



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 – 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

No. 20

TUESDAY, 17 MARCH 2026

- 1 **COUNCIL MEETS.**— The Council met at 11.00 o'clock a.m.
- 2 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL PEOPLE.**— The President said: “We meet today on Tasmanian Aboriginal land. We acknowledge and pay respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal people and elders, past and present. We recognise them as the first inhabitants and the continuing custodians of this land.”
- 3 **PRAYERS AND REFLECTION.**— The President read Prayers.
- 4 **PETITION.**— Ms *Forrest* brought up a E-Petition containing 787 names supporting legislative reform to remove the 12-month limitation period in section 9A of the *Family Violence Act 2004*, ensuring that Tasmania’s laws are consistent with the realities of coercive control and trauma informed justice. Such reform would align Tasmania with other Australian states and territories, which do not impose equivalent limitation periods, and would strengthen the state’s commitment to the safety and dignity of victim-survivors.
Ordered, That the Petition be received. (Ms *Forrest*)
- 5 **PAPERS.**— The Clerk of the Council laid upon the Table the following Papers:—
 - (1) Audit Tasmania: Report of the Auditor-General No. 8 of 2025-26. Auditor-General’s Report on the financial statements of State entities. Volume 4 – Local Government. Audit of State entities and audited subsidiaries of State entities 30 June 2025. Dated 16 March 2026.
 - (2) Audit Tasmania: Report of the Auditor-General No. 9 of 2025-26. Follow up of Report of the Auditor-General No. 2 of 2021-22: Council general manager recruitment, appointment and performance assessment. Dated 16 March 2026.
 - (3) Australian Children’s Education & Care Quality Authority: Annual Report 2024-25.
 - (4) *Industrial Relations Act 1984*: Statutory Rules 2025, No 64, Industrial Relations Regulations 2025.
 - (5) Tasmanian Government Response to the Independent Review of Tasmania’s Right to Information Framework. Strengthening Transparency: Continuously Improving Tasmania’s Right to Information Framework.
- 6 **REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE A.**
— Ms *Forrest* presented the Special Report on a Resolution to Establish Inquiry.
Ordered, That the Report be received. (Ms *Forrest*)
- 7 **MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.**— *Ordered*, That Mr *Vincent* have leave to move Motions without Notice.
- 8 **LEAVE OF ABSENCE.**— *Ordered*, That the Honourable Member for McIntyre, (Ms *Ratray*) be granted leave of absence from the service of the Council for this day's sitting. (Mr *Vincent*)

9 LEAVE OF ABSENCE.— *Ordered*, That the Honourable Member for Windermere, (Mr *Duigan*) be granted leave of absence from the service of the Council until 13 April 2026. (Mr *Vincent*)

10 HOUSING CONNECT SYSTEM REFORM PROJECT.— Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable Minister for Housing and Planning —

With regard to the operations of Homes Tasmania and the Housing Connect System Reform project:

- (1) What was the original tender value approved for the Housing Connect System Reform project?
- (2) What procurement method was used for the initial contract (open tender, selective tender, or limited tender) in accordance with Treasurer’s Instruction PP-2 Market Approaches?
- (3) What was the original approved project scope, and has this scope been altered or expanded since contract award?
- (4) How many contract variations have been issued, and what is the total value of those variations?
- (5) What is the total amount spent to date, including all committed expenditure, on the Housing Connect System Reform project?
- (6) By what percentage has the project exceeded the original tendered cost, and what are the primary drivers of the financial blowout?
- (7) (a) Has Homes Tasmania undertaken any value-for-money assessments during project delivery, as required by Treasurer’s Instruction PF-1 Procurement Principles; and
(b) if so, please table those assessments?
- (8) When did the project formally commence, and what was the original delivery date?
- (9) How many revised delivery dates has Homes Tasmania approved, and what reasons were provided for each revision?
- (10) What is the principal cause of both the cost escalation and the delays in project delivery?
- (11) How many consultants, subcontractors or third-party providers have been engaged in this project since its commencement?
- (12) Were all consultants and contractors engaged under written contracts, as required under the Treasurer’s Instructions?
- (13) Were any consultants or contractors engaged through:
(a) contract extensions or rollovers, rather than open procurement;
(b) urgent or emergency procurement provisions; and
(i) if so, what was the justification?
- (14) Has Homes Tasmania complied with all relevant Treasurer’s Instructions, including but not limited to:
(a) PF-1 Procurement Principles;
(b) PF-2 Policies Impacting Procurement;
(c) PP-1 Procurement Valuation;
(d) PP-2 Market Approaches;
(e) PP-4 Works Procurement (if applicable); and
(f) PF-5 Accountability and Reporting?
- (15) If any non-compliance was identified, when was this reported, to whom, and what corrective action was taken?
- (16) Has Homes Tasmania complied with its obligations under the Financial Management Act 2016, including the requirement for the proper, efficient and effective use of public resources?
- (17) (a) Given the scale of the project, is the project subject to oversight under the Public Works Committee Act 1914; and
(b) if not, why not?
- (18) (a) Was a Risk Management Plan developed at project commencement; and
(b) if so, how frequently has it been updated?
- (19) At what stage did escalating project risks relating to cost, scope, and schedule become apparent, and were these risks formally documented and escalated?
- (20) How frequently was the Minister for Housing briefed on project performance, including cost and timing risks?
- (21) (a) Has any internal assurance review, gateway review, ICT governance review, or external audit been undertaken; and
(b) if so, will the Minister table the findings?
- (22) Has Homes Tasmania issued any performance notices, improvement notices, breach notices or similar actions to the principal contractor or subcontractors during the project?

- (23) Why did the CEO/Director of Homes Tasmania direct that the Housing Connect System Reform be rolled out despite the new ICT system not being operational, and what assessment was made of the risks this posed to community service providers?
- (24) What assessment was undertaken of the operational impact on service providers, before requiring the sector to adopt the new program without a functioning data system?
- (25) Were Service providers, including Colony 47/ Home Base, consulted about the impact to their ability to delivery the new Housing Connect program without the data system in place?
- (26) Did Homes Tasmania receive advice from service providers warning that the rollout was premature or unworkable, and how was this advice acted upon?
- (27) Was a formal risk assessment undertaken before directing implementation of the new Housing Connect model without the accompanying data system, and will the Minister table that assessment?
- (28) Did Homes Tasmania's executive or board approve the decision to proceed with rollout, and what advice was provided to them regarding service-delivery risks?
- (29) Were any alternative options considered, such as staged rollout, delay, or maintaining existing contracts, until the data system was functional?
- (30) Did the early rollout breach any contractual obligations owed to service providers, including obligations around systems readiness, data access, and operational continuity?
- (31) (a) Was the termination or non-renewal of contracts (including Colony 47/Home Base) made before the ICT system was confirmed as operational, and
(b) if so, why?
- (32) When was the Minister first briefed that the system was not ready for use, and did the Minister approve or endorse the decision to proceed regardless?
- (33) Did the Minister or Department receive any warnings from Homes Tasmania, consultants, or community providers about the risks of proceeding with the changed model without a functional system?

The Minister for Housing and Planning (Mr *Vincent*) answered:

- (1) There was no set tender value for the Housing Connect System Reform as the project is made up of multiple parts including service design and delivery, and IT system infrastructure.
- (2) The original Housing Connect tender for the new service delivery model was a limited tender to existing service providers.
- (3) The original approved project scope included four aspects:
 - (a) More ways and places for people to get the help they need to find, and keep, safe, affordable and appropriate housing.
 - (b) Services and supports that are shaped for each person's individual circumstances and life stage.
 - (c) Actions to increase the range of housing assistance options.
 - (d) Skilled and supported staff delivering an Advantaged Thinking approach to providing support to people seeking help.

The original project scope included an enhancement to the Specialist Homelessness Information Platform (SHIP) to improve support assessments. The scope was later expanded to replace SHIP with a fit-for-purpose client information platform (the Housing Connect database).

