like the foreign minister, I do not anticipate any changes to the Australia-US Free Trade Agreement, which has now some considerable tenure, 10 years old indeed. In the discussion with President-elect Trump, we dealt largely with strategic matters that I have mentioned. We did discuss the TPP. We did not discuss the Australia-US Free Trade Agreement and, as I said, like the foreign minister, I do not anticipate any changes being sought to that agreement. It is one that is manifestly in the interests of both countries.

The important thing for all honourable members to remember is, as I said earlier today, the relationship between our two nations is based on our enduring national interests and that is what drives so many of our arrangements. Our ANZUS Treaty, our alliance are driven by enduring national interests and they will be the guide for the upcoming Trump administration just as they have been for the Obama administration and its many predecessors.

Dairy Industry

Ms McGowan (Indi) (14:29): My question is to the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources around the dairy support program. Minister, there are over 100 dairy farm families who live in the valleys of the Kiewa, Upper Murray, Mitta Mitta, Ovens and King rivers. Up to 60 per cent, it is reported, are in need of assistance and 20 per cent are desperate. The government's emergency dairy support package promised a process of fast tracking household support allowances. But farmers in these valleys are reporting a delay of up to 20 weeks to get assistance. Will the Deputy Prime Minister please commit to holding a roundtable, preferably in my electorate, to review the process, to increase staff on the ground and to allocate additional resources to clear the backlog?

Mr Joyce (New England—Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources) (14:29): I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge the work that she does in making sure that we all do our very best to look after dairy farmers through this crisis. The coalition strongly support Australia's 6,100 dairy farmers and in so doing we have made it our goal that we get a better return through the farm gate. I am encouraged by the recent step up in prices in the dairy industry. Although they are starting from a low base, they show some promise that things are starting to turn around.

The government developed the $579 million Dairy Support Package to assist farmers affected by the decisions of Murray Goulburn and Fonterra to retrospectively reduce farmgate prices. The coalition's Dairy Support Package includes $555 million in dairy recovery concessional loans, with 10-year terms and an interest-only rate for five years. As at 4 November, $35.5 million in dairy recovery loans had been approved in Victoria for 67 farmers in the dairy industry, plus a further $9.9 million in offers had been made to a further 17 farmers. Last week I announced that interest rates for dairy farmers who have already taken out these loans—currently at 2.66 per cent—will be falling to 2.07 per cent on 1 February 2017, making them the cheapest rates I can think of in rural Australia. A new round of dairy recovery concessional loans commenced on 1 November 2016 and these are at 2.47 per cent. Furthermore, we note that—

The Speaker: The minister will resume his seat for a second. The member for Indi, on a point of order.
Ms McGowan: I was just getting to relevance really. We were asking about a round table and more resources to fast-track it.

The SPEAKER: The question had a—

Honourable members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: No. Members will not interject while I am addressing the House. The member for Bendigo will leave under standing order 94(a).

The member for Bendigo then left the chamber.

The SPEAKER: I listened very carefully to the member for Indi’s question. It had a preamble that asked about the Dairy Support Program. The minister has got three minutes. He is perfectly in order. There is nothing in the standing orders that says he has to come to a particular part of a long question when a member would wish. The Deputy Prime Minister is completely in order.

Mr JOYCE: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. We have also put $2 million for a milk commodity price index and $20 million towards the Macalister irrigation district upgrade. There is also $900,000 for Dairy Australia's Tactics for Tight Times program. You have asked for a round table. I have today committed that Senator Bridget McKenzie will conduct a round table in your area, so specifically dealing with the issue that is of concern to you.

I might note that the Labor Party back in 2009, when prices were lower than they are today, offered nothing to dairy farmers. They did nothing. They generally do that because rather than help solve a problem they try to exacerbate the problem. The current classic example of exacerbating a problem is what they are doing with the backpacker tax. They cannot help it. When the former AWU member, who is supposed to be looking after Australian workers—

Honourable members interjecting—

Mr JOYCE: Turn around and look here. You do not have to look at your friends. If you do not want to face up to the music, if you are afraid of what you are doing to Australian workers, just keep staring at the member for Sydney. If you cannot face the Australian people then turn your back on them.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER (14:33): It is my pleasure to inform the House that we have present in the chamber this afternoon a delegation from Hungary, led by the president of the republic, His Excellency Mr Janos Ader. On behalf of the House I extend a very warm welcome to you and to your delegation.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

United States of America

Dr McVEIGH (Groom) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Will the minister update the House on the importance of a strong relationship with the United States?

Mr CIOBO (Moncrieff—Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:34): I take this opportunity to congratulate President-elect Trump on his victory yesterday and to reflect on the fact that Australia’s relationship with the United States is underpinned by shared values—
the shared values of democracy, the rule of law, equal opportunity, nondiscrimination, freedom of speech, freedom of religion and free enterprise. These values will continue to define our relationship and ensure that the United States remains a vitally important partner for Australia. This is certainly true in terms of our trade and investment ties. As the Prime Minister mentioned earlier, last year Australia and the United States celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Australia-United States Free Trade Agreement. Two-way trade between Australia and the United States has increased from some $41 billion in 2004, the year prior to the US FTA coming into force, to now more than $70 billion in 2015. In fact, in 2004 only 46 per cent of imports from Australia entered the United States tariff free. Now, thanks to that agreement secured under the coalition, some 96.1 per cent of imports from Australia enter the United States tariff free. Further Australian imports into the US under preferential Australia-United States Free Trade Agreement tariff rates. On the 10th anniversary of the Australia-US FTA, on 1 January 2015, we saw the removal of remaining tariffs on wine, textiles, surgical materials and bedding.

The Australia-US Free Trade Agreement will continue to deliver benefits for Australian businesses and, by 2023, 98.4 per cent of all US tariff lines will be completely duty-free for Australia. The United States is of course our largest source and destination of foreign investment, worth some $1.45 trillion as of 2015, and it is our second-largest trading partner as well. The United States market continues to promise Australian businesses boundless opportunities. We as a government are certainly very committed to building on our strong relationship through a range of initiatives, including complementary Australia-US business weeks and the G'day USA programs, and our investment in the relationship is reflected in the recent opening of a consulate-general in Houston and a new investment promotion office in Boston. The fact is, the strength of our relationship with the US will continue, and we see that also reflected in our strong people-to-people links.

It was, frankly, passing strange that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition rose before to ask a question about renegotiated free trade agreements. It was Labor's policy at the last election to tear up any agreements containing ISDS and to renegotiate them, so how utterly bizarre that she would stand and ask a question about a policy which Labor itself has adopted.

United States Election

Mr BURKE (Watson—Manager of Opposition Business) (14:37): My question is to the foreign minister. Can the foreign minister please advise they House why in her previous answer she did not refer to the Deputy Prime Minister describing Donald Trump's political positions as cruel and nasty and did not refer to the Leader of the House describing the advent of the Trump campaign as terrifying. Can she explain why she did not refer to the Minister for the Environment describing him as a 'dropkick' or the former Prime Minister John Howard saying he was too unstable to hold that high office, or refer to herself saying he did not see the US as having a global leadership role?

Honourable members interjecting—

The SPEAKER: Members on both sides! The member for Ballarat. The member for Ballarat is warned. Members will come to order.

Ms JULIE BISHOP (Curtin—Minister for Foreign Affairs) (14:38): I did not mention the fact that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition called Israel a rogue state and Ariel Sharon a
war criminal; I did not mention the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, who presents himself as the alternative Prime Minister of this country, has chosen to denigrate and demean a presidential candidate in another country. This sorry tactic of trying to blame everybody else for his personal failings will not wash. He presents himself as the leader of a major political party and as soon as he is caught out for poor judgement, for reckless immaturity, he seeks to blame everybody else.

The people of Australia deserve better from the Leader of the Opposition than his trying to blame everybody else for his personal failings. This was not some boozy meeting of union bovver boys hurling insults; this was about protecting our national interests. The Leader of the Opposition has shown that he is not up to the job—he is out of his depth.

Opposition members interjecting—

Ms JULIE BISHOP: Member for Grayndler, he is seriously out of his depth.

Defence Industry

Mr ZIMMERMAN (North Sydney) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industry. Will the minister update the House on any recent announcements regarding the development of Australia's defence industry? What implications do these announcements have for the alliance with the United States of America?

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (14:40): I thank the member for North Sydney for his question. Our relationship with the United States in terms of defence is unsurpassed by any other country in the world. Our interoperability with the United States defence forces, our use of their combat systems integrated into our platforms, our cooperation and collaboration on major projects is our most important relationship in the world, and just this week it was reconfirmed by Australia winning the right to be the maintenance and sustainment hub in the Asia Pacific for componentry of the Joint Strike Fighter. The reason the member for North Sydney asked the question is that one of the businesses in his electorate, Rockwell Collins, will be one of the major providers of navigation systems and countermeasures for incoming weaponry for the Joint Strike Fighter program for the entire Asia-Pacific region. In fact the Minister for Human Services, the member for Aston, also will have a firm in his electorate called RUAG, who will do the landing gear for the Joint Strike Fighter program.

This builds on the success of the Joint Strike Fighter program, in becoming the maintenance and sustainment hub for engines for the entire Asia-Pacific area and for frames for the southern Asia-Pacific region. This was an international competition. The UK, the Netherlands, the US and Australia were the four countries chosen to maintain and sustain the Joint Strike Fighters all around and there will be 3,000 Joint Strike Fighters all around the world. Already, 30 businesses in Australia are doing $800 million worth of business in supplying to the Joint Strike Fighter program components of this particular platform. So this week's announcement on Tuesday is a very timely reminder of the importance of our defence relationship with the United States. It builds on many other things. I was in Washington a few weeks ago to talk to them about the Joint Strike Fighter program.

We could not have a better friend than we do in the United States, and they feel the same way about us, and any of our colleagues who travel to Washington would obviously know that. That is why it is critically important not to put those kinds of relationships at risk by
having bad judgement. It was poor judgement of the Leader of the Opposition to refer to President Elect Trump in the way that he did—to personally denigrate President Elect Trump. It builds on the poor judgement that he showed in saying that he would not tell the Navy whether they should or should not take their vessels within 12 nautical miles of disputed territory. It was poor judgement when he hung on to Senator Sam Dastyari in spite of the fact that he clearly should not have been staying on the Labor Party front bench. It was poor judgement that led him to put Kimberley Kitching into the Senate. It is time his colleagues cut him loose. (Time expired)

**United States Presidential Election**

*Mr BUTLER (Port Adelaide) (14:43):* My question is to the Prime Minister. The Liberal Party's delegate to the United Nations, Senator Cory Bernardi, has lauded the election of Donald Trump as 'a movement against the establishment political parties'. Is the Prime Minister concerned by the movement against establishment political parties, particularly by conservative groups based in South Australia, and what implications does this have for government policy?

*Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:44):* The honourable member is very familiar with the loss of manufacturing jobs in South Australia—after all, his party has contributed so much to the loss of those jobs. After all, it was the Labor Party that in six years did not commission one single naval vessel.

*Opposition members interjecting—*

*The SPEAKER:* The member for Sydney is warned.

*Mr TURNBULL:* It was Labor, in government for six years—

*Honourable members interjecting—*

*The SPEAKER:* The member for Sydney has been warned.

*Mr TURNBULL:* Six years in government, recognising that our submarines needed to be replaced, recognising that our Navy needed new vessels, recognising that work needed to be done, but unwilling and unable to make a decision, leaving thousands of workers in South Australia to face that valley of death as the existing work tails off. We have commissioned, or are commissioning, 54 new naval vessels—

*Honourable members interjecting—*

*The SPEAKER:* The member for Eden-Monaro.

*Mr TURNBULL:* What did Labor do? Nothing. Is shipbuilding important in South Australia? I think it is. I think South Australians know it, and they know that it was the Labor Party that abandoned them.

And what about the Labor Party's brilliant management of the energy supply in South Australia. We need to have reliable, affordable power. Yes, we need to cut our emissions and we are doing so. But you have to be able to keep the lights on. You have to be able to keep the wheels of industry turning. The Labor Party abandoned the workers in those businesses. The Labor Party's energy present to South Australia is the least reliable and the most expensive wholesale energy in the country.

Nobody has less moral right to talk about workers' jobs and the manufacturing industry than Labor members from South Australia. You abandoned the workers in South Australia.
You abandoned the workers at Osborne. It is the Liberal Party and the National Party, our coalition, that has given them hope for an advanced manufacturing future. We did that. We are building up an advanced manufacturing base in South Australia. The Labor Party abandoned South Australia, they abandoned those workers and they abandoned those jobs.

**Australian Defence Force**

Mr ENTSCH (Leichhardt) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Defence Personnel. Will the minister update the House on how Australia's Defence Force personnel are helping to build deeper ties with United States?

Mr TEHAN (Wannon—Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Centenary of ANZAC, Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Cyber Security and Minister for Defence Personnel) (14:47): I would like to thank the member for his question and I note his long and continuing interest in the strong and binding ties between Australia and the US. As a former member of the RAAF he knows the value of our strong relationship with that country. Indeed, the defence relationship between Australia and the US is the strongest in the world, spanning across conflicts and crises to work towards shared common values and interests. This commitment is reinforced by the fact that there are still 190 American MIAs in our country. It is reinforced by the fact that there is a World War II RAAF pilot officer, Francis Milne, buried in Arlington National Cemetery. He is one of only a few foreigners buried amongst the 400,000 American men and women in the United States' national memorial.

Today, in terms of our defence people to people links, there is no relationship more important to our Defence Force personnel. Our exchange program is central to this. The number of Australian defence personnel who are exchanged, embedded or posted for training in the US represents the largest number of postings outside of Australia. These postings help to build and maintain strong working relationships and improve interoperability with the United States Army, the Marine Corps, the Navy and the Air Force. There are approximately 450 Australians in liaison and exchange positions in the US, including in geographic combatant commands. There are approximately 200 US personnel in Australia in addition to the over 1,000 US Marines rotating through the Northern Territory. At Pacific Command, the Honolulu base US military operation with responsibility for the strategically important Asia and Pacific areas, embedded Australian personnel are also making a meaningful contribution to our security. I have recently had the privilege to see first-hand the excellent work they are doing and the positive influence it has on our relationship with the US. Our ties to the United States, through our strong military and defence cooperation, span across conflicts and governments. It is an incredibly important part of our defence engagement with our region, but it is equally important to the Australians and Americans who benefit from this international exchange. This government is committed to that relationship—their strongest defence relationship—as are our defence personnel.

**Automotive Industry**

Mr CHAMPION (Wakefield) (14:50): My question is to the Prime Minister. This morning when asked about the policies the government has put in place that saw auto jobs lost in South Australia, the Deputy Prime Minister said, 'There are not many car plants in National Party seats.' Who will be looking after our people? Why should South Australian workers trust the Prime Minister with their jobs when his own deputy admits that he does not care?
Isn’t it the case that the divisions in this government mean that the Prime Minister is focused on only one job: his own?

Mr Turnbull (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:50): It is remarkable to have another South Australian member giving us the opportunity to talk about the way the Labor Party abandoned the workers in South Australia,—

Mr Champion interjecting—

The Speaker: The member for Wakefield.

Mr Turnbull: to talk about the way in which the Labor Party abandoned the most advanced manufacturing projects in South Australia. Defence industries are at the very cutting edge of technology.

Ms Kate Ellis interjecting—

The Speaker: The member for Adelaide.

Mr Turnbull: They are at the very cutting edge of technology. It is the most advanced manufacturing. And everyone understands this except for the Labor Party. What did they do—

The Speaker: The member for Wakefield is rising on a point of order. I need to point out to him first that he is lucky to be rising on a point of order, given that he has been interjecting through the answer and he has been warned. I will hear his point of order, and then I will not hear him again for the rest of the answer.

Mr Champion: The point of order is on relevance. I was talking about the car industry. The Prime Minister seems unable to talk about that industry.

The Speaker: The member for Wakefield will resume his seat. The Prime Minister is in order.

Mr Turnbull: The honourable member is very well aware of the decisions taken by international car makers during the time of the Labor government. What about Mitsubishi? What about Ford? We understand that. The reality is that Australia’s greatest opportunity is in advanced manufacturing. The reality is that the most advanced manufacturing is in the defence sector.

Ms Henderson interjecting—

The Speaker: The member for Corangamite.

Mr Turnbull: The reality is that it was the Labor Party that abandoned the workers at Osborne, that abandoned the defence industry. Six years and nothing was done; could not even make a decision—a failure. I can hear the honourable member who had a ministerial role in those days, before his negative gearing incident. He will remember very well: nothing done. It was a perfect zero.

Mr Feeney interjecting—

The Speaker: The member for Batman.

Mr Turnbull: How many ships did the Labor Party commission in six years? None—a very simple number to remember—absolutely nothing done. And what that meant was the abandonment of those workers, the abandonment of those skills. And the challenge the Minister for Defence Industry has now, of course, is to maintain the workforce as it is in
Osborne and to build up those skills to prepare to build nine future frigates, 12 offshore patrol vessels, 12 future submarines. This is an enormous project, so much of it being done in South Australia, and we hear the hypocrisy from Labor Party members whose own party abandoned their state. We are standing up for advanced manufacturing, for jobs in advanced manufacturing, for our defence industry, securing Australia with the capabilities the ADF needs and securing our future economy with the skills we need, with the technology we need for a prosperous nation in the 21st century.

_Mr Rob Mitchell interjecting_

_The SPEAKER:_ On interjections, I want to caution the Second Deputy Speaker, for obvious reasons.

**United States Election**

_Mr HOWARTH (Petrie) (14:54):_ My question is to the Minister representing the Treasurer. Will the minister please update the House on the importance of the strength of Australia's long and prosperous economic relationship with the United States of America?

_Ms O'DWYER (Higgins—Minister for Revenue and Financial Services) (14:55):_ Thank you to the member for Petrie. First, I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate President-elect Trump. The Australian government looks forward to working productively and constructively with his administration. Australians, as everyone knows, have a very strong and special, enduring relationship with the United States. It is underpinned by our shared values of democracy, freedom and enterprise. And Australia has no stronger economic relationship than our longstanding economic relationship with the United States of America.

The United States is the world's largest economy, with its GDP estimated at around $17.4 trillion. That is about 22.5 per cent of the world's global domestic product. The United States is and will continue to be a major driver of the economy. For Australia, the United States is our largest direct foreign investor. It is our largest two-way investment partner, with a two-way investment stock reaching over $1.45 trillion in December 2015; and it is our second-largest two-way trading partner in goods and services, at $70.2 billion.

This trade relationship was turbocharged after the Howard government secured the Australia-United States Free Trade Agreement, which was entered into on 1 January 2005. Upon its entry into force, more than 97 per cent of Australia's non-agricultural exports into the United States, excluding textiles and clothing, became duty-free; and two-thirds of agricultural tariff lines went to zero.

Significantly, Australia and the United States continue to work closely together through multiple trade and economic fora—the G20, the World Trade Organisation and APEC. The enduring national interests of Australia and the United States will ensure that our economic relationship will continue to be very strong well into the future.

**Turnbull Government**

_Mr DICK (Oxley) (14:57):_ My question is to the Prime Minister. Speaking about the US election this morning, Senator Ian Macdonald said, about Queenslanders at the last election: 'They also thought in Tony Abbott they had someone they could relate to'.

_The SPEAKER:_ The member for Oxley will resume his seat.

_Mr Rob Mitchell:_ Mr Speaker—
The SPEAKER: The member for McEwen will resume his seat. I will just ask the member for Oxley to repeat his question.

Mr DICK: My question is to the Prime Minister. Speaking about the US election this morning, Senator Ian Macdonald said about Queenslanders at the last election: 'They also thought that, in the member for Warringah, they had someone they could relate to, and I think all those things did impact upon the result and did lead to a bigger than expected vote for Pauline Hanson.' Does the Prime Minister think Queenslanders relate to the member for Warringah in a way they do not relate to the current Prime Minister and his government?

The SPEAKER: Members on my right: having heard the question and understanding the context of it now, I would have allowed the original question.

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (14:58): There are so many talented election commentators in the gallery above us, I will leave those analyses to them. The fact of the matter, as may have dawned on the member, is that the result of the election was: we won and you lost.

United States Election

Mr CHRISTENSEN (Dawson—Chief Nationals Whip) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection. Will the minister update the House on the importance of cooperation with the United States on border security, particularly in the wake of the stunning election of the courageous Donald J Trump as President of the USA?

Mr DUTTON (Dickson—Minister for Immigration and Border Protection) (14:59): Can I also pass on my congratulations, following his election to the Brisbane City Council, to Lord Mayor Graham Quirk, who is up in the gallery today. He is a great Australian. Good to see you here, Lord Mayor. For all of those people interested in the relationship between the US and Australia, please visit the MacArthur Museum in Brisbane. It provides a great opportunity to explore the rich history between our two great nations.

The friendship that has endured over many decades between our two countries, during times of war and peace, is well-documented. We share many of the same values. We celebrate each other's cultures, and our governments and societies share many foundational beliefs and institutions. Australia has a proud history of close cooperation with the United States, and I was very pleased in February this year to be in Washington DC, where I met with the Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson. He is a very integral part of the Obama administration, and I want to recognise the work that he has done as part of President Obama's national security team. We have had a very close relationship, in terms of not just defence relationships but also the links between our border protection agencies. There is a ready exchange of information, on a daily basis, with the millions of movements across our respective borders. We have a great level of cooperation. I pay tribute to Jeh Johnson, and I look forward very much to establishing close cooperation with the incoming Secretary of Homeland Security in the Trump administration.

The government works with the US through multilateral fora, such as the Five Country Conference and Border Five—B5. We also share risk profiles with the US Department of Homeland Security to enhance the integrity of our visa program and inform Customs targeting. I am sure that all Australians will be pleased to know that Operation Angel Watch allows us to share data with the United States to identify and reject registered sex offenders...
who apply for Australian visas. The very practical impact of this very important relationship is felt and understood by all Australians.

Australia gets particular value from the Secure Real-Time Platform by which immigration information is exchanged between partners on the basis of biometric or fingerprint queries. Through this program, we have identified several known or suspect terrorist matches, identity discrepancies and records of immigration offences. I want to say a particular thank you to the US authorities for the work that they have done with us in scrutinising each application of the 12,000 people we announced we would bring in from Syria. It has allowed us to identify over 20 people who are of interest to us—of interest to our intelligence and security agencies. Because of this close working cooperation, which will continue for decades to come, we will keep Australians safe.

**Attorney-General**

Mr DREYFUS (Isaacs—Deputy Manager of Opposition Business) (15:02): My question is to the Prime Minister. I refer to the Attorney-General's humiliating backflip on the legal services direction just before question time. Given this backflip follows the Attorney-General's litany of scandals—including repeatedly misleading the parliament, appointing over a dozen Liberal cronies to jobs worth up to $370,000 a year and claiming people have the right to be bigots—what does the Attorney-General have to do to be sacked?

Mr TURNBULL (Wentworth—Prime Minister) (15:03): I am not sure if there is anything in the standing orders about unhealthy obsessions or stalking, but the member for Isaacs's enduring interest in the Attorney-General is one that reaches a pinnacle. I have seen a lot of envy and enmity between senior members of the bar; I have never seen anything quite at this level. He asked about the legal services direction. The Attorney-General has withdrawn it. There will be a new Solicitor-General appointed shortly, and the Attorney-General will consult with the new Solicitor-General on the new directive in due course.

**Global Security**

Mrs WICKS (Robertson) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Counterterrorism. Will the minister update the House on Australia’s counterterrorism and law enforcement cooperation with the United States? Why is this cooperation vital in keeping our country safe and secure?

Mr KEENAN (Stirling—Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Counter-Terrorism) (15:04): I thank the member for Robertson for that question and the interest that she takes in law enforcement matters here in Australia. As has been noted by other speakers today, the friendship between the United States and Australia is of very long standing; our alliance is founded on shared values; and, of course, very importantly, it is founded on practical cooperation as well. That collaboration has never been more important in an era of a decreasing national security environment and an increase in the terror threats that both countries face. Just as we have worked diligently to deal with the terror threat here at home, a vital part of our response has been to work collaboratively with our international partners on doing everything we can to shape the global response. Australia has a range of arrangements in place that bring together our law enforcement community, intelligence community and other partners to help us deal with the terror threat.
Australia and the United States have, for many years, worked closely on this cooperation, and we greatly value our counterterrorism and intelligence relationships. Since the devastating attacks in New York on 9/11, Australia and the United States have continued to work side by side to destroy terror at its source, in Afghanistan and in the Middle East, and also to seek out and disrupt terrorist networks in our own countries and in the wider world also. This cooperation covers a wide array of efforts, including information-sharing and close operational coordination. In South-East Asia, a region that is so vital to Australia's national security, our American partners look to us to lead the counterterrorism efforts, and we do it exceptionally well. I congratulate our agencies on the strong relationships that they have managed to build in the region.

In addition, this government has enabled the Australian Federal Police to expand and deepen our partnership with US law enforcement agencies to help tackle the threat to Australia of organised crime—specifically, gun smuggling, drug smuggling, outlaw motorcycle gangs, money-laundering and cybercrime. In America, the AFP play a significant role in the exchange of criminal intelligence with partners including the FBI, the National Counterterrorism Centre and the US departments of Justice and Homeland Security. The Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission has deployed analysts to fight cybercrime and money-laundering, through the Drug Enforcement Administration, and to the United States' National Cyber Investigative Joint Task Force. In addition, AUSTRAC, our financial intelligence agency, works closely with the US Internal Revenue Service on regulatory, strategic and operational intelligence. It is paramount that Australia and America continue this close cooperation.

I congratulate the foreign minister; Ambassador Joe Hockey; and our other diplomats for the work they did, with both President-elect Trump's campaign and Secretary Clinton's campaign, to make sure that Australia's interests were going to be protected regardless of what the election result was. I look forward to our enduring law enforcement cooperation continuing under the Trump administration.

Day, Mr Bob, AO

Ms KATE ELLIS (Adelaide) (15:07): My question is to the Prime Minister. The Minister representing the Minister for Education and Training has repeatedly claimed that the $1.84 million grant to a college linked to Bob Day went through the normal processes. Can the Prime Minister provide any other example where a college was awarded an amount which exceeded their entire annual revenue?

Mr Fletcher: The Australian people are fascinated by this!

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide will take a seat for a second. The Minister for Urban Infrastructure was interjecting throughout that question and prevented me from hearing it, so we are now going to hear the whole thing again.

Ms KATE ELLIS: My question is to the Prime Minister. The Minister representing the Minister for Education and Training has repeatedly claimed that the $1.84 million grant to a college linked to Bob Day went through the normal processes. Can the Prime Minister provide any other example where a college was awarded an amount which exceeded their entire annual revenue; and will the Prime Minister now admit that this grant was excessive?
Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (15:09): Yes, I can give an example: the Campbelltown junior soccer club in my electorate.

**Working Holiday Maker Program**

Mr HOGAN (Page) (15:09): My question is to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources. Will the Deputy Prime Minister update the House on what efforts the government is making to ensure a strong labour supply for Australia's fruit and vegetable growers to ensure summer fruits can get to market; and is the Deputy Prime Minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr JOYCE (New England—Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. A lot of work went into making sure that we came up with a tax level and, instead of having 32.5 per cent, which was really instigated back in the Labor Party days and confirmed by the AAT, if we had a 19 per cent tax then the average take-home pay for Australian working holiday-makers would have been around $14.34 an hour. This compares with $13.79 an hour in New Zealand under a backpacker scheme and under $13.39 an hour under a Canadian backpacker scheme.

After we did this, we discussed it, and it was agreed to by the NFF, NSW Farmers, the Northern Territory Farmers Association, the QFF, the Apple and Pear Growers Association of South Australia, and the VFF. It became an eminently sensible proposal to pursue. That position has also been endorsed by the Senate Economics Legislation Committee, which also recommends that this rate be passed.

But there was a group that decided it was not the rate they wanted. Senator Jacqui Lambie became the leading economic light of the Australian Labor Party. She proposed a different rate—a rate of 10½ per cent. The problem with 10½ per cent is that this does not create fairness; it creates a mechanism to attract foreign workers into Australia to take Australian jobs. It seems awfully strange when the member for Maribyrnong, the former AWU leader, has come up with a reason to put Australian workers out of work and replace them with foreign workers.

It is rather remarkable, the lengths he will go to to create a political storm, to throw rubbish on the Australian agricultural industry, to create dissent and to create hurt for the purpose of political intrigue. If it is really his belief that we should have a 10.5 per cent tax rate, then why did he not propose it at the election? Because he had no intention of proposing a rate like that. The rate he proposed at the election was 32½ per cent, and that rate was booked by the Treasurer.

So now we have the Australian Labor Party basically letting their workers go, creating an advantage for foreign workers and putting Australian workers out of a job—and they do it for nothing more than political intrigue. He sits there smiling like the Cheshire cat. He thinks this is funny. It is just as funny as it was with the Chiquita Mushroom workers. It is just as funny as it was with Clean Event. This is what he thinks about the Australian working man and woman. This is what he is doing to the Australian working man and woman on the farm. He does not care about them; all he cares about is political intrigue and creating dissent and creating discord. It is an absolute disgrace, what the Labor Party has done to the backpacker—(Time expired)

Mr Turnbull: I ask that further questions be placed on the Notice Paper.
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE: ADDITIONAL ANSWERS

Dairy Industry

Mr JOYCE (New England—Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources) (15:12): Mr Speaker, I wish to add to an answer about the $35.5 million in Dairy Recovery Concessional Loans that the member for Indi asked about. Loans for 67 farmers have been approved across the participating states—Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales—as at 4 November. In Victoria alone, $28.4 million in Dairy Recovery Concessional Loans, benefiting 58 farmers, have been approved as of 4 November 2016. As I indicated in my answer, a further $9.9 million in loan offers have been made to 17 farmers—all of these in Victoria.

QUESTIONS TO THE SPEAKER

Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources

Mr FITZGIBBON (Hunter) (15:13): Mr Speaker, I remind you that during 2014 I asked a question of the Minister for Agriculture about drought relief. He provided an answer but subsequently changed the Hansard of that answer.

The SPEAKER (15:14): No—

Mr FITZGIBBON: Please hear me out, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I will hear the member for Hunter.

Mr FITZGIBBON: While the minister corrected the Hansard—and he needed to correct the answer for very good reason—he has never come back to the House as the minister and corrected the misleading of the House. I ask you whether it is now appropriate that he do so.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hunter knows two things: if he wishes to raise those sorts of matters, he has a number of opportunities to raise them during the sitting of the House; or he can write to me or to any other authority. My recollection from when I was a humble backbencher is that this was raised with the Speaker at the time. That is my recollection. I know it is something that is dear to the heart of the member for Hunter, because I have it bellowing into my left ear through interjections during most question times. If I have anything to say about the matter, I will let the member for Hunter know and then I will let the House know.

DOCUMENTS

Presentation

Mr PYNE (Sturt—Leader of the House and Minister for Defence Industry) (15:15): Documents are presented as listed in the schedule circulated to honourable members. Details of the documents will be recorded in the Votes and Proceedings.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Inequality

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

The need for the Government to address rising inequality and division in Australia.
I call upon those members who approve of the proposed discussion to rise in their places.

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

**Mr SHORTEN** (Maribyrnong—Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): There is indeed an urgent need for the government and the parliament to address rising inequality and division in Australia. In that vein, this undoubtedly a lesson to be learned from the recent US election. I appreciate that, whilst our two nations share common values and ideals, we are not the United States. Three decades ago we took a different economic direction. We went a different way. The United States chose Reaganism and trickle-down economics; Australia chose Hawke and Keating and the Accord.

In Australia we believe in a minimum wage that is a living wage, a wage that rises regularly and prevents poverty, not sustains it. We believe a university education should be earned on merit, not determined by one's income or by the income of one's parents. It is why Labor governments keep university affordable. We believe Australians who work hard their whole lives deserve dignity in retirement. It is why Labor built universal superannuation and why we always fight for a fair go for pensioners. We believe that the health of any one of us matters to all of us. It is why we created Medicare and why we will fight to protect it.

The numbers tell the story about addressing inequality and division. In 1985 the minimum wage in Australia was A$5.66 an hour; in 2015 it had risen to A$17.29 per hour, an increase of 11.2 per cent in real terms. In the United States in 1985 the minimum wage was US$3.35 an hour; in 2015 it was US$7.25 an hour, a decrease in real terms of 21 per cent. In the last 20 years the proportion of our population aged 25 to 34 earning a tertiary degree grew by almost 90 per cent, but it increased by just 30 per cent in the United States. Australia's middle class holds 40 per cent of our national wealth; the American middle class holds just 19 per cent of theirs.

The Australian model is one of a decent safety net and a strong middle class, and it steered Australia through the global financial crisis. The member for Lilley presided over an economy that did not just weather the world storm; it grew. This was not in spite of Labor's belief in inclusive prosperity but because of it. After the GFC we reinvested in productivity and social equity through the National Disability Insurance Scheme, empowering an extra 470,000 Australians living with disability, and their carers, to participate in our growing economy. The Australian model grows national wealth through productivity, skills, permanent migration, and trade and investment, underpinned by a strong safety net of a fair minimum wage, compulsory superannuation, Medicare, the NDIS and the pension.

We can never be complacent or arrogant about what we have built, and we should acknowledge that all sides of politics have previously made a contribution to the Australian story. But economic change is never even, and it is always hard. We must recognise that there are real challenges in our economy right now. Living standards are two per cent lower than when Labor left office. Most jobs being lost are full-time jobs; most jobs being created are part-time jobs. Productivity is at a standstill; wages growth is flatlining; insecure work is on the rise. More and more Australians worry about being offshored, outsourced, contracted out or downsized. Income inequality is at a disturbing 70-year high. Childcare costs are devouring the wages of working parents. Our tax system continues to disproportionately favour the wealthy individuals and multinational companies who can afford the advice to avoid paying
their fair share. Next time, for the first time ever, homeowners will be in the minority, because a generation have been locked out of the market by tax concessions for speculators.

Our regions are all too often missing out on local jobs in the regions. People in Gladstone, Townsville and Mackay listen to this government talk about massive headline growth and they wonder why it has not delivered for them. People in Gove and Geelong, the Hunter and the suburbs of Perth work their last shifts as their factories and refineries close; yet all they hear is this Prime Minister talking about exciting times. People in Elizabeth and Broadmeadows and North-Western Tasmania see the government puff its chest out about creating jobs and they wonder why so many people in their own community cannot find work. From mining towns to manufacturing suburbs and regional Australia people are hungry for recognition, hungry for Australia’s leaders to recognise that the economy is not working in the interests of ordinary Australians. In this place we should never discount or dismiss the difficulties of people who are struggling—the more than 700,000 Australians who cannot find a single hour of paid work a week, and the more than a million Australians who regularly record that they would like more hours of work by simply cannot obtain them. There are the 800,000 of our fellow Australians on the disability pension, marginalised and blamed rather than supported into work.

We should not be surprised that in our own country Australians doing it tough are furious when they see workers brought in on 457 visas and exploited to undercut Australian wages—dodgy operators bringing people in to work as cabinetmakers, cooks, carpenters, electricians and motor mechanics and paying them, in some cases, $10 an hour or less. We need to recognise that where economic change is fast and uncertain, where economic growth is concentrated in the hands of a few, where there is a widening gap in incomes and opportunities, rewarding the top end and leaving the rest behind, these are the conditions for demagogues and the breeding ground for the politics of blame, of us versus them.

We are not yet at the point of the United States, but unless action is taken it is the direction in which we are heading. This is not the time to aggravate inequality and division with cuts to working- and middle-class families and a $50 billion giveaway to multinational companies, with $17,000 tax cuts plus for millionaires thrown in for good measure. This is no time, also, to appease those who peddle prejudice by giving into their demands.

Where ever there is a vacuum in leadership, it will be filled by extremism. But Labor will not be retreating. We will not lower ourselves to the politics of fear. We will not play the race card; we will not weaken protections against hate speech; we will not marginalise the poor, the sick and the vulnerable for a grubby political dividend. We give more credit to Australians than that. We think more of this country and what we can achieve and where we can go. This is not the time for weasel words; it is the time for policies that put people first. It is time to prioritise the first home buyers and to put the great Australian dream of housing affordability back into the reach of working- and middle-class families. It is time to stand up for Australian jobs. It is time to crack down on employers using and abusing our visa system to import and exploit cheap labour. It is time to invest in our schools. It is time to back public TAFE and Australian apprentices. It is time to get nation-building projects like high-speed rail up and going and to put Australians to work on these projects. It is time to protect Medicare, because every Australian should be able to see a doctor when they are sick and be able to afford the medicine that makes them better.
Labor does not believe in a world of trade agreements which do not deliver the blue-collar jobs for those hurt by these agreements. We cannot be a parliament that protects the banks during the GFC but denies a royal commission to the victims of banking scandals in these circumstances. We cannot allow corporate donors to exert their influence on election campaigns without transparency, accountability and election-funding reform. This government should not and cannot subsidise private health providers exclusively while cutting Medicare and our hospital funding. All this does is concentrate power in the hands of the wealthy few and guarantee that more and more people are left behind.

My party will heed the lessons we saw in Detroit, Michigan and Ohio, Pennsylvania. Labor will deliver an economy that serves and includes working- and middle-class people. Labor will buy Australian, build Australian and employ Australian. We will never leave people behind.

Mr LAUNDY (Reid—Assistant Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science) (15:25):
Between 2007 and 2012 I was happily working away in my family business but I was strongly of the opinion that this country faced real problems. In the four years I have been in this place—and the Leader of the Opposition talked about division—I have taken great pride in representing one of the most culturally diverse seats in federal parliament and standing up to unite our community at every turn. There is no us and them—and the Leader of the Opposition used that term in his speech. There is no us and them; there is just us. I have been saying this for four years.

I am glad the Leader of the Opposition spoke at least a little bit about the numbers because the thing that drove me to this place—the thing that made me turn my back on my career for a little while before I go back to it—is the gross misunderstanding of the gravity of the challenge that this country actually faces. You hear the term 'structural budget' used—it is used day in and day out—but it is never explained. Between 2013 and 2014 former Treasurer Hockey brought down the Intergenerational report. It happened every 10 years and looks 40 years into the future. It belled the cat. In the next 40 years our population will grow in the 65-plus-age bracket at three times the rate that it will in the zero-to-65-age bracket.

In 1910 in this country we introduced the pension. We set the retirement age at 65. Why did we do that? Because the average life expectancy in 1910 was 55. No-one got there. If you did, it was a rarity. The pension was a genuine safety net for those who were considered old in those days. In the next 40 years average life expectancy will reach 92 years of age for a female and 90 years of age for a male. You will work between 18 and 65 or 67, depending on where the retirement age is moved to, and you will retire after that. If you live on social security from zero to 18 you will most likely be the recipient of a public education and the recipient of universal health care. You will work between 18 and 65 and pay tax. Between 65 or 67 and 92 four out of five of us will live on a pension. That is the structural budget deficit. What does it look like? Where is the equality built into this system?

The Leader of the Opposition so quickly passed over—he did use the term, and he was correct—the fact that almost one-third of the workers inside Australia's tax system sit in our middle tax bracket. That 37.3 per cent pay 28.7 per cent of the tax. Where has the equity always been in Australian politics? It has been in our progressive taxation system. As we speak our top rate of tax is 49c in the dollar. What does that mean for me coming from a business background? The Australian government is a joint venture partner with everyone
who pays 49c in the dollar in tax. The Leader of the Opposition uses—and used in the election campaign—the example of the taxpayer earning $1 million. He mentioned the $16,000 tax cut for that taxpayer, which we took to the election. What he does not say is that if you earn $1 million a year in this country, under the scheme as it sits today, you will pay $460,000 in tax—an effective tax rate of 46c in the dollar. If the deficit levy expires, the marginal tax rate will go back to 47c in the dollar. That will mean that if you earn $1 million you will pay $443,000 or an effective rate of 44.3c in the dollar. If you earn the median wage in this country, $80,000, you will pay $16,000 in tax—an effective rate of 21c in the dollar. That is where the equality in this country lies and where it will always lie.

Those opposite want to talk about the composition of those that pay tax, but they do not want to focus on what makes taxpaying fair. If you want to know what it is, here is the break-up: if you earn less than $18,200 a year in this country, you pay no tax, due to the coalition government.

Opposition members interjecting—

Mr LAUNDY: Yes, we abolished the carbon tax and we kept the tax-free threshold. One in five Australians pay no tax. If you earn between $18,200 and $37,000 a year—24 per cent of Australia do that—that is 2½ per cent of our tax take. If you earn between $37,000 and $80,000—which is 37.3, as the Leader of the Opposition said—that is 28.7 per cent of our tax take. Here is the kicker, 18 per cent of Australia sit in the demographic earning $80,000 and above, and they pay 70 per cent of the tax in this country. That is where the equality lies.

The problem we have is sitting on the expense side, because of the structural budget deficit that I have explained. In the next four years, welfare expenditure in this country will move from $159 billion a year to $192 billion a year—an increase of $33 billion. Health expenditure will increase from $71 billion a year to $80 billion a year—an increase of 12½ per cent. Inside welfare, out of that $33 billion, pensions will increase from $63 billion to $73 billion—there is $10 billion; there is a third of the $30 billion. The NDIS, which was left unfunded by those opposite—a $5 billion black hole—will move from $33 billion to $53 billion. There is your $30 billion increase in those two categories alone.

We have real issues in this country. The one thing I agree with the Leader of the Opposition on is that we have issues confronting us moving forward. However, there is no magic pudding economics. The troubles are real. They are demographic. We have fertility rates sitting at all-time lows. You need 2.1 children per woman under the age of 49 to replace yourself in this country. That is just replacement. Our fertility rates are sitting at 1.5 to 1.6—historic lows. It is not unique to any other First World economy; we are just getting there later. We are there, and we need to work together.

The Leader of the Opposition wants division and he wants to sit here and offer all sorts of opinions up about the Trump campaign and the Clinton campaign. Well, I will tell you for the eight weeks of the campaign in Reid every morning within a half an hour of getting to a train station, I had people turn up in black shirts, green shirts and red shirts. I had people from the CFMEU yelling abuse to the point where I think they actually won me votes, but I felt like I was in the front lines of a US election campaign. Yes, he spoke about casual jobs. Why are there casual jobs—160,000 of them since September 2015? I will tell those opposite, because they have never run a business. You need flexibility since the GFC. You cannot increase prices, because of uncertain demand, and you need the flexibility of having casual workers so
that, if the trade is not there, you can send them home. Why? Because, if they are there and you are not taking revenue, you lose money. I have spent four years in this place. I agree that so much of the US does flow this way—

Ms Husar interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): The member for Lindsay will leave, under standing order 94(a).

The member for Lindsay then left the chamber.

Mr LAUNDY: The Leader of the Opposition sat there and told us about how much Bob Hawke and Paul Keating did to stop it, whether it is McDonald's, whether it is suing people— which was never around in my lifetime. You know what I hope never does come here, but I had a snapshot of it in the eight weeks in Reid—it is sheer and rank hypocrisy for the Leader of the Opposition to sit here and lecture, after he lied to the Australian people, bald-faced and looking them in the eye, telling us that we should go to a higher level—

Mr Conroy: Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask that the member withdraw that.

Mr LAUNDY: Member for Shortland, he lied. He looked Australia in the eye and told them we were selling Medicare. Ed Husic agreed to it in a 2GB radio interview.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Assistant Minister—

Mr LAUNDY: He misled the Australian people. I withdraw 'lied'. He misled the Australian people.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr LAUNDY: He tricked them.

Mr Conroy interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Shortland will return to his seat.

Mr LAUNDY: He tricked them into voting Labor and, you know what, it was American in style. It has no place in this country. I know that on our side we will fight to stay above what those in opposition delivered for the eight weeks of the election campaign.

Mr Conroy interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Shortland will return to his seat. There is a general warning on this House. The member for Newcastle is out of her place. The member for Bruce is out of his place. If there is any more of this behaviour, I will be removing them under standing order 94(a).

Mr Conroy: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member withdrew the—

Mr Hawke interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister withdrew. The member for Shortland will return to his seat. The member for Mitchell will not undertake a private debate across the House while one of his cohort is speaking.

Mr GEORGANAS (Hindmarsh) (15:37): I too rise to speak about the need for this government to address rising inequality in our society, in our community, and division in Australia. I do so by giving a couple of quick examples. We just heard the other side claiming that this side is the divisive side. I want to say one thing to this House. It is that side that
speaks about 'lifters and leaners'. It is that side that wants to give $50 billion to the richest people in Australia as a tax cut, and yet at the same time, last week, over 300,000 pensioners across this country received a letter telling them that they will have their pensions cut because of the changes in the assets test and the deeming rates. We are giving $50 billion to the richest people of Australia and punishing pensioners who have worked all their lives, who have saved their meagre savings to not be a burden on the taxpayers and on this nation, and we are punishing them. This is what the divisiveness is all about.