- (4) There have been no contract variations.
- (5) \$4,914,158.
- (6) Noting there was no single original tender value, and the reform project is ongoing, the final project cost is yet to be finalised.
- (7) The service delivery reform has been in place for one full year and data relating to the reform was published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) as part of its Specialist Homelessness Services Annual Report 2024-25. The report shows that fewer Tasmanians needed homelessness services this year with 6 323 people assisted compared with 6 672 in 2023-24 – a 5.2 per cent decrease.
The new service model also reduces the need for multiple support periods. This is shown in the significant reduction in the number of overall support periods, with Tasmanians facing homelessness needing 10 015 support periods in 2024-25 compared with 14 321 in 2023-24.
- (8) The Housing Connect Reform commenced in May 2019 and the original delivery date was 1 July 2023.
- (9) Three.
Delivery of the new Housing Connect service model was originally due on 1 July 2023 but was revised to 1 July 2024 following the decision to replace SHIP.

The service model was delivered on 1 July 2024 but the delivery date for the website portal and database was revised to 1 April 2025 due to data migration issues.

A third delivery date for the IT components is required due to ongoing data migration and functionality issues.

- (10) Changes in project costs and delays have occurred due to the complexity of the development and integration of the new database.
- (11) Eleven.
- (12) Contractors were engaged under written contracts.
- (13) Consultants and contractors were engaged through open procurement process or direct selection and remain in the project through extensions or rollovers.
- (14) Homes Tasmania complies with all relevant Treasurer's Instructions.
- (15) N/A.
- (16) Homes Tasmania is not subject to the provisions of the *Financial Management Act 2016*, other than the Treasurer's Instructions (s 13 of the *Homes Tasmania Act 2022*). Homes Tasmania operates in a manner that ensures proper, efficient and effective use of its resources.
- (17) No - Homes Tasmania and the project are not subject to the Public Works Committee Act.
- (18) (a) Yes.
(b) Monthly.
- (19) Risks have been identified and managed at all stages throughout the project.
- (20) Housing Connect reform has been a standing agenda item at Regular Fortnightly Meetings between Homes Tasmania and the Minister for Housing since late 2023.
- (21) (a) An internal review of the IT component of the project was undertaken.
(b) Noting this was an internal review, it has not been provided to the Minister.
- (22) No.
- (23) The purpose of the Housing Connect System Reform project was to improve housing support for Tasmanians in need and the latest SHS annual report demonstrates it has been successful. These service improvements were not dependent on either the portal or platform.
The decision was made after considering risks with contract compliance between Homes Tasmania and the Housing Connect 2.0 providers if the new model did not commence from 1 July 2024.
- (24) The staged approach to Housing Connect 2.0 implementation was discussed and agreed at the April 2024 meeting of the Housing Connect Reform Steering Committee (HCRSC), which was attended by Housing Connect service providers, Shelter Tas and specialist homelessness service representatives. The HCSR project has been co-designed and implemented with the sector.
- (25) Yes.
- (26) No. Successful proponents agreed to implement structural changes to the service model.
- (27) Risks have been identified and managed at all stages throughout the project.
- (28) The decision was approved by the CEO and noted by the Board on the advice that the continued use of SHIP mitigated risks to service delivery.
- (29) Yes.
- (30) No.
- (31) (a) All Housing Connect contracts (including Colony 47/ Home Base) expired on 30 June 2024.
(b) All providers were invited to tender for the new Housing Connect model
- (32) The Minister was first briefed on the two-stage approach to Housing Connect 2.0 implementation in May 2024.
- (33) No.

11 PROJECT MARINUS LINE UPGRADE.— Mr *Gaffney* asked the Honourable Minister for Energy and Renewables —

With regard to the proposed North West Transmission Line upgrade for Project Marinus and a reply during Estimates from TasNetworks CEO Mr Seán Mc Goldrick, through you Minister, highlighting that there are 10 public landholders, and 271 affected private landowners in the proposed North West Transmission Line upgrade.