The flow-on effects of inequality can be disastrous for a nation. It stifles economic growth, crime can increase, people's health outcomes worsen, there can be political unrest and poorer education levels in society. I do not need to tell you all that has very dire and long-lasting consequences for Australian society. The Abbott-Turnbull Liberal government in recent years has undertaken policy decisions that will undoubtedly adversely affect our nation's equality. But what can you expect, as I said earlier, when you have a government that divides people into two groups, lifters and leaners? You can see examples of this inequity in virtually every single portfolio, and it is very disturbing. Medicare is the perfect example. We heard the member opposite talk about some furphy or lie about Medicare during the election campaign. People were scared of this government when it comes to Medicare. In the last three years they tried to bring in a co-payment. When they failed through the parliament to bring in a co-payment—because we voted against it and others in the Senate voted against—they then decided to go through the backdoor way. What was the backdoor way? Putting a freeze on the payments to doctors.

Mr Hawke interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): The member for Mitchell is warned.

Mr GEORGANAS: No wonder people were scared of your Medicare policy. Your record is inadequate when it comes to Medicare. Your government and your side of politics continuously want to water down Medicare. We need a society and a country where we have universal health care. We want it to matter when you show your Medicare card, not your credit card. Medicare is a perfect example of a good policy, a universal policy, that takes away the inadequacies of inequality.

The result of this freeze on payments to GPs will be dearer trips to the doctor. They will be more expensive, and people will not be able to afford to go to the doctor. It is okay if you have got money. If you are part of that cohort that will receive the $50 billion tax cut, that is fine. But, if you are a single mum with three kids and they all get the flu continuously over the winter period, what do you do then? Does the government care about those people? Certainly no thought has gone into it at all. And, if that is not enough, you are even cutting the children's dental program. Where is the equality there? Tell me where that equality is, when we see $50 billion for the richest people in this nation and we are cutting from pensioners.

We also see this growing inequality in our schools. The government has torn up the unity ticket that they took to the election campaign. In other words, they have stopped 'giving a Gonski', and all students will suffer as a result, because through education is the best way to deliver equity. It is the best way to change someone's life for the better, and we want to make sure that every single student, every single child, in this country gets the education that they deserve, regardless of the postcode where they live, regardless of their background and regardless of what circumstances they come from.
The government tried to deregulate our universities and burden students with $100,000 degrees, imposing a 'debt sentence' on thousands of Australian students. When it comes to blue-collar workers, they have literally chased industries out of this country. We all remember the former Treasurer Mr Hockey’s speech in this place towards the end of 2013, where he basically shoed GMH out of the country. We need this government to stand up for blue-collar workers— *(Time expired)*

Mr HOWARTH (Petrie) (15:42): It is great to rise to talk on this MPI. You want to talk about inequality and division in Australia. That is what Labor is all about. They thrive on division. This MPI is totally disgraceful. They try to create division everywhere they go. At the last election, they created division by telling porky pies about Medicare and other issues. The member for Hindmarsh's contribution did not line up with what they were saying at the federal election. He was talking about $50 billion tax cuts to the richest Australians, but during the election they said it was $50 billion tax cuts to overseas investors. You might remember that, Member for Hindmarsh. You need to listen to your leader, champ, because at the end of the day he was saying that tax cuts would deliver dividends to overseas investors. On that side of the House they do not want to talk about small businesses. They do not want to help businesses above $2 million, above $10 million, above $50 million. Every single one of them spoke only about billion-dollar companies. But the jobs growth is in those small and middle companies as well.

We heard from the Leader of the Opposition. He talks about university costs as though somehow they are going up, when the government pays 60 per cent of them. We have been left with this massive debt from Labor. Do you think it is in the government's best interests for university costs to go up, when we are paying 60 per cent? Their argument is void. It is defunct. We saw the Leader of the Opposition talk about saving Medicare, yet at the same time health funding has gone up in this country. It continues to go up. It is the same with education funding. School principals and members of the gallery would have thought, based on the Labor Party’s arguments, that somehow, when the coalition got in, education funding was going to go down, but it has actually doubled in the last few years. It has doubled and it is continuing to go up and it will continue to go up by a few per cent every year. How do you think we pay for that? It is through income tax. It is through company tax from businesses. You talk about company tax cuts. If the member for Hindmarsh understood the way it worked: if you lower company tax and a shareholder takes an investment, they pay it through income tax anyway. You need to think about that.

But division in this country has never been higher when it comes to the Labor Party. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the member for Lilley and how he saved us during the GFC. He failed to mention that there were billions of dollars in the bank and no debt. But what did the member for Lilley and others continue to do? They continued to increase income tax. And the members for Shortland and Newcastle are right: they did raise the tax-free threshold to $18,000. But at the same time, they put it up for middle- and high-income earners—once again, a class-warfare and divisive act.

The member for Lilley introduced a luxury car tax, as though somehow that would tax the rich more. But what did it do? It hit everyone who drove a LandCruiser. They continue to slash superannuation contributions. They have this divisive debate about employees versus employers. They talk about foreign workers versus Australian workers. They want to give tax
cuts to backpackers. They want to give it a rate of 10 per cent, as though 81 per cent of take-home pay for foreign workers and backpackers is not acceptable. I would think it was pretty good if I could get 81 per cent of my take-home pay and was paying 19 per cent tax. But what do they want to do? They want a rate of 10 per cent, and some divisive rhetoric, when most of them do not even represent country areas.

Look at the same-sex marriage plebiscite. They divide the nation in relation to same-sex marriage: those people who support same-sex marriage and those people who do not. The poor old member for Blair has changed his position on this issue. He was bullied into it by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He said for years—he has gone to all the churches in the area—’I don’t support same-sex marriage.’ And now he does. They are a divisive, angry bunch on the other side of the House. If I had a dollar for every time the member for Lilley and the Leader of the Opposition mentioned ‘inclusive prosperity’ and ‘trickle-down economics’, I would be a millionaire. Yet the member for Lilley says today in his own article that thankfully in Australia we have not gone down the American road of a hollowed out middle class and an army of working poor. They come up with all these great analogies that draw in their base, but they have no practical solution. And look at multinational tax avoidance. They voted against it. What a joke. (Time expired)

Mr Hill interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): I remind the member for Bruce that there is a general warning.

Mr KHALIL (Wills) (15:47): I would like to highlight the need for this government to address rising inequality and division in Australia. Across a range of policy areas—Medicare, education, jobs and economic fairness—this government is failing Australia and failing my constituents in my seat of Wills. Right across the nation they are failing the people of Australia at a time when these areas are really crying out for attention.

While this government is preoccupied with its divisive agenda of cutting the social safety net, removing protections from hate speech and cosying up to the big end of town with a $50 billion tax cut for big business, they have taken their eye off the critical matter of Australian jobs. They have no plan to reverse the slide in full-time work which has seen 112,000 full-time jobs lost since the start of this year. They have no plan to help the 1.1 million Australians who are underemployed to get more hours at work. They have no plan to close the pay and participation gaps for Australian women, which have been stubbornly high for far too long. And they certainly have no plan for the 600 workers at the Ford factory in Broadmeadows or the 750 workers at Hazelwood who have lost their jobs in the past month alone, or the thousands of other Australians around the country who are now wondering whether their jobs—their livelihoods—will go the same way. This is a government that deals in division instead of dedicating itself to the task of growing more good jobs for the Australians who need them.

While there are many winners in our globalised world, there are also many people who have lost out. Thousands of workers have lost or are about to lose their manufacturing jobs. Many live in my electorate of Wills. And not all of these workers, after 20 years or more in a Holden or a Ford plant, can become baristas or start-up tech gurus in our so-called exciting innovation society that the Prime Minister is so fond of talking about. I say to these people that we on this side, the Labor Party, and the labour movement, are doing the hard yards,
thinking hard and developing policies that, upon winning government, we will implement—policies that actually retrain and retool workers, provide vocational education, establish job creation programs and provide support to families that are struggling. Even though this government has abandoned them, I say to these people who feel disconnected, who feel lost, who feel angry: don't give yourselves up to the haters. Keep faith in us, the Labor Party, because we will ensure that there will be better days ahead.

In the suburb of Glenroy in my electorate of Wills, 34 per cent of children are considered highly vulnerable on at least one index measure provided by the Australian Early Development Census. This census measures physical health, social competence, emotional maturity, language and cognitive skills, and communication skills. The Victorian average for vulnerable children is only 20 per cent. These statistics make it startlingly clear that investment in both health care and education is desperately needed in suburbs like Glenroy, which has a rapidly swelling population. That is why we on this side, Labor, are so committed to projects that will work for people in those local communities. The Glenroy Community Hub, for example, which we, Labor, have committed funds to, would include, amongst other things, an integrated children's centre—including maternal and child health services—a kindergarten, child care and facilities for the operation of a community health practice. We have committed money to that project because we believe that this will help the people in those communities.

Despite promising to invest in early childhood education, this government has actually delivered nothing that will assist families to ensure that their children get more access to early education, and now families will not see a cent of new investment in child care until mid-2018—if ever. Labor took to the last election policies that would help ensure that our children are equipped with the skills they need to get ahead in our modern economy. Investment in education is proven to be good for our economy, good for advancing equality and good for reducing inequality. That is why we are committed to it. In contrast, this Prime Minister has torn up the commitment on schools funding he took to the last election, and we have a government intent on undermining our entire education system.

I have also spoken extensively in this place about my passion for multiculturalism and in defence of Australia's vibrant multicultural model, a model that works because we embrace diversity. This model works because we can be proud to be Australian and proud of our cultural heritage. Yet we have a government here which promotes divisiveness. They are attaing section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, trying to undermine the protection that exists there, to stoke division and undermine one of the key pillars of our multicultural society. We will not let them do this.

Ms HENDERSON (Corangamite) (15:52): When the Leader of the Opposition conceded defeat at this year's general election, he promised to be a constructive opposition leader and oversee a constructive opposition. The toxic Labor politics of the 44th Parliament was to be no more, he promised us—the refusal to support our legislation to combat multinational tax avoidance, the nonsensical refusal to support Labor's own $5 billion budget savings, the refusal to acknowledge the corruption and lawlessness in the Australian building and construction sector, the toxic lies that were peddled about Medicare. The Leader of the Opposition even today spoke about respect for women. What about respect for the women
and men who were so fearful of not being able to pay their health costs, because of the lies that Labor told?

Mr Hill: It's the truth!

Ms HENDERSON: It was an absolute, utter scandal, but Labor could not care less. Truth mattered not. The Medicare rebate was frozen by Labor back in 2013. The Medicare rebate was frozen because Labor had made such a mess of its budget, with spiralling debts and deficit, and four surpluses that it promised to deliver but never did. There was only one ice king responsible for that frozen rebate in this place, and it was the Leader of the Opposition. This year we are investing more than $22 billion in Medicare, over $1 billion more than last year. This will increase to nearly $26 billion in 2019-20.

The Leader of the Opposition speaks about manufacturing jobs in Geelong. I am very proud to represent a large part of Geelong. Yes, the people of Geelong are hurting after Ford closed its manufacturing operations—under the previous Labor government. The auto industry started to close in this country under Labor, not helped by a carbon tax that was costing manufacturing $1.1 billion. Before the election we heard about Labor's 50 per cent renewable energy target, but with no plan to get there, putting at risk thousands of blue-collar jobs for green votes in the city. Labor took the same approach when it sat in silence as Daniel Andrews cancelled the East West Link at a cost of $1.2 billion, sacrificing blue-collar jobs once again for green votes in the city of Melbourne. It was an absolute disgrace. We saw division everywhere. And, yet again, this Labor opposition sat in silence as Labor attempted to destroy the CFA, working in conjunction with the militant UFU. Did Labor understand the division that this caused in regional Victoria, including many communities right throughout the Corangamite electorate? Where were Labor's guts to stand up to something that they knew, fundamentally, was wrong?

What have we seen in this 45th Parliament? Despite the promises of the Leader of the Opposition, more of the same. Our alternative Prime Minister of this country determined that it was proper to call President-elect Trump barking mad. We all may have different views about different leaders in different parts of the world, but for an alternative Prime Minister to do that was absolutely irresponsible and divisive. He refused to support a plebiscite for same-sex marriage after saying he would support it—divisive politics, that is what drove that decision. Now we hear again in this chamber, in this debate, a continuation of the Medicare lie—more gutter politics from Labor. A continuation of the lie. And now we hear more gutter politics about a backpacker tax giving a better tax rate to foreign workers than Australians. Even on small business tax cuts—what hypocrisy, what divisiveness from Labor. Previously, Labor supported small business tax cuts, because they knew they were good for jobs. Now, because it is unprincipled and divisive, it is opposing those tax cuts. Even on pensions, where we delivered $30 a fortnight to 170,000 of the most vulnerable pensioners, Labor has denied that. It is divisive, gutter politics from Labor.

Ms Butler interjecting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): The member for Griffith is out of her place, and she is warned.
Dr FREELANDER (Macarthur) (15:57): In medicine, I am used to dealing with reality, but it seems I have been dealing with a fantasy world in here today—after what I have been hearing from the other side. This is a matter of public importance that is very important to me and to the kids I have been looking after for many years.

In his seminal book, *The End of Certainty*, the journalist and thinker Paul Kelly identified egalitarianism as one of the six pillars of what he and others have called the Australian settlement. The other pillars were a faith in government authority, centralised wage fixation, protection for industry and jobs, dependence on a great power for our security and finance, and, above all, a hostility to our location, as exhibited by the fear of external domination and internal contamination. The former great Prime Minister Paul Keating was able to rightly say, in 1996, after the social, cultural and economic reforms of the 1980s and 1990s, that the essentially introspective, defensive and dependent framework had crumbled. But 20 years on, I am not so sure. Much of what was nasty, short-sighted or selfish about the Australian settlement of the 1900s seems to be making a comeback. The question for us today is, can that faux nostalgia for those imaginary, safer, better times return in some new mutated and malignant form?

It seems to me that the dark but enticing promise of a new age of populism will fail only because of the sixth principle of the Australian settlement—egalitarianism has continued to work as a moderating influence. Because of its permeating influence, Australia does not have the same horrendous disparities of income and wealth that we see elsewhere in the world. We are far from perfect, it is true, and we are heading in the wrong direction. But because reforming governments here have tempered their zeal for economic reform and greater efficiency with a solid commitment to protecting those harmed or hurt by change, we have a solid chance of saving ourselves from our own worst instincts. That certainly was the case in the Hawke and Keating years and it, too, was a hallmark of the Rudd and Gillard governments as they struggled with the shock and consequences of the GFC and were able to bring us through successfully.

Egalitarianism is not perfect. It has its weaknesses. It can be very blokey and, unfortunately, invariably seems to stop at our borders. It is a weak reed—a weak defence against baser urges, but it did and it does matter. In particular, I would like to focus on two main areas: health and housing. There are many other areas of inequality but health and housing are the two most important and dear to my heart. It is my view that without access to good quality health care and housing it is almost impossible for families to function appropriately in our society. This means that children are born of low birth weight, often have nutritional problems during pregnancy, there is substance abuse and lack of a stable environment. It makes them very prone to neuro-developmental outcomes that follow on.

Martin Luther King said that discrimination in health care is the worst form of discrimination. I recently visited the Nagle Centre in Campbelltown, a wonderful community asset run by the St Vincent de Paul Society. I was appalled by the number of people living on the streets who attend to just simple things: hot showers, food, psychological support, and sometimes just someone who cares about them.

Equality in access to health care is fast becoming a dream for many Australians. I was recently contacted by an 86-year-old gentleman suffering from bilateral cataracts who had been on the public waiting list for over a year, yet he was told that if he could afford $4,000 to
$5,000 he could have the operation next week. Waiting lists in my electorate for ear surgery for children with hearing loss are now over one year, which affects schooling and speech development and long-term outcomes. This is not the Australia I want for my grandchildren.

In housing, almost one in 200 Australians are homeless and 200,000 households are on social housing waiting lists. In his inquiry in the last parliament the member for Bennelong demonstrated that there are things that need to be done for housing affordability. For his trouble he was removed and his inquiry was shut down.

I have spoken about these major areas of inequality. Many people feel that they are being ignored by governments, and particularly our government, in having equity in our society. It is easy to understand why. Australians have always regarded themselves as egalitarian. I do think we all want an inclusive society. However, if we are to reverse recent trends away from equality it will take active policies from the government rather than the laissez-faire attitude demonstrated to date, both in health care, in housing and in many other ways.

Mr HOGAN (Page) (16:02): I want to pick up on a point mentioned earlier by the member for Petrie. He brought up the example of the backpacker tax, and we are talking about the issue of inequality. The previous Labor government, in fact, brought in the backpacker tax of 32.5 per cent. We were told by industry groups that a tax at that level would not work and the backpackers would not come. We obviously did not want the blueberries and other crops to just rot away without being picked, so we lowered the tax to 19 per cent.

Why did we lower the tax to 19 per cent? We did so because that is the lowest rate of taxation you pay in Australia. The lowest tax rate in Australia cuts in at 19 per cent. We felt that it was fair and reasonable that a backpacker here picking fruit standing next to an Australian worker should pay the same rate of tax. So their inequality measure is that they actually want to the backpacker to pay less tax than the Australian worker. So they want to almost make it easier for foreign workers to do Australian jobs. That is not an inequality that we want to get into.

Some of the points that have been raised by members of the opposition talk about us and them. I think the member for Reid said it very well: 'There is no us and them in this country. There is simply us.' We make no bones about the fact that we want to help those who are having a go. We want to set the parameters of this country so that if you are trying to run a small business or employ other people we make it as easy for you as we can.

In fact, I would like to acknowledge Candy from Candylane Fashion Boutique, who is in the chamber today. She is a small business owner and operator in Alstonville, in my electorate, who employs not only herself but other people as well. We want to make life easier for Candy. That is why we have brought in the small business tax cut: because we know that small business is the biggest driver of employment in this country and that it is important that we extend this to as many businesses as we can.

I was interested too—I struggled, but I actually did listen to the Leader of the Opposition earlier. He went back to the Hawke and Keating days and started to discuss Reaganomics and Thatcher, and Hawke and Keating, but he did not go on to mention some of the things that the Hawke and Keating governments did. But I will remind members opposite, because it is important that they learn the lessons of people they regard as great Labor legends. Do you know what Hawke and Keating did? They lowered company tax rates. They lowered company tax rates enormously. They took them from levels like 60 per cent down into the 40s. The lowered them progressively over time.
Do you know why your great previous Labor leaders did that? Because they understood what drives job growth in this country and what drives economic growth in this country. They knew that we had to remain competitive with countries and tax rates overseas. Your great Labor legends lowered company tax rates, and not just for small business—what we are proposing in the short-term—but for big business, for everyone. Your great Labor leaders understood that our company tax rate had to remain competitive and they lowered it enormously.

Deputy Speaker, as you would probably know, we have created 160,000 jobs just in the last 12 months. We are doing it through a whole array of measures, whether it be reducing red tape or, again, making things easier for small business. Labor, unfortunately—it is easy to do, and we saw the Leader of the Opposition do it today—are running populist politics and using fear as the great motivator. That is why they are opposing things that they previously supported. That includes business tax cuts.

As I think the previous member on our side, the member for Petrie, suggested, you would think from listening to Labor that we are actually cutting money to essential services. We are not. Money spent on education has increased. It was $13 billion when we got into government in 2013 and in the forward estimates it is projected to be $20 billion by 2020. It is the same with health spending. We have also increased spending on health every year. The great failure of the other side is that they do not know how to create the money. They think there is a gold and honey pot out there. We need to support business so that we have more taxpayer dollars to support social services.

Ms Bird (Cunningham) (16:07): I have to say that the MPI raised by the Leader of the Opposition is a really pertinent issue to be addressing at the end of this week—rising inequality in our communities and of the potential for division that can come from a society where people are missing out on the opportunities that we have, for many generations, seen as a birthright in Australia.

I was doing some research this week in preparation for a Remembrance Day speech tomorrow in the suburb of Corrimal, at Corrimal RSL, in my area. There was a fabulous story in one of the old newspapers that I found about a Red Cross branch being established in 1914 in the suburb and about how it was actually established. It was through the efforts of local workers, some of them in a manufacturing base there, some miners and some local community people, determining that they were going to do fundraising activities. I think the local soccer club was doing a fancy dress game and raising money that way. Every week, the workers were pitching in a percentage of their wages towards establishing a fund for the Red Cross. At the same time, in that same period in my area, miners union lodgers regularly put forward a contribution out of their wage to establish things such as our local hospitals.

We have a very strong foundation of communities in this country who take responsibility for helping each other. We see that even up to today. I regularly see on my Facebook feed social media fundraising efforts from local people for a local organisation or a local family who is doing it tough. It is great to see how many people go on and give a little bit—whatever they can—using that mechanism. It is the modern version of those very early, turn-of-the-century forms of fundraising 100 years ago. We have a very entrenched, pervasive and valuable culture that says, when people are struggling or having difficulties, we all pull together. That egalitarian spirit has to be reflected in the parliaments that represent those
people. That is what people expect. They did it then, and they do it today. They stand up and take action to help each other and to create strength, unity and opportunity for people in their communities. They want governments that do the same.

In the last federal election, we were addressing those very issues across the portfolio areas. It may have been the fact that, for the first time, we were about to face a generation who will not have the retirement security of home ownership. It is a foundation that has given so much stability in Australia for people as they leave the workforce in their older years. It was the combination of a strong pension system, which was then built upon by a sound and effective superannuation system, and the capacity to achieve homeownership that gave us dignity and security in our retirement years. We are now seeing a generation of young people for whom housing affordability and home ownership is looking like it will never be within their reach in their lifetime. Shadow ministers from the Leader of the Opposition down were talking about tackling these growing inequalities. A generation may not, for the first time, be able to give to the next generation better circumstances than they had in their lifetime.

I am glad the member for Lilley is here because he has been a powerful voice for these issues that are playing out in our communities. Our communities know how to look after each other. Whether it is health, whether it is education, whether it is supporting apprenticeships—which I am very passionate about—or whether it is giving opportunities for higher education, communities expect their governments to create circumstances that support them. They do not expect them to be ripping away at the fabric that has created the great egalitarian Australia that we know, we recognise and we are determined to keep. (Time expired)

Mr TED O'BRIEN (Fairfax) (16:13): I have to say how saddened I am, too, that this week closes with an MPI opened by the opposition leader. The opposition leader framed today's debate around an implied threat that Australia might be going down the path of the United States. To anybody who might be listening to this chamber today, I say, as a humble new backbencher to this House: despite the opposition leader's previous words about the President-elect and his words in this House today denigrating the United States, we the Australian people in fact hold our relationship with the United States very dearly. We have an enormous amount of respect for what is ultimately our most important strategic alliance.

I think all members of this chamber should be made aware, if they do not already know, that Australia is a medium-sized liberal democracy living within a very volatile, uncertain global environment. It is so important that we work closely and collaboratively with our allies, and there is no greater ally to this country than the United States. So despite the opposition leader's words, despite what he previously called the now President-elect of the United States and despite his insinuation today in the MPI wording that any increase in inequality and divisiveness in Australia would lead us down the path of the United States, I for one reject that notion. I for one am proud of our relationship with the United States, and I am absolutely appalled that on this last day of this sitting, the day after we hear about President Trump being elected, we have the opposition leader taking such a stance.

Let me now move on to the question at hand, which is all about the need for the government to address rising inequality and division in Australia. If there is an inequality right now for which we should all hold responsibility for fixing, it is generational inequality. Generational inequality comes about if we do not take action to arrest the debt. That is precisely, unfortunately, what the Labor Party would have us not do—they do not want to
arrest the debt. Despite the fact that we are carrying a deficit due to the overhang of responsibility from the former Labor government, their proposals put us $16½ billion behind in debt—$16½ billion that their policies would add to the deficit and we would have to borrow. And who pays back that debt? We do, and our kids do. Will our generation be able to pay back the debt? I am a dad; I am a father—do I leave it to my four-year-old little girl and her peers to pay back this debt because the opposition refuses to take economic responsibility? Inequality starts with the economy, and the economy needs to be fixed. If we do not fix it, we create generational inequality.

My colleagues in this debate have already pointed to the backpacker tax and the need for us to ensure that Australian workers are not disadvantaged compared to foreign workers—something the opposition will not accept. We actually do have policies that are creating opportunities for growth and jobs—half a million jobs are being created by this government. We have another year of economic growth in this country.

Social disparity is another area of inequality. One of the big social issues we have debated in recent months has been the proposed plebiscite on the issue of same-sex marriage. The opposition will not have every Australian’s vote equally considered. They do not want the Australian people to have a vote, because they think their conscience is more important than that of the Australian people. Is that equality? No, it is not. There is hypocrisy at the heart of the MPI that has been proposed today, and that is why I am very happy to be speaking against it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Coulton): The discussion is concluded.

MOTIONS

National Library of Australia: Council Membership

Mr HARTSUYKER (Cowper—Assistant Minister to the Deputy Prime Minister) (16:18): by leave—I move:

That, in accordance with the provisions of the National Library Act 1960, this House elects Mr Leeser to be a member of the Council of the National Library of Australia and to continue as a member for a period of 3 years from this day.

Question agreed to.

COMMITTEES

Public Accounts and Audit Committee

Report


Report made a parliamentary paper in accordance with standing order 39(e).

Mr HILL: by leave—The Joint Standing Committee of Public Accounts and Audit is one of the parliament's oldest and most significant committees, with a long history of enhancing accountability and improving efficiency in public administration. As we all know, government is an increasingly complex task. We also know that taxpayers have an expectation that their money will be expended prudently and transparently. As a result, as the annual report makes clear, 2015-16 was a period of noticeably increased activity for the committee, with a considerable increase in the number of reports tabled, recommendations
made and submissions received by the committee in the course of the year. The increase in submissions received is particularly heartening, as it demonstrates increasing awareness of the value of prudent public administration.

I would like to extend thanks to the former chairs, Dr Andrew Southcott MP; the Hon. Ian Macfarlane, former MP; the former deputy chair, Mr Pat Conroy MP; and all members of the committee for their diligent efforts in maintaining its strong tradition of proper parliamentary scrutiny. With the work of this parliament now fully underway, the current committee has been quick to adopt four new thematic inquiries into core aspects of public administration, including Commonwealth procurement, the Commonwealth performance framework, Commonwealth risk management and public sector governance. In my capacity as deputy chair, I look forward to working with members of the committee in the 45th Parliament on these and other inquiries to maintain standards of excellence and meet the public's expectation of ensuring the proper and efficient use of public resources by the executive and across all Commonwealth agencies.

A final note, as a member of the committee, to all members of the House: this committee, I have been pleased to discover, has a strong history of bipartisanship. Indeed, in over 100 years there has only ever been a very small handful of dissenting reports from this committee, fulfilling its role as an important accountability mechanism for the entire parliament over public service. It is a place also to consider public sector reform. I and other members of the committee invite any members of parliament with an interest in public administration and public sector reform at any time to raise issues and ideas with us. I ask leave of the House to present executive minutes on reports of the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit.

Leave granted.

Mr HILL: I present the executive minutes on reports 451, 452, 453 and 454 of the Joint Committee of Public Accounts and Audit.

BILLS

Social Security Legislation Amendment (Youth Jobs Path: Prepare, Trial, Hire) Bill 2016

Second Reading

Consideration resumed of the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

to which the following amendment was moved:

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

"Whilst not declining to give the bill a second reading, the House notes that the Turnbull Government cannot guarantee that, under Youth Jobs PaTH (Prepare, Trial, Hire):

(1) jobs will not be displaced by cheaper labour;
(2) wages will not be undercut and some participants will be paid below minimum award wages;
(3) participants' safety will not be compromised and that adequate insurance arrangements will be provided;
(4) participants won't be used to help businesses sidestep unfair dismissal protections; and
(5) it will prioritise using small to medium enterprises in PaTH because they have a demonstrated track record of employing more job seekers through the jobactive programme".
Mr WALLACE (Fisher) (16:22): I had the opportunity to listen to the speech given by the member for Barton. It was an illuminating speech, where the honourable member said that Labor were not opposing the Social Security Legislation Amendment (Youth Jobs Path: Prepare, Trial, Hire) Bill 2016, but they were referring it to a Senate committee. Yet they proceeded to attack the benefits that would flow from the bill. One of the primary criticisms of the member for Barton was that, although the bill is loosely referred to as the PaTH bill, there was no 'A' in the full title of the acronym—a very interesting observation. The honourable member went on to say that there were concerns about labour being displaced by the use of the internships that the bill would provide.

I was in business for 30 years before coming into this place. I have employed apprentices on group training programs as a builder. I have also employed trainees in my practice as a barrister. In fact, many small businesses take great pride in providing young people with an opportunity to try to get their foot in the jobs door. None of us—not you, Mr Deputy Speaker, not me, probably not just about anybody in this room—would have got our respective feet in the door of the jobs market if someone had not given us a go. This bill does exactly that. It provides young people with an opportunity to get their foot in the jobs door. But it does more than that. It teaches them very beneficial job skills that many of us old enough to be in this House might take for granted.

The member for Barton quoted Interns Australia that it was expected that only one out of five internships would lead to a job. I do not know whether that is true or not, but what that observation overlooks is that you cannot put a price on experience. You cannot put a price on job skills. I put it to those opposite that this pathway program will help young people who have perhaps been long-term unemployed to get the skills that they need to get a job, whether it is with that host employer or with another employer down the track. They say that the definition of insanity is to keep doing what you have always been doing and expect a different result. This bill provides another tool in the government's kit to be able to provide jobs for young people.

The government will introduce up to 120,000 of these internship placements over four years. It is not a small program or the government simply putting its toe in the water—it is a significant attempt by the government to trial this program, one that is certainly very worthwhile. Young people will be assisted with the help of employment service providers. They will work out and design an internship of between four and 12 weeks duration, during which the job seeker will work 15 to 25 hours a week. Participation in this program is entirely voluntary for both job seekers and businesses. In addition to gaining valuable hands-on experience in a workplace, young people who are otherwise unemployed will receive an additional $200 per fortnight on top of their regular income support payment whilst they are participating in the internship. Businesses that take on these interns will receive an additional $1,000 and will benefit from the opportunity to see what a young worker can do and how they fit into the team before deciding whether to offer them ongoing employment.

As someone who has employed people—I would hate to put a figure on the number of apprentices that I have put through group training and the number of trainees that I have put on—I can say that this is a commitment that anyone who has run a small business would know. Small businesses do not just do this for their own benefit. They do it because it gives them the ability to see what a particular young person will bring to their business. They do not
do it for the $1,000, let me assure you of that. In these sorts of programs, rarely does a young person bring the sort of skills, certainly within this period of time, that would enable the business to recoup its costs. But it does defray some of the costs involved in bringing a young person on board. It enables the employer to check the person's skills and see whether they are a good fit for their business. That is very important. Some businesses will allow that young person to go on; some will not. But even where the businesses do not continue that employment arrangement, those young people will have learned vital skills. For an unemployed person there is nothing like having the discipline of having to get up out of bed, get dressed, have brekkie and go to work.

The SPEAKER: The member will resume his seat. He will have the opportunity to continue his remarks at the next sitting.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER (16:30): It being 4.30 pm, I propose the question:

That the House do now adjourn.

Animal Welfare

Mr ZAPPIA (Makin) (16:30): The greyhound racing fiasco in New South Wales once again highlights the difficulties that can occur, both for government and industry, when animal cruelty is ignored. In 2006, the Howard government suspended live exports to Egypt because of cruelty. In 2011, cattle exports to Indonesia were suspended because of the torturous killing methods used in Indonesian abattoirs. This year, the national greyhound industry was thrown into chaos because of cruelty in that industry. The message from these events should be clear. Firstly, Australians will not tolerate animal cruelty. Secondly, governments that dismiss the cruelty do so at considerable political risk.

Public reaction to animal cruelty should come as no surprise. Galaxy polling this year found 75 per cent of people support the re-establishment of a national body focusing on animal welfare, 84 per cent believe that the federal government should set goals for animal welfare and have a plan to achieve them, and 73 per cent of Australians believe that farm animals could be treated better. In the examples that I referred to earlier, the cruelty should have been, and probably was, known to government authorities. However, it took media exposure and then public outrage for governments to act. When they did react, nothing less than tough measures would have sufficed.

Live export trade, although much improved by the ESCAS conditions, is still fraught with cruelty. Unacceptable slaughter methods are common, and transport continues to be problematic. The stranding of the MV Ocean Outback after leaving Fremantle in December 2015 carrying 13,000 animals is a case in point. Here in Australia, intensive animal farming and questionable halal and kosher slaughter methods continue unchallenged. Notably, the ESCAS does not mandate stunning animals before slaughter, nor can it whilst halal and kosher slaughter without stunning is allowed in Australia. The slaughter of animals for commercial meat supply will never be pleasant, but in this day and age where pre-slaughter stunning is widely used and proven to be much more humane, it should be mandatory in Australia and a condition of export. Such an approach is unlikely to occur while the government department that is responsible for animal welfare also has the role of promoting live exports.
It is only a matter of time before a new cruelty case emerges and another industry sector is immersed in controversy. Excuses about isolated cases of noncompliance or adherence to weak OIE welfare standards will not suffice, nor should they. We can and should do better. It is a sad reflection on humanity when more care is taken in most manufacturing industries than in the handling and slaughter of animals that endure and feel pain. Yes, the animals will end up on the food plate, but that does not justify or excuse unnecessary cruelty.

To date, the existing system has failed animals. A new approach is required. For some time, I and others have been calling for a national independent office of animal welfare that would have oversight of all animal welfare matters. It should be established. Labor committed to an independent office of animal welfare at the last election. Such a body, if adequately staffed and empowered, could provide the oversight needed. By contrast, since its election, the coalition government has shown little interest in animal welfare. In November 2013, Australian government funding for a national animal welfare framework through the Australian Animal Welfare Strategy ceased, in turn ending both the Australian Animal Welfare Advisory Committee and the Animal Welfare Committee itself. There is no national strategy, and animal welfare is mostly left to under-resourced state government departments. Not surprisingly, Australia's global animal welfare standing is falling and is now well behind that of New Zealand and the UK.

As expected, there is little support for an independent office of animal welfare across industry sectors, many of whom seem indifferent to the suffering of animals and instead prefer to get behind ag-gag laws which seek to prosecute those who expose the cruelty.

Conversely, establishment of an independent office of animal welfare has widespread support from animal welfare advocates. It will take the politics out of animal welfare and provide national leadership for all animal welfare matters across Australia. The issue will not go away until we have a process that the community can have confidence in.

**Petition: Western New South Wales Integrated Cancer Care Centre**

Mr COULTON (Parkes—Deputy Speaker) (16:35): I rise to table a petition from residents of Western New South Wales.

The petition read as follows—

This petition of concerned citizens of the Federal electorate of Parkes and wider Australia draws to the attention of the House the urgent need in Western New South Wales (NSW) for more equitable access to services to diagnose and treat cancer. Currently residents of Western NSW are required to travel to locations such as Sydney and Orange in order to obtain diagnosis and treatment of this disease. In many cases, the travel involved leaves cancer patients and their families severely out of pocket and sees them away from their homes for often extensive periods of time. In addition, the emotional and physical toll this takes on patients and their families can be crippling. Doctors from the NSW Western Local Health District have reported that there are many cases where residents in rural and regional areas are refusing to undertake diagnosis and treatment for cancer as they cannot afford to leave their homes and families. This is particularly the case for residents in Indigenous communities across Western NSW.

We therefore ask the House to do all in its power to provide funding towards stage 4 of the NSW Government's redevelopment of the Dubbo Hospital. The funding will facilitate the necessary infrastructure for an integrated cancer centre that would include equipment for both diagnosis and treatment of cancer.
From 45,971 citizens.

Petition received.

Mr COULTON: Every now and then in your life you get to be part of something that grows and becomes bigger than anyone could ever imagine. The campaign for an integrated cancer care centre for Western New South Wales, based at Dubbo, is a classic case. Earlier this year I was approached by a delegation led by the West Dubbo Rotary Club, clinicians Dr Honeywell and Dr McClintock, and other health professionals from Dubbo Base Hospital, and representatives from the Aboriginal community, through the Jimmy Little Foundation. In the gallery today I would like to recognise Lyn Smith from the West Dubbo Rotary Club and Frances Peters-Little, daughter of the famous singer Jimmy Little, here today to witness the presentation to the Australian Parliament of a petition with 45,961 signatures on it. It was decided from that meeting that it was needed to demonstrate the support that this centre for Western New South Wales would have. A small band of helpers, led by Lyn Smith, and including members of my staff in Dubbo, distributed these petitions right through Western New South Wales in towns like Bourke, Brewarrina, Nyngan, Cobar, Gilgandra, Coonabarabran and many other places as well. This overwhelming support shows the need for an integrated cancer centre in Dubbo, one that not only has the ability to supply treatment to people but has a world-class diagnostic facility there. This centre will have a PET scanner, the first one in Western New South Wales.

I am pleased to say that the presentation of this petition is a little redundant, because during the election campaign Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce announced that the federal government would contribute $25 million towards that centre, based in stages 3 and 4 at Dubbo Base Hospital. The New South Wales government, led by the local member, Deputy Premier Troy Grant, said that they would supply the funds to continue this project and see it to fruition. We are looking at a project in excess of $50 million that will be constructed in stages 3 and 4 of the redevelopment of Dubbo Base Hospital. Planning has already been undertaken for that. The early stages of the demolition of the old hospital site to enable new construction will commence next year. I believe that by some time in 2019 we should have patients from Western New South Wales attending the centre.

The reason this is important is the fact that the chance of dying at an earlier age in western New South Wales is far above the national average. One of the reasons that people die in western New South Wales is that, quite frankly, it is too difficult to receive treatment. I represent the second-largest Aboriginal population of any electorate in Australia. The Aboriginal people are connected to their community and if this service is located in Dubbo they will come to Dubbo for treatment, because they will have family connections. They will soon have a hostel provided at Macquarie Home Stay, where they can stay while they are undertaking this treatment. They will not have to undergo the arduous journey either to Sydney or to Orange for this treatment. So I would like to congratulate the people of western New South Wales who signed these petitions and distributed them and showed their passion and the need for this. I would like to recognise the representatives, Lyn Smith and Frani Peters-Little, who are in the gallery today, and to you, Mr Speaker, and to the Australia Parliament I present this petition to demonstrate the will, the need and the desire of the people of Western New South Wales to have this setup, and I would like to show my appreciation to
my colleagues in the government, Senator Fiona Nash and the Deputy Prime Minister, for making that happen.

The SPEAKER: I thank the member for Parkes and, as I said, in recognition of his capacity as Deputy Speaker, it is my great pleasure to welcome his guests to the House of Representatives this afternoon.

Infrastructure: Public Transport

Mr JOSH WILSON (Fremantle) (16:40): In Fremantle and in metropolitan areas around Australia we face some common and interrelated challenges. Urban sprawl has meant that people seeking new and affordable housing are often pushed to the edge of our cities and they are therefore dislocated from jobs and services. They also bear the heaviest travel burden in both time and cost. Our challenge is to avoid further unnecessary sprawl and to provide much better public transport and to do so at a time when capital for infrastructure funding is tight. In that sense, it is a familiar problem, and we have wrestled with it for some time. How do we support urban infill? How do we create innovative and diverse housing and how do we deliver increased density on the basis of high-quality design, better transport options and more liveable neighbourhoods?

One emerging solution is an infrastructure funding model called value capture or value creation, which seeks to draft in private sector investment to help create urban rail projects. As a representative of a community that is affected by congestion, which needs careful urban development, based around public transport, I am interested in the potential of this mechanism to deliver on those needs. The idea of value capture, which I am glad to see is now an inquiry topic for the Standing Committee On Infrastructure, Transport and Cities is essentially to use the land value increase that inevitably comes with new public transport to fund that infrastructure. In that sense, it is not only a smart way to fund new transport options but it is also inherently more fair. Why should government alone and the taxpayer bear the cost of light rail, for example, if the immediate effect of such a project is to dramatically improve the value of private assets? Once upon a time, we expand our cities around public transport, with trams and trains coming first and land development following in due course. Unfortunately this changed when cars and buses took over as the dominant transport mode in the post-war period. Whatever freedoms we may experience as private vehicle users, the dominance of the car has led to sprawling cities, congestion, pollution and vast amounts of hardscaping.

My electorate is relatively well served by hard rail through both the Perth to Fremantle line and the Perth to Mandurah line, but the east-west links are poor and there is a need to support the proper pursuit of infill development with a more comprehensive public transport network. As always, the task is to plan for and to pay for it. The government should lead that process. We should be prepared to explore and apply new solutions. That is why we need to look seriously at value capture, which makes it possible for the private sector to invest in urban rail and undertake land development at the same time. In essence, value capture allows government to guide the urban development project as a whole with infrastructure funding, perhaps, delivered through a bond that could be sustained by appropriately calibrated land taxes, which increase as the land value increases. Alternatively government can shape the project through a public-private partnership that is founded on private investment underwriting the delivery of the transport infrastructure in return for the higher development
yield. This is the model that might be better described as value creation. It is of course possible to have a combination of both.

Internationally, this land based private sector approach is how they build railways in Japan and Hong Kong. It has been used to underwrite a number of rail projects in the US and it was applied to help fund the cross rail project in London, which is the biggest infrastructure project in Europe. While it is clearly on the agenda here in Australia we have not yet seen it put into practical use and I am hopeful that will not be the case for much longer.

In my electorate we have two possible rail corridors with redevelopment potential that could attract a value capture or value creation approach. The first runs south from Fremantle along the Cockburn coast, through Spearwood, and then turns east out to Cockburn central where this line would meet the existing Southern Railway. The second corridor runs east west along South Street from the Fremantle CBD through a major redevelopment area being planned in my old stomping ground of Beaconsfield. It connects the subcentres of Hilton and Kardinya to the Murdoch Activity Centre, which already comprises Murdoch University and Fiona Stanley Hospital.

I want to record my gratitude to Professor Peter Newman for his advice and expertise in this area. Very few people have made such a considerable contribution to understanding and implementing the principles of good urban design, both in Australia and around the world—especially in relation to the transformative potential of public transport. Peter Newman is a Fremantle treasure. We are proud of his work and we want to share in that kind of future. We want to see more public transport and we want to see rail, in particular, criss-crossing the South Metro region.

Deakin Electorate: Infrastructure

Mr SUKKAR (Deakin) (16:45): As the member for Deakin I see it as a very important role that I improve the local infrastructure for my area. I want to update the House and update my electorate on some of the progress we have made in relation to projects that I announced prior to the election. The first will be interesting to you, Mr Speaker, given it is on our border, and that is the upgrade to the Dorset Road-Maroondah Highway intersection. The Turnbull government has committed $8 million as part of our urban infrastructure fund to improve that intersection. I want to update my electorate and let them know that I recently met with representatives from VicRoads. The planning and consultation is underway. It is a very exciting project. We will also look to put the project out to tender very shortly. The most exciting thing about the briefing I received from VicRoads was the fact that, based on their modelling, for the average road user travelling along Maroondah Highway through peak hour, rather than potentially being stuck for up to 12 minutes at that intersection this upgrade will reduce that to two minutes. From 12 minutes to two minutes—that has even exceeded my expectations. I pay tribute to you, Mr Speaker, in helping me gain that $8 million of funding.

I also want to update my electorate on the upgrade of Canterbury Road at Heathmont Village. This is a $1.2 million commitment to improve safety in accessing Heathmont Village. We have done a lot of work with the Heathmont Village Traders Association. That planning is completed, as is consultation with the traders, and in a sense that project is really ready to go and will go out to tender early next year. I want to thank Maroondah City Council, who have largely driven that project, having undertaken a lot of the planning. Work on that project will commence next year, which is very exciting. They are two very significant road projects. We
are not wasting any time—we want to get them done; we want to improve safety and we want
to improve the flow of traffic in our suburbs.

Another project in Heathmont is the Melbourne East Netball Association netball stadium—a $10.5 million commitment from the Turnbull government. This is progressing very well. It is an exciting project. We have many thousands of young girls who at the moment play netball in the rain—the rain, the wind, the cold—while there are many young boys just up the road playing basketball in a warm stadium. That will change—we will now have our netballers able to play rain, hail or shine. I want to thank Kylie Spears, the president of the Melbourne East Netball Association, for being the champion of that project and enabling the planning to be undertaken so quickly. I am also very pleased to acknowledge that she will now be able to take that passion as the president of the Melbourne East Netball Association onto Maroondah City Council as she was recently elected onto council. She will be able to assist me in overseeing that project. We do not want to waste any time; we want that to commence as soon as possible and funding agreements are being negotiated as we speak.

Again in Heathmont we have made a $500,000 commitment to upgrade the pavilion at HE Parker Reserve. Again, we are working very closely with Maroondah City Council and I am pleased to say that it looks very likely that the Maroondah City Council will support this project with matching funding to make this redevelopment even bigger and better. I want to commend and thank the new mayor, Tony Dib, who along with me is a good friend to the Heathmont Jets Football Club and is ensuring that Maroondah is getting on board with the federal government to deliver this exciting project.