Of these, Mr Mc Goldrick said seven out of the 10 public landholders have signed option agreements. He also stated that 17% of the 271 private landowners had not yet signed, meaning that at least 46 private landowners had not signed option agreements at that time.

The TasNetworks CEO also highlighted that 4%, or over 10 private landowners had not let the Hydro on their land to even start negotiations:

- (1) What defines the 10 public landholders:
 - (a) Does it mean the Crown, Federal, State, local councils, and/or publicly listed companies/corporations; and
 - (b) Can you please disclose the identity of the 10 public landholders?
- (2) Of the 271 private landowners, how many individual properties/titles are owned by:
 - (a) Forico;
 - (b) UniSuper;
 - (c) Publicly listed companies;
 - (d) Mainland corporations and mainland institutional investors;
 - (e) Tasmanian corporations and Tasmanian institutional investors; and
 - (f) Overseas investors, including (but not limited to) foreign-owned superannuation and/or pension funds?
- (3) Of the 281 total of both private and public landholders:
 - (a) include all properties affected by all stages of the North West Transmission Lines development or just stage 1; and
 - (b) If only stage 1, then how many affected properties in total will there be in all stages?

The Deputy Leader of the Government (Mr *Vincent*) answered:

- (1) Public landholders include the Crown, State owned companies and local councils. The 10 public landholders are:
 - (a) Central Coast Council;
 - (b) Burnie City Council;
 - (c) Kentish Council;
 - (d) Northern Midlands Council;
 - (e) Hydro Tasmania;
 - (f) Taswater;
 - (g) TasRail;
 - (h) Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania (NRE); and
 - (i) Sustainable Timbers Tasmania (STT).
- (2) TasNetworks have advised eight parcels of land affected by Stage 1 of the NWTN are owned by Forico and that no titles/properties are owned by Uni Super. Noting these categories are not tracked by the business, to the best of TasNetworks knowledge there are no land titles owned by:
 - (a) Publicly listed companies;
 - (b) Mainland corporations and mainland institutional investors;
 - (c) Tasmanian corporations and Tasmanian institutional investors; or
 - (d) Overseas investors.
- (3) TasNetworks have advised that the number of property owners affected by Stage 1 of the North West Transmission Development (NWTN) is 281.
- (4) The number of properties affected by Stage 2 of the NWTN will be quantified during the finalisation of the Stage 2 design, should there be a decision to proceed.

12 LEAVE TO TABLE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS AND INCORPORATE ANSWERS INTO HANSARD.—*Ordered*, That Mr *Vincent* have leave to Table answer to Question Nos. 17, 18, 20 and 21 and have the answers incorporated into the Hansard record.

13 TASPOTS OPERATIONS.— Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable Minister for Infrastructure and Transport —

With regard to TasPorts operations:

- (1)
 - (a) How many marine pilotage services have been provided annually over the last 5 years; and
 - (b) How many marine pilots have been employed each year for the last 5 years, by year?