I want to quickly mention the Blackburn and Mitcham football clubs. We have made a $500,000 commitment to Blackburn and a $400,000 commitment to Mitcham for Morton Park and Walker Park respectively. We are progressing those plans. I thank the committees of both of those clubs, and of course Whitehorse City Council. We want to make these redevelopments as big as possible because these are two huge clubs, and I look forward to delivering both of those projects for these very important community clubs.

Finally, we have a $1.2 million commitment to help Norwood Secondary College fund a new basketball stadium—the first time that the whole Norwood Secondary College will be able to meet under one roof. We are negotiating those agreements, and we want to make sure that that happens as soon as possible. We are progressing all of these projects. We have got a big agenda but we will make it happen as quickly as we can.

**Youth Unemployment**

*Ms CHESTERS* (Bendigo) (16:50): All of a sudden the Deputy Prime Minister has found a voice on youth unemployment. He has found a voice and is saying, ‘What about young workers? What about young people looking for jobs?’ Let us hope that it is more than just rhetoric coming from the Deputy Prime Minister. Let us hope that he is serious about tackling regional unemployment. Let us hope that he is going to suggest to the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection and suggest to the Treasurer that we look at some of the things with the backpacker tax that his government is not talking about. Let us hope that he is going to talk about the structure of the visa and about the fact that this government wants to increase the age of eligibility for foreign young workers in this country up to 35, bringing more young backpackers into this country and competing against young Australians for jobs. Let us hope that he is going to talk to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, the
minister for immigration and the Treasurer about the fact that they want to include tourism as an industry that young backpackers can work in to get the extended visa—the second-year visa. When it comes to standing up and supporting young people in our community, we need to have more than just the rhetoric of the Deputy Prime Minister caught out on a tax measure.

I have some statistics which I hope will enlighten the Deputy Prime Minister about just how challenging it is for our young people in the regions. Rural and regional areas account for 20 of the top unemployment hotspots for 15- to 24-olds. In outback Queensland it is as high as 28 per cent, and in the New South Wales Hunter Valley region it is 22 per cent, yet the national youth unemployment rate is 12.2 per cent.

Let us look at medium-household income. In Greater Melbourne it is about $45,000 a year, and in the rest of Victoria is it about $39,000 a year. Let us look at what is happening to young people when it comes to education and completion rates. Country kids have a lower year 12 completion rate than most other areas. Six out of 10 adults—60 per cent—living in Melbourne have completed year 12, but when it comes to rural and remote Australia the figure is as low as 33 per cent of adults. In 2011, the proportion of year 12 leavers who went to university in major cities was 54 per cent. In rural and remote Australia it was 36.5 per cent.

When it comes to jobs, our young people in the regions are unemployed. When it comes to completing school, there are simply not the resources, the motivation or the structures in place to encourage year 12 completion. Perhaps that is the reason why so many of our schools in regional and remote Australia are crying out for the Gonski funding to be continued—the equity funding.

Let us look at health statistics. There is higher teen pregnancy in our regions compared to our cities. In fact, it is three times higher in the regions than in the cities. The rate of STIs is higher in the regions than in our cities. When it comes to mental health, the most heart-breaking figure of all, rural and remote areas have a youth suicide rate of 66 per cent higher than in our cities.

These statistics paint a very alarming picture for young people in rural and regional Australia when it comes to health, mental health, education and job opportunities. There needs to be a radical plan to help those in our regions. We need to invest in jobs. We need to invest in education. We need to make sure that young people in our regions have the same opportunities as those in the city. Let us hope that the Deputy Prime Minister, at the end of this week, reflects on these statistics. Let us hope that it is not just question time rhetoric when he says that he cares about young workers in our regions.

Forde Electorate: Government Funding

Mr VAN MANEN (Forde—Government Whip) (16:55): I would like to take this opportunity to speak about some of the positive actions that the coalition government has been taking over the past few years in my electorate of Forde. It is a government that has delivered for many Australians, a government that is focused on growing the economy, a government that is focused on creating more jobs and a government that will support those who need it most.

I am proud to say that, over the past two terms, I have delivered on every commitment made at the 2010 and 2013 elections, and I have every intention of continuing that record. I
have committed to a number of important community projects to support organisations that provide services to our community. We have committed $350,000 to the Loganholme Football Club to upgrade their clubhouse. The Loganholme Football Club is a fantastic local club. It is continuing to grow and is a major force in the Brisbane Premier League. I am proud that we have been able to support its members, players and supporters. We have also committed $100,000 to the Ormeau Bulldogs Junior AFL Club so they can install, with the help of Gold Coast City Council—and I thank them for their partnership in this—lights on their fields so that the club has the capacity to continue to grow, through being able to move the seniors and the older juniors to training at night. That makes it much easier for the club to manage their training programs.

Beenleigh & Districts Senior Citizens Centre will receive $90,000 to upgrade their kitchen facilities. The kitchen is not only used by the seniors citizens centre, which is one of the largest, if not the largest, in South-East Queensland, but it is also used by our local Meals on Wheels, a terrific local organisation that supports many families in need. This will allow them to prepare more meals, store them better and get them out to our local community.

Along with these exciting projects, we have also committed a further $525,000, through our safer communities program, to fund the installation of new CCTV cameras around Logan. The government is committed to making our communities safe, and we are also committed to improving the local environment. Through the Solar Communities program, we allocated $100,000 for six local organisations to install solar panels on their roofs to mitigate some of the costs of running their organisations. These organisations include the Park Ridge Panthers Football Club, Twin Rivers Community Care at Eagleby, Beenleigh Multisports Association, Bethania community centre, Pimpama community hall and Waterford Demons Rugby League Club.

A new Green Army project for the Albert and Logan Rivers was also announced, with $200,000 to improve water quality and protect the waterways through revegetation, the removal of invasive weeds and the introduction of measures to reduce erosion. When it comes to roads, the coalition government has committed more than $40.6 million in Roads to Recovery funding to the Logan and Gold Coast councils in Forde. This funding is helping local governments to repair and maintain our local road networks. This funding is in addition to the $10 million we contributed to upgrading Exit 54 at Upper Coomera, and that vital project will be completed in a matter of weeks.

During the election the Turnbull government made a significant commitment of $215 million to help fund two important upgrades to the M1, in Logan and on the Gold Coast. It was a tremendous win for the electorate of Forde but also the electorates of Fadden, McPherson and Moncrieff on the Gold Coast. This announcement means the Turnbull government has taken two of the biggest items on Queensland's infrastructure wish list and moved them from the 'one day' column into the 'ready to go' column. The $215 million commitment is in addition to more than $13 billion of investment by the coalition government in Queensland infrastructure.

Queensland is already receiving more transport infrastructure funding per capita than any other state in the Commonwealth. I commend my senior cabinet colleagues for this contribution to Queensland and my electorate of Forde. I am extremely proud to be part of a
coalition government and I look forward to another productive three years of delivering on these commitments in my electorate of Forde.

Mr Georganas: to move:

That this House:

(1) expresses its deepest condolences for the victims of the devastating earthquakes that hit Central Italy on 24 August and 30 October 2016;

(2) recognises the:

(a) ongoing suffering and displacement that the earthquakes have caused to the residents of the affected towns; and

(b) courageous and tireless work of the emergency and medical workers, and volunteers to save lives and prevent further tragedies; and

(3) expresses our sincere thanks to the Australian communities who have rallied to show their support and solidarity in the face of this tragedy.
The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Buchholz) took the chair at 10:00.

CONSTITUENCY STATEMENTS

United States Presidential Election

Dr LEIGH (Fenner) (10:00): In the 240-year history of the American republic, no candidate has ever before been elected president without previous military, executive or legislative office. Elections determine power, not truth. It remains true today as it was yesterday that Donald Trump has called women 'pigs' and has made fun of a reporter with a disability. He has advocated a ban on Muslim migration and has called Mexicans criminals and rapists. He has claimed that President Obama was born in Kenya and only admitted to Harvard through affirmative action. He has dismissed an American-born judge as a Mexican who would not fairly hear his case and attacked the parents of a Muslim soldier killed in action.

As Nick Kristof, the New York Times columnist, noted, summarising Trump's behaviour over four decades, 'I don't see what else to call it but racism.' These remain facts, and those who say that the people in Australia should refrain from stating these facts are effectively saying that when someone is powerful we should not call out sexism and racism where we have seen it. It was reasonable for those on the other side of the House to describe Mr Trump as 'terrifying' and 'kind of weird' and his comments on women 'loathsome'. And those who made these comments should not now refrain from them.

What should progressives do on the day after a Trump victory? A temptation is to retreat, but it is vital to remember that reform is two steps forward, one step back. As the great American Martin Luther King once wrote:

Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.

The great American Martha Nussbaum wrote many of those who transformed their countries have drawn on the ethic of love including Jawaharlal Nehru, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Nelson Mandela and Vaclav Havel. As the great American Barack Obama once put it:

... whenever we exaggerate or demonize, oversimplify or overstate our case, we lose. Whenever we dumb down the political debate, we lose.

And an increased partisanship cannot be met by increased partisanship.

Today is the day in which many progressives are naturally sad and angry, wishing to pull the blanket over their heads and retreat from political life. But I urge progressives to remember the words of another great American progressive, United States senator Cory Booker, who spoke about the politics of love at the recent Democratic National Convention. He concluded with a wry smile that 'love trumps hate'—maybe not every day, but in the long run.

Local Council Elections: Victoria

Mr ANDREWS (Menzies) (10:03): I too came to speak about elections—municipal elections in this case. The beauty of democracies like Australia and United States is that
periodically people get to decide who their government is. I found over the years that when you lose an election, the first thing you should do is examine why you lost the election rather than blame those who have won the election—but I will leave it at that.

I came to congratulate the new councillors in my municipal areas, having had recent elections in Victoria. In Manningham I congratulate Geoff Gough, for a return to the council after many years, and Michelle Kleinert in Heide Ward; Dot Hayes, who has been returned in Koonung Ward; and Paul McLeish and Councillor Sophie Galbally in Mullum Mullum Ward. They will be joined for this next period in the Manningham council by Paula Piccinini, Anna Chen, Mike Zafiropoulos and Andrew Conlon. In addition to congratulating all of those councillors who have been elected, I congratulate Councillor Michelle Kleinert for being elected the new mayor of Manningham for the forthcoming term. It would be remiss of me not acknowledge the work over the past terms of those councillors who were not re-elected: Councillor Jim Grivokostopoulos, Councillor Meg Downie and Councillor Stephen O'Brien.

In the Maroondah City Council, I congratulate Councillor Tony Dib, in the Arrabri Ward, who was returned. Also returned were Councillor Nora Lamont, in the Mullum Ward; Councillor Samantha Marks, also in the Mullum Ward; and Councillor Rob Steane, in the Wyreena Ward. They are now joined by Councillor Kylie Spear and Councillor Paul Macdonald, in the Arrabri Ward. In the Mullum Ward is someone known particularly to those on the other side. They will be interested to know that Councillor Mike Symon, who was a member here for Deakin previously, is now a councillor in the Maroondah council. He is joined by Councillor Michael Macdonald and Councillor Marijke Graham, who make up the new Maroondah council. I congratulate Councillor Tony Dib, who has been elected as the mayor, and Councillor Nora Lamont, the deputy mayor, in the Maroondah council.

Finally on councils—although the Banyule City Council is not in my electorate, it adjoins it—I take the opportunity of congratulating Councillor Tom Melican, who has been elected the new mayor of Banyule. Tom has been a friend of mine for a long time. Indeed, we had children in the same babysitting club together a few years ago. I congratulate him, and I congratulate all of those councillors and wish them well in their duties in the forthcoming term.

Lee, Ms Mary

Mr GOSLING (Solomon) (10:06): I want to speak about an amazing Territorian who recently passed away in Darwin. Mary Lee was born Mary Cubillo in the 1930s. During her life she survived the bombing of Darwin, which took the life of her father, a wharfie, who was killed in the raid on Darwin in February 1942 while he was unloading the ship Neptuna. Mary Lee raised 15 children, survived Cyclone Tracy and graduated from university at the age of 64. Mary Lee met and was hugged by a president, President Obama, who sent her photos of himself and his family wearing the beanies that Mary had crocheted for them.

She was to fight for the recognition of native title and the Kenbi land claim, which was granted to the Larrakia people after 37 years—just months before her death. She was to fight for the stolen generations. Her mother was removed to Bathurst Island, in the Tiwis, when she was a child. Mary Lee was to become renowned as an elegant and loving matriarch.

Mary's story is that of the Top End. It is a very Darwin story. It reflects that story of our nation and the often painful and shameful relationship with our first peoples. It also tells of
the strength, resilience and enormous generosity of spirit that has enabled the nation's reconciliation movement and our national apology to the stolen generation, delivered by then PM Kevin Rudd.

To Mary's family I send my heartfelt condolences. Mary Lee, nee Cubillo, a proud Larrakia woman, will continue to inspire. It is the stories and lives of Australians like Mary who will continue to inspire me.

I also acknowledge one of my staffers, Sharon McAlear, herself a Larrakia woman and long-time true believer. Her father, Richard Koolpinyah Barnes, is a proud Larrakia leader. I am very proud to have been elected this week as deputy chair of Labor's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander caucus committee, led by our Indigenous federal members. I do not take this role lightly. I have a strong sense of responsibility. It is a privilege to be part of a team and a party that includes leaders such as Senator for WA Pat Dodson; the member for Barton, Linda Burney; and our own senator for the NT, Malarndirri McCarthy, who is the chair of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander committee.

As the member for Solomon and the deputy chair of this committee, I will work to honour the memory of people like Mary Lee. May Mary Lee and those who have gone before her rest in peace with their ancestors in the knowledge that the Australian Labor Party will continue their struggle for recognition and justice for our country's first peoples for generations to come. Mah Muk. Thank you.

North Sydney Electorate: Remembrance Day

Mr ZIMMERMAN (North Sydney) (10:09): Tomorrow our nation will pause, as we have done every year for nearly a century, to remember those men and women who served Australia in times of war. In my own electorate, our RSL sub-branches will be holding services in Hunters Hill, Lane Cove, Chatswood, North Sydney and Lavender Bay.

Remembrance Day was born out of the horrors of the First World War. It marks that 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month, when the gunfire that had thundered across Europe for four long years finally fell silent. The Great War affected every corner of Australia. Sixty thousand Australians never returned to the embrace of those who loved them. Wives were widowed, children were left without a parent, mothers and fathers lost those they loved and had reared for a finer destiny. The ambitions and hopes of an entire generation were left decimated on the battlefields of Europe and the Middle East.

In my electorate, around 10 per cent of the population were to serve in that war. Over a thousand men and women were never to return. The North Sydney community was determined to honour the service of those local residents who had made the ultimate sacrifice and, through the generosity of ordinary citizens, memorials were established across the North Shore to ensure that the names of those who had perished were never forgotten. The most significant example of their efforts was the North Sydney cenotaph in St Leonards Park and, in the words of one of the local members of parliament at the time, designed to 'bear mute testimony to the love and admiration of a grateful community.'

On this cenotaph, and on memorials from Hunters Hill to Chatswood, are recorded in bronze and stone the names of those who died. Tomorrow, we will see one of those memorials, the Lane Cove Roll of Honour, unveiled following its restoration. I congratulate Lane Cove Council and the Lane Cove RSL sub-branch, both of which, with the support of a
federal grant, worked to see the roll properly restored. It records the names of 284 local residents from Lane Cove who died in the First World War. Each name represents a life that was extinguished well before their dreams were realised.

War knew no social boundaries. The offspring of the famous and the ordinary are commemorated. Proportionally, Australia had the highest casualties in the British Empire, and it was our soldiers who became our heroes of that war. They taught our nation how to show courage and how to endure hardship, in effect establishing the narrative of our national beginnings as a young Australia bound together through mateship and love of country. A century on, memories have faded, but tomorrow we will show we remember them all. We will also remember the service of the many more who have been prepared to fight in the defence of our country in wars and conflicts since the Great War and do so today. It is our opportunity to affirm that, as a nation, we will never forget.

Fremantle Electorate: Port School

Mr JOSH WILSON (Fremantle) (10:12): My electorate of Fremantle, like all electorates, can be considered on one view as a network of school communities. Schools are a particular focal point. They serve a special function, and our public education system in particular should be the foundation of fairness and opportunity in this country. I think we would all recognise that schools do a lot more than simply teach a curriculum. All schools provide a broad social context; a kind of extended family in which children are connected to one another, are watched over and guided by teachers and other staff, and get to benefit from and contribute to a wider community.

Within the Fremantle electorate, Port School in Hamilton Hill takes that wider function to an extraordinary level of engagement and influence. It works to enable the education of kids who face serious disadvantage and who, in many cases, have multiple and complex needs related to causes like poverty, homelessness or family trauma. The school includes a specific learning facility for young mothers, with an onsite childcare centre that allows them to be at school with their kids and to finish their high school education. You really could not get a better example of the importance and the value of needs-based funding than Port School.

But the Port School experience also shows up the unnecessary obstacles that can develop within support frameworks and the decision-making inertia within government that can make life unnecessarily hard for organisations that are already waist deep in a fast-flowing stream of complex problems. For example, many of the students at the school rely upon income support and other assistance from different programs, and they can find it hard to manage and comply with all their administrative requirements. It often falls to the school itself to assist the students, and it would help if an agency like Centrelink could provide some dedicated assistance a couple of times a month, perhaps even on campus.

On a separate issue, Port is not a big school. It exists on a constrained site and for several years has been pursuing access to adjoining, unused land set aside as a road reserve. The school knows it may not be able to expand into that space permanently, but there is no reason why it cannot gain access to that land for the medium term. Surely this is a matter that an agency like Main Roads Western Australia could bear down upon and resolve in a month or so, if it wanted to.
I want to pay tribute to the principal, Barry Finch, and all the teachers and staff at Port School. They undertake work that is varied and intense; they teach classes that need to be innovative and flexible in circumstances that change day by day; they support young people in myriad ways; and they are drawn closely into their lives and their struggles. I have no doubt it is very rewarding work, precisely because it is so meaningful, but I also know it would demand a lot of you personally and emotionally. I am very grateful that there are people who not only do such good work but are energised by it, who are themselves uplifted by taking their part in the great cause of supporting young people whose wellbeing is so fragile.

Cassidy, Ms Kerri

Mr WOOD (La Trobe) (10:15): It is with great pride and honour today that I am able to stand here and represent the ongoing dedication and commitment of one of my La Trobe constituents, Kerri Cassidy. Kerri Cassidy has dedicated the last seven years to raising awareness on behalf of people with multiple sclerosis, commonly known as MS, and other neurological diseases, for them to have equitable access to angioplasty treatment for chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency, referred to as CCSVI.

Kerri has had this treatment herself and she is passionate about helping other people with MS. Angioplasty is the surgical repair and unblocking of a blood vessel commonly known as the coronary artery. This treatment is required for a person who is diagnosed with CCSVI, as the flow of blood in the veins draining the central nervous system has been compromised.

Kerri Cassidy introduced herself to me in 2014 as CEO of CCSVI Australia. She has played a vital role in the ongoing research to confirm the requirements for MS diagnosed patients to have financial assessment for the treatment of CCSVI through the Medicare system. As Kerri explained to me, if you do not have MS, you are entitled to get a Medicare rebate for this; if you do have MS, you cannot. To me, that seems very unfair.

Kerri has inspired a community of professionals and other neurological disease sufferers to work together in groundbreaking research. To date, 80 per cent of the treatment patients in this study have had results displaying measurable improvements in disability, cognition and quality of life.

Kerri is actively seeking bipartisan support from the Australian government to review the medical evidence collected. She is actively seeking financial support to be available for the treatment of CCSVI through Medicare. This has the potential to relieve the financial burden of nearly four million Australians.

This is also a huge congratulations to Kerri. This week, in Parliament House, she was part of the 2016 National Disability Awards, which she attended with her husband, Glenn. It was a great pride to witness Kerri Cassidy being recognised and rewarded as a joint winner of this year's Excellence in Justice and Rights Protection Award. This is something Kerri can be very, very proud of. 3 December is the 2016 International Day of People with a Disability. Kerri, you have achieved so much and you are achieving so much for others. Thank you so much for what you do.

Taxation: BHP Billiton

Mr SWAN (Lilley) (10:18): Rampant tax evasion is now a structural cause of political polarisation and growing inequality, globally and within our country. It is a huge part of the
trashing of public faith and legitimacy of democracies around the world. Everyday workers have the sense that the economy is an inside/outside game where the wealthy play by very different rules and everyone else is denied opportunity.

Over the past decade, the behaviour of BHP and other multinational companies has shattered public faith in our political system. We have heard about trickle-down economics, but it has an older and uglier brother. This is the straight rip-off, where companies refuse to play by the rules, and their cronies simply look the other way. It is clear that, over a decade, there has been a culture of tax avoidance at BHP, and they have sought to evade tax on $5.7 billion held in their Singapore tax shield. Not only have they flouted federal tax law; they have also behaved disgracefully in seeking to avoid state royalty payments through transfer pricing. BHP have been using a Singapore tax shield to smuggle profits out of Australia. Mr Beavan, their chief financial officer, may choose to cutely describe aggressive transfer pricing as a 'valuation dispute', but, in my world and the world where working Australians live, this is tax evasion.

We have yet to hear from the BHP board any cogent defence or contrition for their actions. It is clear that board members of BHP have not been true to the values they espouse in their charter of corporate responsibility. The board will be meeting in Brisbane on 17 November. This will be an opportunity for the BHP board to explain to the people of Queensland their actions in seeking to evade $300 million in royalty payments through transfer pricing. The governments of Western Australia and Queensland have been treated very poorly by BHP. If BHP are so confident in their legal position, it is an opportunity to explain why they have increased their provisions for taxation disputes. Their recent accounts added US$570 million in expenses to repay the federal government for income taxes and the state governments for royalties which they should have paid in the first place.

The evidence against BHP is damning. Over a decade, they have ramped up their Singapore marketing hub to camouflage aggressive transfer pricing. Historically, BHP have wrapped themselves in the Australian flag. Now that the truth and scale of their activities are before the Australian people, it is imperative that they outline a new, ethical approach that repudiates their tax-avoiding past and sets an example for other corporates well into the future. Failure to do so will mean that the 'Big Australian' will henceforth be known as the 'Dishonest Australian'.

**Education**

**Brisbane Electorate: Schools**

Mr EVANS (Brisbane) (10:22): I rise today to highlight this government's commitment to education. While the federal government of course does not run any schools, the fact is that this government is committing more to school education than any past government. And our budget commitments continue to increase over time to help the states better run their schools. Over the course of the 2014 to 2017 calendar years, the Australian government is making available $13.4 billion in education funding to Queensland. This represents an overall funding increase of $913 million to Queensland. I make the points that these numbers are obviously going up year on year and, more importantly, that these increases, year on year, are of an order of magnitude that is clearly greater than inflation. These record commitments are the types of results you get with a coalition government with a plan for the economy and growth, and this is why economic management matters—to record an economic number not for its
own sake but for what it signifies in terms of our increased standard of living and the real results it delivers in all of the areas where we are truly passionate.