- (2) How many marine pilots have left TasPorts employment in the last financial year and in the current financial year to date?
- (3) Listed separately for the 2025/25 financial year and the current financial year to date, provide the:
 - (a) dates of each marine pilot's departure;
 - (b) locations of the port(s) they were operating; and
 - (c) (i) whether any who left employment were still undergoing training; and
(ii) If so, how many were in training?
- (4) (a) If any marine pilots left during training did this result in a delay to the training and recruitment pipeline; and
(b) If not, how did TasPorts avoid delays to marine pilotage services?
- (5) What is the current number of qualified marine pilots at:
 - (a) Burnie and Port Latta, listed separately if required;
 - (b) Devonport; and
 - (c) Hobart.
- (6) What is the required number of marine pilots at each port to maintain service standards without delays?
- (7) With regard to shipping delays attributable to marine pilot availability in the 2024/25 financial year and in the current financial year to date, provide data that shows the:
 - (a) number of delayed vessel movements;
 - (b) hours and/or days of delay;
 - (c) relevant ports impacted;
 - (d) actual vessels affected including the number of petrol tankers; and
(i) the length of delay for each vessel; and
(ii) the products each vessel is carrying;
 - (e) number of complaints received and details of which companies have raised complaints or concerns regarding delays;
 - (f) statements as to whether TasPorts prioritises traffic to or in and around TasPorts owned berths when there is a shortage of marine pilots; and
 - (g) the costs to customers from any pilotage delays or shortages?
- (8) Provide detail regarding the workforce planning model used by TasPorts for marine pilots including:
 - (a) how TasPorts determines required staffing levels; and
 - (b) the acceptable delay threshold?
- (9) With regard to Berth 4 in Burnie:
 - (a) when did TasPorts first receive advice that Berth 4 was unsafe for use;
 - (b) how long did TasPorts continue operating Berth 4 without restrictions after receiving the first safety report advising it was unsafe;
 - (c) did TasPorts seek a second engineering opinion and if so why;
 - (d) when was the deterioration of material beneath Berth 4 first identified in in TasPorts monitoring systems; and
 - (e) what was the timeframe between an adverse safety audit identification and remedial action in TasPorts safety protocols?
- (10) Noting our ports can be an entry point for illegal drugs, what is TasPorts Drugs and Alcohol Policy:
 - (a) when was it last reviewed;
 - (b) when was it last updated;
 - (c) if any changes were made;
 - (i) what were the changes; and
 - (ii) why were the changes made?

The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Mr *Vincent*) answered:

- (1) (a) TasPorts provides marine pilotage services across Tasmania's ports in accordance with statutory and safety requirements.

Over the past five years, TasPorts has delivered approximately 1,700-1800 pilotage movements per annum, with annual totals varying due to shipping demand, seasonal conditions, and operational requirements across ports.

Pilotage services are provided safely and reliably in accordance with regulated fatigue management, emergency response coverage, and port-specific operational constraints.

Financial year	Pilotage – Job count reportable
2020/21	1,353
2021/22	1,448
2022/23	1,919
2023/24	1,849
2024/25	1,771
Five-year average	1,668
Post-COVID average	1,846

(b)

As at	No. pilots
Current	16
June 2025	15
June 2024	15
June 2023	15
June 2022	14

- (2) In FY25 one marine pilot left TasPorts employment, due to resignation. In FY26 two marine pilots left TasPorts employment, due to resignation. As of 16 February 2026, a third pilot had resigned and will end employment with TasPorts in early April.
- (3) (a) In FY25 one pilot departed on 24 March. In FY26 one pilot departed on 15 December 2025, and one pilot departed on 10 September 2025.
(c) One employee was still a trainee at the time of resignation.
- (4) (a) Yes. The resignation of a marine pilot during training, combined with the timing of other workforce changes, had a short-term impact on the training and recruitment pipeline. Marine pilot training and licensing requirements are extensive, highly regulated and port-specific, and typically take approximately four to six months to complete. By contrast, the standard notice period for resignation is eight weeks. As a result, while TasPorts had already commenced recruitment to maintain pilot numbers, replacement pilots could not be trained and licensed within the same timeframe as departures. This timing mismatch created short-term operational pinch points during a peak operating period. TasPorts has since progressed recruitment and training activities to restore resilience across the system and continues to actively manage these pressures through safety-led operational planning.
- (b) While the impacts described above created short-term operational pressure, TasPorts has actively managed these challenges to minimise disruption to marine pilotage services. This includes:
- Implementing safety-led rostering and fatigue management to ensure pilots were not operating beyond regulated limits;
 - Prioritising vessel movements based on safety, emergency response requirements and system-wide operational considerations;
 - Utilising multi-port licensed pilots where practicable to support coverage; and
 - Engaging with affected customers where necessary to advise of operational constraints and adjust scheduling arrangements.
- These measures have enabled TasPorts to continue providing safe pilotage services while managing the short-term impacts of pilot training and recruitment during a peak period.

(5)

Location	Total
North-West	6
Bell Bay	4
Hobart	6
Total	16

(6) There is no fixed minimum number of marine pilots per port that guarantees the absence of delays.