Education is critically important. I consider that our schools sit at the heart of our local communities, and that is why my first act after being elected was to write to all of the P&Cs and P&Fs in the Brisbane electorate to introduce myself, provide my contact details and express a keen interest in their activities and their priorities. Today's schoolkids will be tomorrow's health professionals, our next biomedical engineers and data analysts and tomorrow's creative minds. I want to do everything that I can to promote their education.

Over recent weeks, I held my inaugural Christmas card competition for all students in years 1, 2 and 3. It is a simple way I can help to get local Brisbane kids to get their creative juices flowing and obviously to build their natural excitement at the upcoming Christmas holidays. I had an outstanding response, with more than 500 entries from over 15 schools. What struck the judging panel, I think, was the high quality of the entries. I wish to congratulate all of the entrants from schools right across Brisbane, with a particular thank you to the teachers that made time for the activity. I want to thank the judges, Michael Hawke from Village News and Leah Kidd from Quest Community News, for their judging expertise. These were not easy choices.

So to announce the winners in year 1: first place went to Louisa Woodley, Holy Spirit School; second place went to Gigi Rombola, Clayfield College; and third place went to Alister Rose, Holy Spirit School. In year 2: first place went to Luca Brunello, St Columba's School; second and third places went to Dashiel Withnall and Scarlett Baker of Clayfield College. In year 3: first place went to Elizabeth Francis, Newmarket State School; second place went to Sofia Ferries, Holy Spirit School; and third place went to Alexis-Jane Maddern of Clayfield College.

Congrats again to all of the winners and participants. The winners will be featured in my Christmas card that I will send to every mailbox in the Brisbane electorate this December, and I look forward to holding the competition in future years. (Time expired)

Gellibrand Electorate: Women's Circus

Mr WATTS (Gellibrand) (10:25): I rise today to congratulate the Women's Circus in Footscray in my electorate on their 25th anniversary and acknowledge the important work that they have done for our community. The Women's Circus—a long-time feature of the Footscray Drill Hall—is a not-for-profit arts organisation that was founded to offer the survivors of domestic violence or abuse circus and performance training as a vehicle for personal empowerment and change. The circus training and creative programs nurture self-awareness and self-esteem in the participants.

The Women's Circus works with a huge cross-section of the community, offering 18 classes a week to more than 300 women. It even provides training sessions for girls in our schools. Since its establishment, the Women's Circus has not just provided circus training for women of all ages, levels and backgrounds. It has also offered a community of support for women to heal, connect and grow, while also producing socially engaged arts projects for women and their communities. The values of the Women's Circus reflect the vitality of the western suburbs of Melbourne—values like inclusion, empowerment, imagination and
innovation. These are values that help bind our community together, helping individuals overcome social barriers, cultural differences, disadvantages or disability.

Earlier this year I was pleased to have been able to give the Women's Circus a $500 grant to improve signage and security at the drill hall as part of the Gellibrand stronger communities program. While I was there I gave some of the circus classes a go. I am sorry to say that I was the one needing healing afterwards. In the days after my visit I discovered aches in muscles that I did not even know I had. But the Women's Circus's 25th anniversary celebrations include the Stories in Motion exhibition at the Footscray Community Arts Centre which will feature photos, oral histories and memorabilia from the circus's past theatrical productions. The celebrations will also include a performance of the Penelopiad at the drill hall, adapting Margaret Atwood's book retelling the myth of Penelope from the Odyssey. It is a very appropriate subject for an organisation that has done so much to give voice to women who have been silenced by men and their societies in which they live.

In the spirit of giving voice to women that the Women's Circus was founded to realise, I want to give time today to acknowledge each of women currently involved in the Women's Circus individually. In particular, I want to thank the current board, chair Annette Hughes, deputy chair Jodie Granger, Siobhan Hennessy, Jane Sargent, Karen Hofer, Felicity Cull, Stephanie Watt, the Women's Circus staff Morgan Aldrich, Betty Musgrove, Natalie Grigg, Steph Kehoe and executive director Devon Taylor. I want to thank the Women's Circus resident trainer and head rigger Franca Stadler—who has also taken on the enormous challenge of training my three-year-old son in recent years—and all of the circus's trainers. Finally, I thank the founder of the Women's Circus, Donna Jackson, and everyone else has been involved in the Women's Circus over the past 30 years. Thank you. Congratulations for the work that you have done to make our community a more inclusive place. I look forward to 25 more years of your work in our community to come.

Remembrance Day

Ms BANKS (Chisholm) (10:28): Tomorrow is Remembrance Day, and all over Australia Australians will be moved to remember, honour and respect those Australians who made the ultimate sacrifice for our great country. The 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month attained a special significance in the post-war years and remains to this day a special, poignant, annual moment in our lives. At 11 am tomorrow Australians all over the country will observe one-minute silence to remember those who died or suffered for Australia's cause in all wars and armed conflicts.

In my electorate of Chisholm, schools businesses, communities and church groups and RSLs will be commemorating Remembrance Day. Organising and participating in these events requires the goodwill and hard work of many people. And they are an important part of the fabric of our lives. For example, John Saunders and the team at the Clayton RSL will be coordinating and organising a Remembrance Day event to commemorate the fallen.

The dedication, passion and commitment of the committee and broader team at the Box Hill RSL in the Chisholm electorate are evident as soon as you walk through the doors of the RSL and/or congregate in the adjacent parkland at the Box Hill Gardens. Box Hill RSL President Tony Bowden, Vice-President Trevor Sykes, Secretary Ray Wall and Treasurer Arthur Merryweather, John Haward, Brian Tateson, John Sheehan, Judy Coates and Ray
Spokas all give of their heartfelt time and effort to enable this to be a continuing and enduring tradition in the heart of Chisholm.

The Box Hill RSL have coordinated significant events this year, including Battle of Long Tan-related events and the annual school event prior to Anzac Day, Anzac Day events and the gunfire breakfast as well as, of course, their planning for Remembrance Day. In addition, and importantly, a magnificent memorabilia display in the Box Hill RSL is significant not only in its presentation but also in its value to the broader community, which has the privilege of viewing it, including those of younger generations. Additionally, a student, Emma Gilbert from Mount Waverley Secondary College, read a beautiful essay about the nurses during the war. It is critically important that the significance of this day stays with generations to come such that they understand the sacrifices those before them made.

Tomorrow our country stops and remembers in silence those wonderful Australians who made the ultimate sacrifice for us all. Lest we forget.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Buchholz):** Before I proceed, I understand it is the wish of the House and the members that constituency statements be able to continue for a further 30 minutes. There being no objection, the chair will follow that course.

**Millman, Mr Simon**

**Royal Perth Hospital**

Mr HAMMOND (Perth) (10:31): I rise to talk about part of my electorate and one of my constituents whom I am very proud to call a very fine friend. Yesterday, the entire world watched the US democratic system provide an outcome—somewhat unexpected, at that, but an outcome nonetheless. No matter what our views are about that outcome, the democratic process itself, in its own right, is something that we treasure and hold very dear. All here know the hard work, the many moments of anxiety and the strong sense of purpose required to seek public office and to seek to serve our community.

My good friend Simon Millman has put himself forward as the local Labor candidate in the state electorate of Mount Lawley. Encompassing the suburbs of Mount Lawley, Coolbinia, Menora, Yokine and parts of Dianella and Inglewood, it is almost entirely within my own federal electorate of Perth. Simon and I have shared great times, we have shared really tough times and we also share a very similar set of values. We have both devoted much of our working life to representing victims of asbestos disease and victims of workplace injury—fighting so they can get justice. That is the side that we work for.

Last Saturday, I attended a forum on jobs in my electorate, hosted by Simon Millman, in Dianella. Simon spoke of his pride in his father, a plasterer, and how his father was made redundant in the recession of the early 1990s. The family home was lost to the bank. It was one of those formative experiences for a teenager like Simon, leaving a message about the importance of jobs—safe jobs, lasting jobs, secure jobs—something that Simon will not ever forget and something that he has shared with me on many occasions.

Of course, there are other issues amongst our constituency, but without decent employment much else in life is at risk—particularly health. In my electorate, the key health service is the Royal Perth Hospital. It is staffed by some amazing health and allied professionals. But they and our constituents have been terribly let down by the state Liberal government. In 2008, the Liberal government campaigned extensively at the time on the promise to ‘transform’ Royal
Perth Hospital into a 400-bed trauma facility with a new emergency department and a new west wing. The expected cost of the transformation was $180 million. It did not happen. This is one of the oldest and most established public hospitals in Western Australia, and it is desperately in need of investment. Now, ambulances ramp or queue with patients waiting to be admitted.

I cannot wait until the people of my electorate and Mount Lawley have for themselves in our state legislature an advocate like Simon, who understands the value of work, the importance of health and the need to keep your word.

St Stanislaus' College

Mr GEE (Calare) (10:34): It is with great pleasure that I congratulate those students from St Stanislaus' College in Bathurst who were recently announced as student leaders for 2017. The announcement was made during the school's annual speech night on Saturday, 5 November. St Stanislaus' College is now in its 149th year, which is an amazing milestone, and it is a testament to the school's commitment and focus on providing quality education standards for both its day and boarding students who come from all over the Calare electorate and, indeed, beyond.

The evening celebrated the achievements of the students and showcased an extraordinary array of talent in the performing arts. It highlighted the depth of the educational programs offered by St Stanislaus' College. It enjoys the benefits of a first-class creative arts department, which plays a vital role at Stannies in the education of boys and young men. The evening concluded with the students coming together to perform Pink Floyd's *Another Brick in the Wall*. As we might all agree, it is quite the classic, and the students certainly did it justice. The large-scale production was very impressive, and I congratulate the creative arts faculty at St Stannies and their dedicated staff for putting it all together.

I note that the student leaders announced for 2017 are head prefect Dom McCrossin and deputy head prefects Jerome Arrow, Luke Macauley and Tom Statham. The prefects are Lachlan Melville, Anthony Taylor, Jamal Hopwood, Izaac Molenkamp, Joel Thomas, Oliver O'Toole, Jack Thurtell and Will Weldon. The house captains and vice-captains are: St Charles House, captain Harry Brown and vice-captain Andrew Krenzberger; St Johns House, captain Tom Bartlett and vice-captain Thomas Felsch; St Josephs House, captain Henry Marson and vice-captain Harper Kemp; St Justins House, captain Jack Cornish and vice-captain Ryan Mawhood; St Vincents House, captain Nathan Germech and vice-captain Luke Powell; and St Xaviers House, captain Yool Yool and vice-captain Hamish Scott. I would like to offer my congratulations to all of those students. I trust they will serve in their new roles with honour and uphold the traditional values of Stannies.

I would also like to thank Dr Anne Wenham, the current head of the college, for inviting me to be part of this wonderful evening. The community is looking forward to Stannies's 150th anniversary celebrations next year. I congratulate all of the students who received student leadership positions at the annual speech night and all of those who received prizes for their academic achievement. I congratulate the school, the staff of the school and the wider school community of St Stanislaus' College in Bathurst for a job well done over the previous year. We wish them all the best for 2017 in their 150th year.
Ms MADELINE KING (Brand) (10:37): In my first speech in this parliament on 11 October, I mentioned an offbeat theory which postulated that David Bowie was the glue that held the universe together. Given the significant electoral event in the US yesterday, I am reaching the conclusion that this theory has some merit.

Tomorrow is Remembrance Day; the 78th anniversary of the World War I armistice and a day when we as a nation reflect on the sacrifice and bravery shown by our service women and men in all the wars and armed conflicts around the world where they have served Australia's cause. Standing, as I will, at the Rockingham cenotaph observing the RSL's Remembrance Day service, I, alongside many others, will take a minute's silence to remember those who have died or suffered in the service of our country. The Remembrance Day service in Rockingham will resonate with many people because of the critical role the community that I represent plays in the defence of our nation.

With the Royal Australian Navy's largest base, Fleet Base West, at HMAS Stirling on Garden Island, just off the coast of Rockingham in the heart of the Brand electorate, the local community is acutely aware of the sacrifice of our Defence personnel. The strong military presence means our serving men and women live not only on the base but also in our local communities. They are our neighbours and they are our friends. The 2,300 service men and women stationed at HMAS Stirling, the 600 Defence civilian employees and the 500 long-term contractors all make Rockingham a Navy town. These are dedicated people; dedicated to the service of our nation.

We now know that HMAS Stirling on Garden Island is one of the many Defence sites around the country that has tested positive for legacy firefighting foam contamination, and HMAS Stirling has recorded one of the highest levels of contamination rates in the nation. It appears these tests have been carried out since 2013 and that risks have been known for three years. Recent testing concluded four months ago, and we only heard this week the results of these tests, which show that there are dangerous levels of contamination on the land that hosts thousands of service personnel.

Following repeated calls by Labor for the release of these results, they have finally been made public. The government's code of silence on this contamination issue is unacceptable, utterly disrespectful and shows a total disregard for those committed people that serve the nation from HMAS Stirling in Rockingham. It is unacceptable for the government to keep them and their families in the dark about the potential harm in their workplace. With three government defence ministers, surely one of them could have taken the time to communicate with my community about what is happening on Garden Island.

This is an important issue that must not be hidden or ignored, and the community must be kept informed. I call on the government to urgently engage with the defence community of Brand, to do the right thing by the service personnel across Rockingham—and across the nation, for that matter—and deal with this dangerous contamination that is hitting all of our service bases.

Mr COLEMAN (Banks) (10:40): On Saturday, 29 October I attended the 18th Bankstown Children's Festival. It was great to attend the festival again this year and to be a
part of the activity. The children's festival was started many years ago by Mr Thuat Van Nguyen OAM, whose vision was to bring together the different cultural communities of Sydney—people of different cultural backgrounds and, particularly, the kids from those different cultural communities—and celebrate those different cultures and the harmonious nature of our multicultural society. I would like to thank Mr Van Nguyen for his fantastic work in creating the children's festival, in promoting it and in making it what it is today. As always, it was a terrific day with good weather this year. Congratulations to everyone who was involved in putting this event together.

Last Friday, 4 November, I attended the 72nd annual art show presentation of the St George Art Society awards. It was held in the old school of arts building at Kogarah, which must be one of the most beautiful buildings across the entire St George region, and it was a great to see the tremendously high quality of the art on show. I would like to congratulate all the winners on the evening—including Mr Walter Bennett, who won the award for mediums other than oil and watercolour—and, indeed, to thank Jean Harrow, the president of the St George Art Society and all of the committee for all of their work. The art society has been through some difficult issues in recent years, and it was great to see everyone coming together for that most timeless of activities, which is appreciating fine quality art. To Jean Harrow and everyone who was involved: congratulations on another great event.

In late October I attended the AGM of Coolaburroo Neighbourhood Centre in Padstow. Coolaburroo is a great institution in the Padstow area that looks after the community through so many different events and groups. There is the Picasso kids art group, the ladies mosaic group—we saw a number of those mosaics on display on the day—and a range of other services that provide support to people in the community, particularly people in the community who are in need. Recently I visited the ladies crochet group at Coolaburroo, and that was also a great visit. To Rossanna Umansky, the Coolaburroo manager, and all of the staff and volunteers: congratulations on another great year.

Ms HUSAR (Lindsay) (10:43): On the evening of Thursday, 3 November I was welcomed to a performance by a local choir called Singing Out Strong, or SOS. The SOS choir was originally formed for women who are victims of abuse or are recovering from addiction. It has since opened up and now welcomes any woman in the area, providing a supportive, safe place for local women to heal and grow after significant trauma. The choir sang a few original tracks as well as a couple of songs that were given new lyrics. The women shared their stories bravely. They spoke of their life's horrors, their lightbulb moments, their victories and their journeys of finding themselves. Each story, as inspiring as it was, was also horrific.

This group meets under the auspices of West Connect Domestic Violence Services. West Connect were also responsible for hosting the annual Reclaim the Night event in Penrith on Friday, 4 November. The women in the SOS choir and those who support them should be exceptionally proud of their achievements, as each of them has overcome significant challenges. I applaud them on their courage to share their stories, their voices and their commitment to rebuilding their lives. In a community like mine, which records some of the highest rates of domestic violence in New South Wales, this is a very important cause. I look forward to having them perform at my International Women's Day event in March next year.
In the brief time I have left, I would like to touch on World Teachers’ Day, which is celebrated in Australia on the last Friday in October. It is a day to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of our teachers and pay respects to the significant contribution they make to all communities. It is a day that should be marked with great fanfare and celebration, but, as is often the case on a busy school day, the needs of the students come first and many schools are not able to find the time to celebrate. On Friday 28 October, I visited four wonderful schools in my electorate, took a long morning tea with the teachers and we shared a morning together. They are all schools in our area that have additional challenges—some due to capacity, some due to disadvantage and some that cater to multiple support classes within the school. It was an opportunity to say a sincere thank you to all the teachers for the amazing work they do, particularly in our community building capacity, broadening horizons and creating leaders.

I was able to hear about the fabulous work and learning taking place each day in the classrooms across my electorate, and I was humbled by the warm welcome each of the teachers showed me. Teaching is too often a thankless profession. We should all be, in this place, doing what we can to ensure teachers are supported in their jobs and, critically, we should be ensuring each school has the resources they need to provide the quality education our children deserve. I will take this opportunity to call once again on the Turnbull government to fully fund Gonski in support of our hardworking teachers. Happy World Teachers’ Day to all the amazing educators in my electorate of Lindsay, and a special thank you and shout out to Glenmore Park High School, Kingswood South Public School, Regentville Public School and Chifley College Dunheved Campus for having me along to celebrate this important day.

Arnison, Miss McKinley

Page Electorate: Community Organisations

Mr Hogan (Page) (10:46): McKinley Arnison is an 11-year-old athlete that excels in the water and on the land. What makes her results even more outstanding is that she competes with cerebral palsy. Her medical condition means that she competes in the category S8, and her results this year have been outstanding. In November last year, she won bronze medals that the New South Wales Primary School Sports Association state athletics championships; one for discus and the other for long jump. This year, she competed in the shot-put and discus at the same NSW PSSA event, finishing in second place in the shot-put and eighth in the discus. The second place in the shot-put means that she now qualifies for the national championships later this month.

Even though these results are impressive, they pale in comparison to her recent success at the para-swimming championships. She competed in several multiclass events picking up five gold medals. McKinley took out gold in the 50-metre freestyle, 50-metre backstroke, 50-metre breaststroke, 50-metre butterfly and, lastly, the 100-metre freestyle. She recorded her personal best in each race. She was also lucky enough to have her medals presented to her by the Australian Paralympian swimmer, Timothy Hodge, who competed in Rio recently. McKinley has been swimming since the age of eight and has been swimming with the Richmond Valley Club since starting her journey to an elite sportsperson. Of course, McKinley balances these fantastic sporting achievements with a busy life at the Evans River K-12. Well done to McKinley and congratulations on your effort.
Volunteers play a vital role in regional communities and in my community there are many local organisations that rely on the tireless efforts of their volunteers. Earlier this year, a number of community organisations had the opportunity to access grant funding through the government's strengthening communities program. The grants were between $1,000 and $5,000 and allowed organisations to buy much-needed equipment such as computers and assist with transport costs, first aid courses and the like for their volunteers. Some of the organisations within my community that benefited from these grants included: the Casino Neighbourhood Centre, the volunteer Marine Rescue at Evans Head, the Mend & Make Do Crew in South Grafton, the 1st Lismore Scout Group, Meals on Wheels in Iluka, the Northern Region Westpac Life Saver Rescue Helicopter Service, the Lismore Thistles Soccer Football Club, the Kyogle District Care Connection, the Grafton stroke recovering club, Community Radio Coraki and the Clarence Valley Vietnam Veterans' Association. There were many others as well, and I am very happy to say that the government has again recognised the value that volunteers play in building inclusive communities by announcing another round of this fantastic program. I encourage all community organisations which rely on volunteers to apply for this funding to assist them with the wonderful work that they do.

Nuclear Disarmament

Mr ALBANESE (Grayndler) (10:49): I rise to address the issue of nuclear disarmament. On 27 October, the United Nations adopted a crucial and important resolution to convene a UN conference in 2017 to negotiate a legally binding instrument to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons. One hundred and twenty-three nations voted in favour of this resolution. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons has said:

This historic decision heralds an end to two decades of paralysis in multilateral nuclear disarmament efforts.

I commend the hard work of ICAN in Australia in helping to progress the disarmament agenda. However, it is disappointing that Australia was not one of the 123 countries that voted in favour of this resolution; they did not even abstain. They were one of the few countries very much in the minority that voted against this resolution. As well as establishing the conference for 2017, the proposal also recorded the international community's urgency in securing substantive progress in multilateral nuclear disarmament talks in the meantime. Yet, in the fortnight that has followed this important vote, and even after extensive questioning that took place in the Senate, the federal government is still to provide a sufficient answer as to why Australia was not one of those that supported a ban on the worst weapons of mass destruction.

The Labor Party's platform affirms our belief that, as a non-nuclear armed nation and a good international citizen, Australian can make a significant contribution to promoting disarmament, the reduction of nuclear stockpiles and the responsible use of nuclear technology. Unfortunately, the recent voting record of those opposite shows that they do not share the same priorities that we do. We have now reached a time where an overwhelming majority of the world's nations are ready to outlaw nuclear weapons, just as the world has outlawed chemical and biological weapons. The Turnbull government must stop working to undermine this process; instead, it must work with other nations. The government should commit to attending the 2017 negotiating conference. If Australia fails to participate, this will
tarnish our international reputation as a disarmament supporter. This is a huge opportunity for the international community to make real progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

**Kendall, Professor Mark**

**Nanopatch**

Mrs PRENTICE (Ryan—Assistant Minister for Social Services and Disability Services) (10:52): I take this opportunity to congratulate Professor Mark Kendall, who last night received the CSL Young Florey Medal at the Association of Australian Medical Research Institutes' dinner here at Parliament House. The Young Florey Medal is awarded to an Australian biomedical researcher for significant early career achievements in biomedical science or human health advancement, the research for which must be conducted primarily in Australia. As I have reported to the House previously, Professor Mark Kendall of the University of Queensland and his research team developed Nanopatch technology, a needle-free technology to deliver vaccinations, including the polio vaccination. Professor Kendall's Nanopatch is a small square of silicon containing 20,000 microscopic spikes that deliver a vaccine directly to the skin's immune cells. Imagine, a small needleless patch about the size of a fingernail applied directly to the skin that is painless, uses a fraction of the dosage, does not require refrigeration and does not need nurses or doctors to deliver it. In a box that was once probably padded and contained six fragile syringes, you can now get hundreds of these little patches. They can be delivered, they can be dropped and whole villages can be vaccinated in just half a day.

Let me be clear: this breakthrough is not just a concept tucked away in the laboratories of the University of Queensland. In fact, human clinical trials are now underway in Brisbane, with the World Health Organization planning a polio vaccine trial in Cuba next year. Not only is the World Health Organization taking a genuine interest in the Nanopatch, so too are the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Merck. As one of Australia's premier research institutions, UQ tackles significant global challenges, including biosciences and nanotechnology through to sustainable development and social science. Australians are delivering some truly incredible feats. In fact, Australia has been at the forefront of many medical developments throughout the last century, from the first ever clinical trials of penicillin by Australian scientist Howard Florey in the forties, to the breakthrough success of the HPV vaccine by Professor Ian Frazer, another Ryan resident, and now to Professor Kendall's Nanopatch. The sky is Australia's science and innovation limit.

With support from the coalition government through our innovation and science agenda, I know there will be many more important discoveries and breakthroughs made as a result of the talented research institutions right across Australia. The Turnbull government is ensuring that today's investment in science and innovation will create jobs and growth opportunities which will contribute to our economy in the future.

I take this opportunity to again congratulate Professor Kendall for his hard work and dedication in developing this revolutionary medical technology and on receiving the prestigious CSL Young Florey Medal. *(Time expired)*
Deepavali

Racial Discrimination Act 1975

Ms ROWLAND (Greenway) (10:55): I would like to thank the Hindu Council of Australia for organising, once again, an excellent event in Parliament House on Monday night to celebrate Deepavali, the Festival of Lights. I particularly want to mention Professor Nihal Agar and Kanti Jinna of the Canberra Hindu Society. I also want to mention outgoing High Commissioner Navdeep Suri. We will be sorry to lose him. He has been an excellent representative of his government and the people of India in Australia. I also want to mention the representatives from a variety of cultural and religious communities who joined in the festivities, including Sikh, Jain and Fijian representatives. And I am delighted to note that I recently received an invitation to celebrate Hanukkah in the next sitting fortnight.

That brings me to the issue of section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act. It is one in which I have had a long involvement and a very deep interest since its inception 20 years ago, including the fact that it arose from recommendations from a number of inquiries, including the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. It is well known that the inquiry conducted by Attorney-General Brandis in 2014 was one in which the community spoke loud and clear, saying that it did not want these provisions against racist hate speech watered down. I went around the country and I heard the real stories—including those from people in the member for Moreton's electorate—from communities who did not want this change to occur.

In this place, we often talk about theoretical arguments. The reality is that these are issues that affect people's lives. We have some very serious challenges in terms of the economic consequences of racism in this country. We have some very serious challenges for some specific cohorts—for jobseekers who are being subjected to exclusion in the labour market based, often, on their race. Here I will quote from my colleague Dr Andrew Leigh, who found, in a 2009 study, that people without Anglo names had to submit many more applications to get the same number of job interviews as someone with an Anglo name. The study found that:

To get as many interviews as an Anglo applicant with an Anglo-sounding name, an Indigenous person must submit 35 per cent more applications, a Chinese person must submit 68 per cent more applications, an Italian person must submit 12 per cent more applications, and a Middle Eastern person 64 per cent more applications.

That was in 2009. I wonder what the results would be now.

This is more than talking about what a successful multicultural nation we are. We here are all decision-makers. The laws we devise and amend do have real-world consequences. We have many other significant challenges to address in this community, including culturally-sensitive aged care. Our energy and focus should be on addressing those, rather than concentrating on what divides us.

Murray Electorate: Ministerial Visits

Mr DRUM (Murray) (10:58): Next week in the electorate of Murray it is going to be a very, very busy time, as I welcome two ministers and an assistant minister. On Monday next I am going to be hosting Darren Chester, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, and taking him to the historic river town of Echuca. During the election campaign, Minister...
Chester was able to confirm that the funding for the Echuca-Moama bridge—which is certainly going to be a bridge over troubled waters, when it gets built—has now been secured. What we have to raise awareness of is that—after the announcement of all of the moneys, between Victoria, the federal government and New South Wales—some five months on, nothing has happened. So we need to get the Victorian government and VicRoads—the organisations and the bureaucrats—into gear and at least get the design of the bridge completed as soon as we possibly can before we can move onto construction.

On Wednesday I am going to be hosting Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce, and Barnaby Joyce is coming to Shepparton to look at the new program that has just been announced by La Trobe University, which is a degree in agribusiness. This is showing the changing face of agriculture where these degrees and courses are being introduced into many of the universities around Australia. It is certainly great news for Shepparton that we are going to be able to offer a new degree in agribusiness. It is going to be very, very important.

The next day, on Thursday, the Hon. David Gillespie, the Assistant Minister for Rural Health, is coming to town. He is going to highlight an ophthalmology and vision program. It is an awareness-raising program called 'Do You See What I See?', which is going to be offering free eye tests for everybody. These eye tests will be available all year round with a whole range of high-quality optometrists. We are going to see Graham Hill in Shepparton and we are going to raise as much awareness as we can, because macular degeneration is an eye disease that can be cured; it can be fixed. There are treatments available. What we need to do is make sure that we find these problems very, very quickly.

So I am looking forward to these three visits from those ministers and assistant ministers and they, obviously, are along National Party lines. The ministers are continuing to deliver for the Goulburn Valley, the seat of Murray. They had a very high presence through the region during the election campaign, and it is great to see that their visits are continuing now that they are in government and that they are delivering these amazing programs for Shepparton and the Goulburn Valley.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hastie): In accordance with standing order 193, the time for members' constituency statements has concluded.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr LLEW O'BRIEN (Wide Bay) (11:01): I move:

That the Federation Chamber do adjourn.

Schools

Ms RYAN (Lalor—Opposition Whip) (11:01): A few nights ago here in the parliament, I had the pleasure of attending the Australian Primary Principals Association life membership presentation ceremony. I was reminded once again that schoolteachers, the majority of whom are dedicated and passionate women, are the workers spending the time necessary to improve the future for this nation. With that in mind, I think it is tragic that this government refuses to invest in the future of our children. In my electorate of Lalor, each primary school student in a public school is underfunded by over $1,000 at the Gonski funding rates. The teachers who work with the children in the electorate of Lalor deserve our attention, and their schools and our children need investment, whether those schools be state, Catholic or private.
However, I want to focus more closely today on what schools are actually doing for students in the electorate of Lalor. With that in mind, in my-cup-of-tea-with-school-principals program, where I visit schools regularly, I talked about the impact that the needs based funding model is having at Woodville Primary School, run brilliantly by Principal Lyn Vincent. The school uses their equity funding to provide for student-centred coaching and to build the capacity of the teachers in their teams. They have a high rate of transience with many children in their fourth or fifth school—remembering this is a primary school, so you can imagine what each of those school moves does in terms of student progression and learning.

So there is a lot to catch up on at Woodville primary and, to that end, they have set really clear targets where, for every child, they want to see more than one year’s growth of learning delivered in a year—an aspirational target that Lyn feels, at this point, they will have met by the end of this year, and there will be great celebration. To support the teachers and to build their capacity, the equity funding allows for two hours a week of professional learning and collaboration for every teacher in this school. Having been in schools my entire life, I understand how critical that professional learning time and the provision of it in schools are to the growth in teacher capacity.

I want to talk about one of their targets, which I know most in the room today will be impressed by. Because of the nature of the school, they found themselves with high student absence rates, with an average of 22 days a year. They set a target to get that down to 17 days a year, on average, missed by pupils in their school. I want to share with the House that they expect to better that target this year. This is real cause for celebration and it would not be possible without the equity funding going into that school to support the teachers, the principal, the parents and the children to get the culture right and get things moving.

Another interesting thing about the school when it comes to equity funding is the literacy program that it is enabling, where they have a full-time person who works across the school with teachers, assisting them to build their capacity but also doing direct intervention, targeted to where students’ needs are. They do the same in numeracy at the moment with dedicated class time. They are doing enormous amounts of work in literacy and numeracy. They are doing early work with very early transition and early intervention in transition, and this is critical in an area where 30 per cent of children are not attending kindergarten. Thirty per cent are walking through the school doors not having had four-year-old kindergarten, let alone three-year-old.

They also—and this is cause for great celebration—will be joining the University of Melbourne Network of Schools in 2017. There are 20 schools a year that get to join that program. Again, it has to be self-funded by the school, and equity funding will go to support that and to support the teachers and those in the school who need to attend professional learning to be part of that very successful program. I think of the member for Gellibrand’s electorate, where Footscray North Primary School have been involved in that program across the last three years. They have had some incredibly important results in improved student learning. They also, of course, have English as a second language support that they are giving in this school. This equity funding is critical.
South Australia: Electricity Infrastructure

Ms FLINT (Boothby) (11:07): There are a few things I think we tend to take for granted in Australian life. We tend to take for granted our clean, safe drinking water, we tend to take for granted our fresh, unpolluted air, and usually, I would say, we tend to take for granted our secure, reliable and affordable power supply—but not anymore in South Australia. I am appalled that my home state no longer has secure, reliable and affordable power. We have suffered an internationally unprecedented blackout and we are now facing, nationally, unprecedented high power prices. South Australian residents and businesses can no longer rely on a secure, affordable electricity supply. Families cannot afford to pay their skyrocketing power prices; pensioners and the elderly cannot afford heating or cooling; businesses must now lurch from contract to contract, pushing up the already climbing cost of living. This is the sad reality of energy security in South Australia, and my residents in Boothby and across the state are dealing with this reality every single day.

The unprecedented statewide power blackout earlier this year stands as a prime example of the South Australian power network in turmoil, thanks to 14 long years of a failed state Labor government. With no power anywhere, our entire state was thrown into chaos. Businesses and places of work had to shut down, forcing huge amounts of traffic onto the roads. We did not have enough police to make up for the downed traffic lights, because traffic lights were out at every single intersection, and an already dangerous situation was made far more dangerous.

I want to pay tribute to the amazing job our police did in terribly dangerous conditions. They all put their lives at risk and we should all be very thankful for the job that they did keeping everyone safe. I also want to pay tribute to residents in my electorate of Boothby, who had experienced a very significant flooding event just before this power blackout, and at the time they thought they were going to be flooded again. So they had no power and they thought that they were going to be flooded. It was a terrible situation.

While this was all going on we had another crisis unfolding at the Flinders Medical Centre. Only an hour into the power blackout the generator failed at Adelaide's second biggest hospital, and it is a miracle, I think, that no lives were lost. Unfortunately, clients of the fertility clinic at the hospital were not so fortunate and, tragically, many healthy embryos that were about to be used in IVF treatment were lost. Industrial areas were shut down in Adelaide and in our regions, costing tens of millions of dollars at a time when our state finances can least afford it. The struggling steel operation at Arrium, the main employer in Whyalla, which is already doing it tough, as we know, lost about $10 million due to the blackout.

These unacceptable crises are some of the worst that South Australia has faced, and the lack of energy security will throw more at our community. They really do—and should—expect better, and they deserve better. However, it is when we compare the ongoing effects of the failed state Labor government that one really appreciates what this unreliable electricity market means to householders and businesses. South Australia has the highest electricity prices in the nation and some of the highest in the developed world. For retail consumers, this means they are struggling to pay the bills. Pensioners and seniors must constantly ask themselves whether they can afford the cost of simply heating and cooling their homes, and with another hot Adelaide summer coming up I really worry what this means for the health of our elderly South Australians. Mums and dads are struggling to balance the household budget, and the quarterly electricity bill is one that they dread. This is not just because they never
know how high it will be but because it means they cannot spend that money on other things like their children’s education. In short, energy poverty is a real issue in South Australia.

This situation is already scary enough but, with the closure of Victoria's Hazelwood station, upon which South Australia relies quite heavily, it is only going to get worse. The unstable energy market is also impacting our economy, which has stagnated thanks to Labor’s antibusiness and antijobs policies. Employers who are dealing with the highest state taxes in the country and the nation’s most expensive WorkCover scheme must now try to scrape together the money merely to keep the lights on. There are small businesses in my electorate facing electricity price hikes of over 200 per cent. Even those businesses who wish to invest in energy efficient plant and equipment cannot do so, because so much of their revenue is going into paying the bills. This really is not good enough. We need safe, secure and reliable power supply in Boothby and in South Australia, and we need it now.

Global Security

Dr ALY (Cowan) (11:12): I rise today to speak on the critical issue of countering violent extremism for our national and international security, particularly in light of international events that may or may not pose challenges to our security and may see us relying more and more on our own capabilities and resilience in this area. Countering violent extremism, or CVE, refers largely to the prevention and intervention aspects of counterterrorism. It encompasses not only law enforcement capabilities for disrupting terrorist activities but also the social aspects of prevention, targeting the push and pull factors that account for the terrorist phenomenon.

In October last year, I was privileged to be the only Australian representative to speak at Madrid+10: Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism. That is a policy dialogue that is organised by the World Leadership Alliance, an alliance comprising democratic former presidents and prime ministers from around the world. In 2005, the first Madrid policy dialogue was co-chaired by Kofi Annan and Bill Clinton. The two-day dialogue in Madrid last October acknowledged that radicalisation and extremism continue to undermine human rights and fundamental democratic values and destabilise global peace. It also asserted that law enforcement and military means alone will not ever be an adequate response to the scourge of terrorism that we face in today’s world. The gathering in Madrid analysed and defined the most necessary responses to violent extremism, and it produced recommendations aiming at a global consensus to stop violent extremism. It also proposed a new framework for a broad partnership and global action. That framework on global action comprises 10 elements: legitimacy, inclusion, faith and ideology, education, technology, prevention, entrenched conflicts, regional solutions, security, and practising what we preach.

The global consensus framework builds on decades of knowledge, evidence, and expertise in countering violent extremism. But for Australia it presents us with an opportunity to develop an Australian framework for countering violent extremism that is responsive to both our unique and also our not-so-unique circumstances. Such a plan is necessary, because despite our robust and comprehensive law enforcement framework, despite our wide-ranging and extensive legal framework for countering terrorism, despite our strong intelligence and monitoring capabilities, attention to the prevention and intervention capabilities has not kept up and we are lagging behind in this part of our approach.
On a weekly, and sometimes daily, basis, I am getting emails and phone calls from parents who are in fear for their children. They tell me that they have tried everything. They tell me that they are struggling to find any help, any support, any information that could help them stop their children from going down a dark path. They tell me that they are coming to me as a last resort. That is why we need a plan for preventing and combating violent extremism in Australia that is driven by those principles that were brought together in the Madrid+10 policy dialogue, and that take into account three things that I propose, the first one being socialising agencies, those institutions, structures and individuals that do influence young people; the second being social cohesion, the soft power mechanisms that promote and sustain positive interrelatedness and unity between individuals and organisations in society; and the third being social influence—actors, institutions and groups that exert positive interpersonal effects on individuals.

Such a plan should work across five areas of social and economic participation, and integrate resilience against violent extremism into these areas. It should be based on research and good practice around the world and be integrated into a smart framework that aims to balance the robust hard measures with effective soft measures. Smart counterterrorism is achieved through such an integrated strategy, with a resource base and tool kit that draws from both hard and soft power. In closing, I would like to say smart CT is not just a matter of balancing these measures; it is a matter of getting them right.

**Calare Electorate: Small Business**

Mr GEE (Calare) (11:17): The spirit of enterprise is alive and well in the Calare electorate. Today, I would like to mention just a few of the many successful small businesses in our region. They are vital to regional communities, and I am particularly proud of those that are operating in our electorate. There are some two million small businesses in Australia providing employment to around 4.8 million people, and, having owned and operated a small business myself, I am only too aware of their importance. This is particularly so to our rural and regional communities.

Firstly, to PJL: in 2006, three young local guys, Phil Wilkin, Joel Spagnolo and Luke Buckland, needed a place to modify a dump truck they had purchased at auction. An empty shed on Luke's property in Molong was soon found, and the PJL story began. From those humble beginnings, the PJL group today employs more than 250 people and operates right across Australia. It operates from four permanent sites 24 hours a day, providing specialty services to the mining, earthmoving, drilling and construction industries. It was a great pleasure to join the three founders recently—and they are all still good mates—at the PJL family fun day to mark their 10-year anniversary. It was an opportunity for Phil, Joel and Luke to thank their many employees and their families for their support, but it also raised important awareness and fundraising for men's mental health. It is an amazing local success story.

Another amazing local success story is Angus Barrett Saddlery. Also known as 'the next RM Williams', Angus Barrett has been doing leather work and selling his handmade goods in Orange and around Australia, and indeed internationally, since 1986. Throughout school and work, Angus has always been making something with his hands.

After many years working across Australia on farms and cattle stations and in mines and drilling camps, Angus settled in Orange with a plan to start his own manufacturing business,
and in 2000 he registered Angus Barrett Saddlery. In 2010, he and his wife Sarah opened their first flagship store and just a few weeks ago opened their first standalone retail centre in Summer Street, Orange. It is very impressive, to say the least. In an age where many have decried the death of manufacturing, Angus and Sarah have proved that there is a future for local manufacturing in the Orange area. I have to confess that I am wearing an Angus Barrett belt as I deliver this speech to the House today.

Besides Angus Barrett Saddlery and their wonderful success story, we also have Fastway Couriers. I recently attended the launch of the Fastway Couriers business in the Orange region. Its new owners and operators are Mike and Karen Andrew. Karen is the former CEO of community housing provider, Housing Plus. That is a multi-million dollar concern in itself. At the recent launch at Orange's Botanic Gardens, a number of Fastway executives were in attendance, including its chief executive officer. Given Karen's experience with Housing Plus and her great contribution to the region, we know that Fastway Couriers is going to be a tremendous success. Well done, Karen and Mike. We also congratulate all of their subcontractors who are going to be working with them, also operating their small business in conjunction with Fastway.

Coleman's Equipment was established in Orange by Mark Coleman and is a family-owned and operated business supplying water-carting services, service trucks, earthmoving services and the sale of earthmoving equipment. Since its inception, Coleman's Equipment has continued to expand both in size and the range of services that it offers. It prides itself as being a business that maintains a close working relationship with its clients. Its aim is not to be the biggest but to be the best. This is achieved through an exclusive worldwide network of partnerships, with Mark often travelling overseas to personally inspect equipment prior to purchase and ensuring the final product that is delivered to the client meets high and exacting standards. Mark has over 16 years in the industry, from management positions with a Caterpillar dealer through to asset management in both underground and surface mining operations. Mark is ably assisted by his father Chris, and I congratulate Chris as well. It is a family business based in Orange but it is global in its reach.

I congratulate all of Calare's small business operations and operators. They are truly the engine room of our economy. They personify the spirit of enterprise, and I will always and support advocate on their behalf.

**Lindsay Electorate: National Disability Insurance Scheme**

Ms HUSAR (Lindsay) (11:22): I rise to speak about the National Disability Insurance Scheme and the difference it is making to the lives of people with a disability in my electorate of Lindsay. The NDIS is something Labor members are incredibly proud of, particularly as I fought hard for and campaigned for it many, many years ago. It was the previous Labor government that fought for and introduced the scheme that will substantially transform the lives of people with a disability—and I want to highlight the words 'transform the lives', not specifically to care for them, but to transform their lives—and make sure they are able to achieve the level of independence that most of us take for granted. Importantly, the scheme is about creating long-term certainty around disability supports and bringing to an end a system that was described by the Productivity Commission in 2011 as 'underfunded, unfair, fragmented and inefficient'.

---

**FEDERATION CHAMBER**
The NDIS was modelled to ensure that people with a disability are able to participate in the community and take control of their own lives. Unfortunately, it does sadden me to say that the National Disability Insurance Agency—the independent statutory body tasked with implementing the NDIS—is not being supported appropriately by this government. I have spoken with multiple people in my electorate who say that the intention of Labor's NDIS is not being realised under this government. This should in no way be seen as a reflection on the NDIA or local service providers. They are a remarkable group of people working incredibly hard and doing the best they can. But many of the process issues that I have heard of need to be addressed if the NDIS is to reach its full potential and deliver the outcomes that we all want.

I have been told of a young high school student in my electorate who has recently been given a new wheelchair that is not fit for purpose because it is too long, too wide and too heavy for the mother to manoeuvre around the house. As you can appreciate, a wheelchair is a significant aid in giving somebody the independence we speak of. Unfortunately, it is obviously causing significant stress and anxiety within this family. This is one of the resourcing issues I have heard. Another common issue that I hear is that the NDIA often is not able to meet with the users of the scheme face to face because of staffing issues. Clearly this is not an ideal situation and the NDIA agrees but, again, this organisation is constrained by the level resourcing it is allocated by this government.

Another constituent, a young girl in my electorate who has been diagnosed with autism, was found eligible in May this year but has still not been able to finalise a plan six months later. This case is a concern and it demonstrates yet again the continuing issue of properly resourcing the agency to efficiently and effectively process all applications and care plans. I have been told of a gentleman in my electorate who has seen an effective reduction in support after entering into a care plan. Prior to his new plan, he was receiving five days a week in a day program. His new program gives him just one day a week. I have heard time and time again about concerns with the application process—for instance, one young woman who has been sent back and forth to a paediatrician since March this year and who still cannot finalise a care plan. These are issues of resourcing, clearly. It highlights the need to properly resource this agency.

The other big issue that has come up in my electorate time and time again is that the plans are expiring now. The plans have no succession in place. There are plans that are expiring and people are being left without the supports that their children, particularly those who are in early intervention, require. Appointments are being routinely cancelled because families do not have access to the money that they believe should be in their packages. I believe the government must act to ensure the NDIS is properly resourced to achieve the outcomes it was created for. As a member of the Joint Standing Committee on the National Disability Insurance Scheme, I am extremely proud to continue advocating for the NDIS to make sure it is rolled out in the spirit in which it was intended and with full resourcing.

Migration

Mr GOODENOUGH (Moore) (11:27): Business migration to Australia is one of the best methods of attracting investment capital into our economy by people who are prepared to reside in Australia, bring their financial assets with them and subsequently take up citizenship. In the current economic climate, it is important for the government to promote...
investment through business migration to facilitate Australia's economic recovery. The banking sector has tightened its prudential lending criteria, which makes it difficult for mid-size firms to raise finance for construction and development projects. So investment through business migration will help bridge the gap.