Required pilot numbers are determined through a workforce planning model that considers:

- Port-specific risk profiles and vessel types;
- Frequency and timing of shipping movements;
- Fatigue management and mandatory rest requirements;
- Emergency response coverage obligations;
- Training and licensing status; and
- The availability of multi-port licensed pilots.

TasPorts plans pilot resources to maintain safe and reliable services across the system, recognising that weather, vessel scheduling and safety considerations may occasionally require short-term operational adjustments.

(7) TasPorts does not maintain a standalone dataset attributing vessel delays solely to marine pilot availability.

Vessel movements are influenced by a range of factors including weather conditions, vessel readiness, terminal operations, tug availability, safety considerations, and regulatory requirements, in addition to pilot availability.

Where short-term operational adjustments have been required to manage pilot fatigue or maintain emergency response coverage, TasPorts has engaged directly with affected customers to coordinate scheduling and minimise disruption.

TasPorts does not prioritise traffic based on ownership of berths. Vessel movements are prioritised based on safety, regulatory obligations, emergency response requirements, and system-wide operational considerations.

TasPorts does not collect or verify customer cost data, as these are commercial matters between customers and shipping operators.

TasPorts has received a small number of customer concerns regarding pilotage availability during peak operating periods, which have been managed through direct engagement and operational coordination.

(8) TasPorts' workforce planning for marine pilots is based on a risk-based operational model, rather than fixed staffing ratios.

In determining required staffing levels, TasPorts considers a range of interrelated factors, including:

- Statutory and regulatory requirements governing marine pilotage;
- Directions and requirements issued by the Harbour Master;
- Port-specific operational risk and complexity;
- The volume, frequency and timing of shipping movements across Tasmanian ports;
- Fatigue management and mandatory rest requirements;
- Training, licensing and supervision requirements for pilots; and
- The need to maintain emergency response capability across ports at all times.

In addition, TasPorts must ensure that marine pilots are able to meet minimum annual sea-time and vessel movement requirements to maintain their licences. Given the scale and pattern of shipping movements in Tasmania, there is a practical limit to the number of pilots that can be sustainably employed while still enabling each pilot to maintain regulatory competency and currency.

As a result, increasing pilot numbers beyond this level would not resolve short-term availability pressures and could introduce additional safety and compliance risks. It would also increase the cost of pilotage services, which would ultimately be passed on to customers. TasPorts therefore

manages a necessary balance between safety, regulatory compliance, operational resilience and cost efficiency.

There is no defined “acceptable delay threshold” for marine pilotage services. Decisions regarding vessel movements are made on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with Harbour Master directions and regulatory requirements, with safety as the overriding consideration.

Where delays occur, they are managed through direct engagement with customers and are typically influenced by a combination of operational, weather and safety factors, rather than pilot availability alone.

- (9)
- (a) Berth 4 at the Port of Burnie remains safe for use by its customer Strait Link.
 - (b) TasPorts has received a range of engineering advice around the structure at Berth 4, however has not received a safety report advising that Berth 4 is unsafe for use.
 - (c) TasPorts has sought specialist advice from multiple consultants to support its active risk management and design development of a remediation solution. This has included engineers and maritime engineering specialists.
 - (d) The condition of Berth 4 has been monitored through TasPorts’ established inspection and asset management processes over an extended period.

In 2015, a dive survey identified localised undermining and scour beneath a section of the Berth 4 quay wall. Project planning to remediate this scour commenced. At that time, discussions were also underway with Toll (StraitLink’s predecessor) regarding ramp extensions and wharf works associated with the introduction of larger vessels.

In 2017, TasPorts received an engineering assessment prepared for Toll in support of those works. That report identified further scour and noted a potential risk of global instability. The assessment assumed the quay wall was keyed into underlying material, and on that basis the works undertaken at the time focused on scour protection only. Those works were delivered by Toll.