Earlier this year I spoke in parliament on the effect of the changes to the complying investment framework for the significant investor visa, which came into effect on 1 July 2015. At that time, in February this year, the number of SIV applications lodged post July 2015 was approximately eight per month. I am pleased to inform the House that, based on the full 2015-16 financial year statistics from the Department of Immigration and Border Protection, the number has increased to an average of 18 applications per month as at 30 June 2016. However, the number of lodgements of SIV applications through the 2015-16 financial year has dropped to around 14 per cent of the previous year’s application numbers. The 1,544 applications over the 2014-15 financial year under the old eligibility criteria dropped to just 213 applications under the new investment criteria in the ensuing 12-month period.

Industry sources have projected that this represents a potential loss of $6.65 billion of investment flowing into our country. The number of SIV applications was experiencing solid growth in demand since its introduction in 2012. However, the market reaction to the changes of the complying investment framework highlights the negative reaction by overseas investors, particularly from the traditional Chinese and Hong Kong markets, towards the changes to the complying investment policy.

At the time of the proposed change, it was predicted that the new complying investment framework for the SIV would cause great concern amongst the major investor groups applying for the visa. It appears that there is evidence to suggest that these concerns have been realised. Overseas investors who are qualified for SIV applications are often talented businesspeople with business acumen and often prefer to have direct control over their investments or business interests. By investing in proprietary limited companies, investors are able to select with confidence the industries and businesses in which they are experienced. Their capital investment is complemented by human resources in the form of business talent and expertise, creating economic development and employment opportunities for the Australian community.

I make the case for a government review to be undertaken of the changes to the complying investment framework for the SIV and the impacts on the investment and business migration. The government can improve investment through business migration by reintroducing more flexible investment options to the complying investment framework, such as restoring investment in proprietary limited companies, whilst keeping the benefits of newly introduced complying investments in managed funds and venture capital.

The current minimum eligibility threshold of $100 million for funds under management does not provide adequate opportunities for medium-sized businesses to compete with large banks and institutions in the market. I believe that this threshold should be reviewed with a view to improving access to capital by medium-sized firms, which represent an important sector in our economy that should not be neglected by the government. If the complying threshold for funds under management were lowered to, say, $25 million, this would allow more companies in the construction and development industry and other sectors to access...
investment funds from business migrants under the SIV and the premium investor visa schemes to commence projects.

I call for the complying investment framework for business migration visas such as the significant investor visa and the premium investor visa to be reviewed. Investment through business migration is preferable to foreign investment because it brings both financial and human capital into Australia—migrants who have a pathway to becoming productive Australian citizens.

**Turnbull Government**

Mr DREYFUS (Isaacs—Deputy Manager of Opposition Business) (11:32): Many members in this place have been feeling a sense of deja vu these past few months. This Prime Minister, who so many Australians thought would lead or hoped would lead a reformist government, has not only failed to renounce the unpopular and flawed policies of the Abbott government but, like a recidivist who cannot help himself, has re-embraced and pursued these failed policies even while knowing that they are bad for the country. The member for Warringah's thought bubble for a divisive plebiscite on marriage equality has been embraced by Prime Minister Turnbull, picked up like the political football that the Liberals think marriage equality is. Mr Turnbull, beholden as he is to the far Right of the Liberal Party, has run with this failed and flawed policy in the full knowledge of the hurt it would have caused and the cost it would have incurred. The Prime Minister, hand in hand with the Minister for the Environment and Energy, has adopted what little climate change policy the Abbott government had bothered to put together. Riddled with the kind of uninspired, unscientific and unambitious proposals that one would expect a climate change sceptic like the member for Warringah to produce, this dog of a policy has hung around the Prime Minister's neck like the millstone that it is.

It is a great sadness to me and to millions of Australians that one particular policy of the Abbott government era has been resurrected by the Prime Minister. The Abbott government's 2014 attempt to repeal section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, the law that has drawn a line against racial abuse, against Holocaust denial and against harmful hate speech for over 20 years, was one of the biggest failures of the Abbott government, proof of just how out of touch it was with the Australian community. On section 18C, as with so many issues, the Abbott government had grossly misjudged the views of the Australian community, which rejected the repeal with rallies and thousands of emails and phone calls to elected representatives.

Yet, in 2016, the anti-section-18C crusade has been revived. It shows, in the starkest way, just how weak the leadership of the Prime Minister is that he would cave in to the far Right troglodytes in his party on a matter of such importance to millions of Australians. It is unfortunate that supporters of the repeal of section 18C—the usual motley crew of tabloid shock jocks and far Right culture warriors—use the Racial Discrimination Act, an act that has served Australia well for over two decades, as their vehicle to promote the misguided belief that they, martyred souls in the defence of freedom that they think they are, are somehow the persecuted and victimised in our society.

The Liberal Party's latest push to weaken protections against race hate speech will take the form of a parliamentary inquiry. I ask the advocates of the repeal: what is it that you think you should be allowed to say? What racially-based insult, offence, vilification or abuse do you
think that you should be able to say to someone that you cannot currently say? Section 18C is no more a restriction on freedom of speech than our laws protecting people against defamation. Many members opposite understand this but would rather engage in soaring rhetoric about the rights of bigots than engage in constructive discussion about how to protect the Australian community from race hate speech.

This issue was laid to rest in 2014. It has been revived, not for reasons of law but because it is a pet project of the Institute of Public Affairs and the hard Right of the Liberal Party to which Malcolm Turnbull is beholden. Millions of Australians will be aghast to learn that, instead of acting on climate change, on funding Australian schools, on meaningful law reform, on doing something about people's jobs or people's businesses, this government's priority is to revisit a proposal that the Australian public resoundingly rejected in 2014.

Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act does not need changing. It is a good law and it has served the Australian people well. There has been a mass of misinformation spread about the way in which this law operates, including misrepresentations of cases decided by courts and misrepresentations about even the number of cases and the number of conciliations that are conducted by the Human Rights Commission or that are taken to court. Labor will oppose any attempts by this government to water down the legal protections against race hate speech.

Child Safety

Mr Evans (Brisbane) (11:37): I rise to note some troubling statistics. International comparisons of drowning rates are indicating that Australia has the second-worst recorded in the world for toddler drownings. Each year in Queensland, over 500 children aged 15 years old or under present to emergency departments for injuries sustained in the home, backyard or garden, burned by hot kitchen implements, scalded by hot water in the bathroom, poisoned from accidental access to chemicals or bleeding from accidents involving sometimes innocuous household items. On average, these children will include 88 children aged four and under who are presenting at Queensland hospitals as a result of choking on parts of toys or other small household items. Many will be infants and young children admitted to hospitals with serious internal burns or other injuries sustained from ingesting button batteries—some of them, unfortunately, fatally.

I want to play my part in raising the profile of child safety and improve awareness about the simple actions that everybody can take around the home and in our lives to reduce the risk of injuries on the people around us, particularly our children. I also want to play my part in helping to raise understanding that these accidents are not automatically the parents’ or anyone else's fault. This is an increasingly complex world where new products cause new and sometimes surprising risks in a world where goods flow quite quickly between places with sometimes very different approaches to product regulation, manufacturing standards and labelling laws. Education and awareness are key.

A few weeks ago, I was privileged to visit in organisation located in Brisbane called Kidsafe. Kidsafe is working hard to prevent child injuries and accidents from occurring. They do important work raising awareness around kid safety and trying to reduce accidents and injuries for our youngest Australians. The team at Kidsafe Queensland work tirelessly, with quite limited resources, to achieve the goal of fewer children and youth injured or killed from
preventable accidents. They do tremendous work, including through education, advocacy, research and partnerships.

This year, Kidsafe celebrated the reopening of the Kidsafe House in Herston. The premises had been previously severely damaged in a storm, and Kidsafe's operations, as well as its financial position, suffered significantly as a result. In all of its work, Kidsafe teaches that high standards in equipment and products for children will mean a safer experience.

I feel that I have a contribution to make on these issues, having previously worked with the product safety specialists of so many of Australia's retailers; having previously worked for the ACCC, including with its product safety division; having run the National Retail Association's technical standards committee; and having been a council member on Standards Australia. I have had the benefit of working closely with many of the passionate advocates and the professionals around Australia who help to keep products safe and our kids safe.

Yet we do not make it easy. Labyrinthine agencies across all levels of government play different and sometimes duplicating or conflicting roles in the regulations around products, product bans and labelling. Those regulations are constantly changing, as they should, when products change and risks are better understood, but sometimes the change is painfully slow and sometimes our states take different approaches. It makes it incredibly challenging, even for the professionals, to stay up to date on our product safety laws, standards, bans and education and awareness activities. Consumers must be flummoxed.

Our regulators face challenges in this government's framework as well as difficulties, obviously, with the limits of their jurisdiction and global product markets where any Australian now can buy almost anything on the internet from around the world. Certainly, for the benefit of our regulators, industry and especially our citizens, we must do better, in an increasingly global world, to make our regulations more consistent with other major product markets such as the EU and North America.

I believe technology can also play a role not only in potentially reducing the regulatory burden around product safety laws—especially labelling—but also in the dissemination of education and awareness in the community. I note, in passing, that social media can have its drawbacks. Honourable members may sometimes reflect on the tone of comments on social media—in which case they should feel a special sympathy when they consider the treatment dished out to honest businesses who have sold perfectly legitimate and compliant products but are targeted by internet trolls who do not understand the facts or, indeed, the hatred targeted at parents who try to come forward to raise awareness when their kids have had a terrible injury.

I would like to formally record in this parliament the sincere thanks of the people of Brisbane to Kidsafe for their great work. Their tireless efforts and vital services literally save lives. I pay special tribute to the Kidsafe Queensland CEO Susan Teerds and the chair Ian Coombe for their advocacy. I want to pay tribute today to the product safety and child safety professionals around Australia, and I look forward to working with them very constructively on these matters into the future.

**Leyonhjelm, Senator David**

Mr HAYES (Fowler—Chief Opposition Whip) (11:42): On 29 September, National Police Remembrance Day, the nation paused to remember police officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty and to honour all serving members of our police forces. We are
indebted to these men and women who go to work each day, prepared to face dangers that, thankfully, most of us will never have to encounter. Therefore I was horrified when it was reported to me that one of our number—someone who has been given the honour to represent the community—in this place had said he would be happy to let police 'lie on the side of the road and bleed to death'.

I am advised that Senator David Leyonhjelm made these comments at a Queensland bikie law rally. His comments insulted not only 60,000 police officers across our nation but those of us who value the work of our law enforcement community. These abhorrent, disgusting and disparaging comments were made just months after the senator won a seat in the Australian Senate.

Recently, Senator Leyonhjelm continued to show his contempt for police. In November 2015, he said:

The police are not our masters, they are our servants, and I think they should remember that.

Further, in a parliamentary inquiry, he is quoted as saying, 'All cops are bastards.'

Now, given his position as a legislator, Senator Leyonhjelm should be well aware that our police are sworn to uphold the laws made by parliaments and that, in protecting life and property, it is our police that are often called upon to deal with the very worst aspects of society and human behaviour. The primary job of police is to prevent crime and, in doing so, to protect and support our communities. They are normal people with families and loved ones, and yet these are the very people that Senator Leyonhjelm has singled out, degraded and abused—not the lawmakers or politicians like himself, but those who choose to enforce the law. A mother wrote on social media: 'My daughter is a police officer. I would never say to you: "Your daughter should lie on the side of the road and bleed to death." You have said that to me. Police officers have mums and dads, children, wives and husbands. You have insulted us all.'

As I said earlier, National Police Remembrance Day honours police officers who lost their lives in the line of duty. There are currently 764 names on Canberra's National Police Wall of Remembrance and every year, tragically, more names are added. All of these officers have given their lives for their communities. Clearly, they have done much more for this country than Senator Leyonhjelm could ever hope to achieve. How can someone who is supposed to represent the Australian people be so out of touch as to make such outlandish statements against those who work tirelessly for the good of others and our community? Is this what the Liberal Democratic Party really stands for? I note that Senator Leyonhjelm is at the centre of the guns-for-votes scandal, and I certainly caution the government that they might do well to be a little bit more careful about who they choose to do horsetrading with.

Senator Leyonhjelm is a man who is obviously out of touch with the wider community and has no respect for the work and the people of our law enforcement agencies. I would urge Senator Leyonhjelm to consider spending at least one shift in his local police station—riding the truck on a Saturday night, attending a car crash, going to the scene of a suspicious death, informing parents that their child will never come home—and then to sit back and take a little time for some quiet reflection and consider whether he stands by his comments about police.
I finish on the quote of one police officer, who writes this: 'Well, Senator, you may want us to lie on the side of the road and bleed to death, but rest assured that, if you need saving, I will be there for you. That is what sets us apart.'

**Workplace Relations**

**Mr FALINSKI** (Mackellar) (11:47): I rise to speak on the importance of workplace relations reform in Australia for our nation, its workers, children and our democracy. The Australian public must look askance and wonder why this parliament cannot come together to deliver better governance of registered organisations. Most Australian workers, and particularly the two million members of registered organisations, must wonder what is going on when this parliament has to debate the very idea that registered organisations should be subject to the same standards as corporations.

It is disappointing—indeed, worthy of despair—that those on the benches opposite frustrate the government from delivering what the Australian public expects. I cannot understand why those opposite think that millionaire shareholders should have available to them rights in the management of their corporate organisations that members of registered organisations cannot have. Of course, it really should not be a surprise, as *The Sydney Morning Herald* reserves its front page and the ABC runs a lead story every time a company gives money to the Liberal Party. However, they neglect the tens of millions of dollars that the union movement funnels through to the Labor Party, and even ignore when significant undeclared sums are paid by building companies directly to the Leader of the Opposition and his campaign manager.

This paid-up claque represents the very worst that money can buy in politics. But don't the unions get their money's worth! Nothing is too low for those opposite to defend. Physical violence on building sites—for Labor, that is not a problem. Extending the visas of outlaw bikie gang members with multiple charges is not a problem; productivity-slouching, costing billions more to deliver critical public infrastructure—none of these things is a problem.

The legislation is not about union busting; to start with, it will impact 63 employer organisations compared with 47 unions.

The Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Amendment Bill is about protecting workers, ensuring accountability of officials and reducing conflicts of interest. It is about giving members rights they should already have. These are rights they would have if the members of the parliamentary Labor Party cared as much for the ordinary workers as they do for the higher echelons of the union movement—that is, those very people who control Labor preselections. This legislation is about holding officials of unions and employer organisations to the right standard.

If Labor thinks that these standards are too high or that they are not right, I presume they will be moving amendments to the Corporations Act to right this wrong for company directors and shareholders alike. But you are likely to see the Pittwater freeze over on a warm summer day before that happens, because the Labor Party believe in double standards. They believe that millionaire shareholders should have rights that union members such as hospital cleaners can only dream of having. The Labor Party and their parliamentary members cry crocodile tears for workers whenever they can, but they reserve their passion and real fight for the union officials that pay their bills and control their preselections, while these union officials spend...
the hard-earned dues of their members on overseas trips, tattoos and their children's school fees.

The Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption uncovered numerous examples of misuse of members' funds, as well as a deep-seated culture of lawlessness. Gaps in current laws mean that many more unethical and questionable practices go undetected and unpunished. We cannot have a healthy democracy when one half of the parliament is beholden to organisations that refuse to even disclose the salaries of and payments to their officials.

The bill will: amend the existing registered organisations legislation to introduce a new robust regulator, the Registered Organisations Commission, or ROC; provide for the same standards of accountability to be applied to registered organisations and their officers as those which currently apply to companies and their directors; and increase the penalties for failing to comply with those requirements. The powers of the ROC will be modelled on those of corporate regulators. New accountability measures will include requiring registered organisations to disclose remuneration paid to their top five officers in head office and in branches, and requiring officers to disclose conflicts of interest. These cannot be described as onerous obligations on registered organisations—unless the relevant organisations have something to hide from their members.

It is time that the parliament saw the union movement that resists such basic compliance and reporting obligations for what it is—a giant vampire squid whose tentacles are wrapped tightly around the productivity of this nation and the welfare of its membership. This legislation will help to pry it loose and remove the sustenance and oxygen from the parasitic elements of these organisations.

Broadband

Dorothea Mackellar Poetry Awards

Ms STANLEY (Werriwa) (11:53): Many of my constituents continue to struggle to access broadband internet. The age and standard of much of the infrastructure means that services in my electorate are limited, even if they are available. My father helped build the Miller telephone exchange in the 1960s. It is that very same exchange that still services the area today, and it has been at capacity for some years. The simple reason is that upgrades were deferred, pending the eventual rollout of the national broadband network. Consequently, the response many of my constituents get when requesting a connection is that it is full and that for some years they have not been willing to invest the money needed for the upgrade.

One of my constituents, Dr Nilofur Ali, is a local physician who has a practice based in Casula. She actually lives in Middleton Grange, also in the electorate of Werriwa, and is unable to access an internet connection at her residence that would allow her to complete important work remotely and phone into international medical professional conferences from home. While living only a few blocks from a street that does have access to the NBN, she has to drive to her surgery to access the internet. This is also the case for her daughter, who is currently studying at the University of Sydney. She struggles to do research and often worries about achieving deadlines for online submissions because the internet is, simply, down.

Dr Ali is by no means the only constituent that has contacted me since July. Chris Petrou contacted me this week. He cannot access even basic ADSL and as a result is paying up to
$90 a month for a less reliable mobile broadband connection. It is understandable why he feels at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to joining the 'connected world'.

Many people do not have the luxury of high-speed internet at their workplace, and participating in education, employment and so many other important facets of modern life is a real struggle as a result. There are many cases like this, and it is no wonder that many residents of south-west Sydney are feeling like second-class citizens, waiting for the broadband rollout that has been deferred again and again.

Technology now plays a central role in education. A good-quality internet is essential to many young families. Many couples have moved to the south-west of Sydney, attracted by more affordable housing and the excellent and committed teachers in our local public schools.

Last week, I was fortunate enough to attend Casula Public School to recognise Daisy Millpark, a student from my electorate, who was selected as the upper primary runner-up in the Dorothea Mackellar Poetry Awards this year. These awards have been running for 32 years. This year, there were 11,766 poems submitted by schoolchildren from all over the country. The award was started in 1983 with just 300 entries.

Daisy's poem is extremely moving and demonstrates extraordinary talent and wisdom. It is about Daisy's grandmother and expresses perfectly the emotion she feels and the love she has for her grandmother. As I read Daisy's poem, I could readily imagine the circumstances she wrote about. The language and form she uses are highly emotive, and the poem has a fantastic lyrical beauty. It opens:

Hands like prunes that grasp you tightly,
A beaming smile whenever she sees you,
Old as the earth, old as the temple of Delphi,
And sometimes dotty.
Singing my song all day long
Daisy, Daisy, give me your answer, do,
I hold her tight and search her eyes.

This is great literature, and it is what poetry is all about. Daisy's recognition by receiving a Dorothea Mackellar Poetry Award is a hugely prestigious achievement for her schoolteachers and her parents but especially Daisy herself. It was really wonderful to meet Daisy and her parents.

Her classmate Vicky Su also received a commendation in this award. The talents of these students were fostered and supported by their teacher, Michael Davis, whose outstanding efforts were recently recognised at the 2016 Ultimo principals network awards. I congratulate Daisy and Vicky and the entire Casula Public School community and their principal, Robyn Evans, for the wonderful work that they do with our children.

See Poy, Mr Herbert 'Junior'

Mr ENTSCH (Leichhardt) (11:57): I rise today to acknowledge the life of a local legend, Herbert 'Junior' See Poy, who passed away on 21 October at the age of 85. Junior was born on 2 May 1931 to a well-known Innisfail family who were direct descendants of Tom See Poy, a Chinese migrant who came to Queensland to work in the Palmer River goldfields in the 1870s. Tom likened searching for gold to 'trying to catch the moon at the bottom of the sea',
but his luck changed when he answered an advertisement for labourers to develop a sugar plantation on the Johnstone River. He saved money and purchased a peddling business, which developed into a merchant store and by 1925 was a substantial department store in Innisfail. Tom and his wife had five children, one of whom was Herbert, Junior's father.

Junior's formative years coincided with the time of post-war prosperity. Innisfail was booming, and the family business, See Poy & Sons, was prospering and would eventually become the largest department store in North Queensland.

Junior inherited a love of music from his father, who used to play saxophone to entertain the US troops at the end of World War II. In fact, Junior and his cousins Bernie Lee Long and Brian How Kee are credited with launching Far North Queensland's jazz scene. They were described as 'inseparable' as they played their way through local clubs and social dances. They formed the band Three Blind Mice in 1968, and Junior's first wife, Anne, sometimes joined the band as a singer and dancer. Both of his children have become talented musicians. Having heard him play many times, I certainly became one of those local fans of Junior's, and I can attest very much to the fact that his music had the ability to make the audience stop and listen intently and applaud tremendously at the end.

Junior's hobbies included waterskiing and game fishing. He was quoted in a The Sydney Morning Herald article on 3 December 1978 titled 'Skippers' homes are where the big fish bite'. The journalist writes of spending a day on the Great Barrier Reef with Innisfail motel owner Junior See Poy and other keen marlin fishermen:

> As dolphins circled the boat, we caught 45 skad and mackerel averaging 1-2 kilos in an hour—a haul Sydney fishermen could never match. Then we baited the lines and waited for the marlin to bite. The journalist was fortunate enough to haul in a 1,501-pound marlin which was tagged and let go. But Junior's comment to all of this was: 'Anywhere else in the world that would have been a good day's fishing. But by our standards it was a bad one.' A talented businessman in the hospitality industry, Junior built a motel in 1971 and even called it the Black Marlin Hotel and restaurant. He spent countless hours building it with his own hands.

He was also involved in numerous community projects, including the motor cycle club, the game fishing club and the Chamber of Commerce. This dedication to community is something that is characteristic of the wider See Poy family. Thousands of music fans enjoyed Junior's tunes at local establishments around Far North Queensland for many years and, in 2012, he was awarded the Cairns Regional Council Australia Day Cultural Award. At the time, he had been entertaining the Far North with this skills on the saxophone for more than 60 years. Even during his retirement, he would practice the sax for most of the day and ensure that he continued his love of fishing whenever the weather allowed. He recorded his first jazz CD at the age of 69 and continued to donate his time and talent to any worthwhile cause.

Junior was a devoted husband to second wife Andra, loving father to John and Tommy, and cherished grandfather who will be truly missed in our community. At his funeral in Cairns on 28 October, friends and family remembered a man who was deeply involved with the place he loved, and lived his life to the fullest. Junior's son, Tommy See Poy, recalled his dad's very strong sense of community and sense of fun. Junior was one of those very special people in our community who clearly achieved iconic status. He was farewelled with a jazz band jamming on the street—something he would have certainly loved. Vale Junior See Poy.
Question agreed to.

Federation Chamber adjourned at 12:03