In 2023, as part of TasPorts’ Wharf Condition Monitoring Program, undertaken in accordance with the Wharf Structure Condition Assessment Manual (WSCAM), additional scouring beneath Berth 4 was identified. TasPorts initiated further investigations to determine the extent and risk. Later in 2023, TasPorts engaged a specialist maritime engineering firm to undertake a detailed assessment. This assessment identified that, in addition to scour, the quay wall was subject to global instability, and that earlier assumptions about the wall being keyed were not correct. It also confirmed that previous scour protection works were only partially effective.

TasPorts received a draft report in December 2023 and immediately implemented recommended control measures, including the installation of survey control marks to monitor wharf movement. The final report was received in January 2024 and recommended further geotechnical investigations to support the design of remediation works, with a focus on maintaining the safe operation of StraitLink services at Berth 4.

- (10) The TasPorts Alcohol and Other Drugs Guideline (Guideline) and Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy (Policy) were last reviewed during the period from July to October 2025.

The Guideline and Policy were updated and circulated on 8 October 2025.

The Policy and Guideline were amended to:

- Improve the drafting (i.e. to increase clarity and remove repetition);
- Make it clear that the Policy and Guideline do not form part of any contract between any worker and TasPorts, and that TasPorts is permitted to replace or vary the Policy and Guideline at any time;
- Confirm TasPorts’ position that the consumption of alcohol and drugs (except certain medications) at a TasPorts workplace, including a vessel, is not permitted (though the Policy and Guideline provide that the CEO may approve the consumption of alcohol on a TasPorts’ worksite); and
- Include an express confirmation that TasPorts does not tolerate false, misleading or vexatious allegations in relation to the use of alcohol or drugs.

The changes to the Policy and Guideline were primarily made because:

- The Policy and Guideline were due for review;
- There were queries raised about the clarity of the operation of the Policy and Guideline (ie, the drafting could be clearer); and
- TasPorts is committed to providing a safe workplace for all its employees, including appropriately prohibiting alcohol and drug use.

14 EVICTIONS FROM PUBLIC HOUSING.— Ms O'Connor asked the Honourable Minister for Housing and Planning —

With regard to eviction from public housing:

- (1) For each of FY2016-17, FY2017-18, FY2018-19, FY2019-20, FY2020-21, FY2021-22, FY2022-23, and FY2023-24, can you please provide the number of evictions from public housing tenancies broken down by:
 - (a) Vacant possession after termination notice;
 - (b) Vacant possession after Court order; and
 - (c) Vacant possession after Sheriff/Bailiff/Police attends to enforce order.
- (2) Of those households evicted from public housing, for each of the years specified in Question 1,
 - (a) How many had at least one household member who was a child?
 - i. How many children were listed as household members for each of these households?
 - (b) How many households included at least one tenant who disclosed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status on application or rent review forms?
 - i. How many children were listed as household members for each of these households?
- (3) For each of the years specified in Question 1, how many public housing tenancies were managed by Homes Tasmania in total?
- (4) For each of the years specified in Question 1, what was the total number of public housing tenancies with a tenant who disclosed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status on application or rent review forms?

The Minister for Housing and Planning (Mr Vincent) answered:

- (1) Table 1 – Total evictions from public housing by financial year

2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
30	61	40	38	10	13	20	30

Table 1 outlines the number of evictions from public housing from 2016-2017 to 2023-2024 by financial year. Eviction data is not readily available for the reasons listed in the question.

- (2) Data is provided for children aged 16 and under.

Table 2a – The numbers of households evicted with children as household members

2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
6	12	15	12	3	5	5	9

Table 2ai – The number of children listed as household members for the household evicted

2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
11	22	37	29	3	6	7	13

Table 2b – The number of household evicted where tenants disclosed Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander status

2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
8	10	4	6	0	3	5	7

Table 2bi – The number of children listed as household members where tenant disclosed Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander status

2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
1	4	5	2	0	0	0	4

(3) Table 3 – The total number of public housing tenancies managed by Homes Tasmania by financial year

2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
6880	6856	6931	6961	6904	4897	4863	4861

Table 3 represents the number of households with active public housing tenancies at the end of June each year, as shown in the Report on Government Services (RoGS).

The number of public housing tenancies has reduced over time with the transfer of management to community housing. There has been an overall increase in social housing tenancies.

(4) Table 4 – The total number of public housing tenancies managed by Homes Tasmania that include tenants with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status by financial year

2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024
444	455	513	536	575	432	444	440

Table 4 represents the number of households with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status with active public housing tenancies at the end of June each year, as shown in the Report on Government Services (RoGS).

As above, the number of public housing tenancies has reduced over time with the transfer of management to community housing. There has been an overall increase in social housing tenancies.

15 MACQUARIE POINT TOXIC SOIL MANAGEMENT.— Ms *O'Connor* asked the Honourable Leader for the Government —

The Macquarie Point site has unknown and known contaminants, including asbestos and potential acid sulphate soils. It is unknown exactly which contaminants exists in which locations on the site. Considering the potential hazards from excavation on the site, including the release of toxic gases, and exposure to toxic dust, can the Minister please advise:

- (1) When will the Site Suitability Statement be complete and which agency will be responsible for this body of work?
- (2) Has the EPA developed a detailed Environmental Management Plan that deals with these hazards? If not, when will it be prepared?
- (3) How will Macquarie Point Development Corporation prevent health and safety risks to workers onsite and the general public?
- (4) What mitigation strategies are being put in place to prevent risks to onsite workers, Hobart residents and visitors to Sullivans Cove from contaminated soils?
- (5) What level of monitoring and oversight of contaminated soil excavation, treatment and removal is currently being undertaken and planned over the course of the stadium development?
- (6) How will level 4 contaminants be dealt with when disturbed and exposed?

- (7) Does MPDC expect contaminated soils which have been excavated to be stored on site, and if so, what measures will be taken to prevent any risk to public health from dispersal of this material?
- (8) Where will contaminated soils be disposed of and how will the safety of people be assured once disposed in these locations?
- (9) If there is a release of contaminants exposing workers and /or the public, what is the plan for notifying people?

The Deputy Leader of the Government (Mr *Vincent*) answered:

- (1) Site Suitability Statements are issued by an accredited Environmental Auditor and are expected to be finalised in the first quarter of 2026.
The Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012, provides the only statutory remediation review process in the state. It includes the appointment of an Environmental Auditor, accredited by the EPA, who is engaged through out the process, and is informed by an expert remediation consultant working with the Macquarie Point Development Corporation.
The Corporation is responsible for undertaking the remediation process, as set out in the Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012.
- (2) The *Macquarie Point Development Corporation Act 2012* sets out the remediation actions that are required before development can occur.
Activity on site is supported by a Site Environmental Management Plan (or SEMP).
The SEMP was developed by the Corporation's expert remediation advice and is reviewed and approved by the Accredited Environmental Auditor.
SEMPs are site-specific and set out requirements for activity at Macquarie Point. The SEMP is reviewed and approved by the Environmental Auditor, and is a key part of the process of setting out the requirements for receiving Site Suitability Statements.
The SEMP has been updated over time to reflect the latest information available and works to date. The Corporation has had a SEMP in place since 2015. The current version of the SEMP is version 4.0, updated in early December 2025, and has been approved by the Environmental Auditor. The SEMP was tabled in the Legislative Council on 4 December 2025.
- (3) Works on site are supported by a task-specific work health and safety plan. These are generally in the form of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).
These plans are informed by the SEMP, which has been approved by the Environmental Auditor and informs activity across the site.
The SEMP:
 - identifies known areas of contamination and provides an overview of appropriate management measures to:
 - address potential human health and environmental risks associated with subsurface contamination; and
 - maintain compliance with relevant environmental management requirements, and related safety management requirements.
 - provides procedures for contamination management associated with intrusive works such as excavation and disposal of soil, dust and odour control, stormwater and sediment management, noise control and groundwater management.
 - documents planning controls to prevent unacceptable environmental risks following development relating to land use, building requirements, establishment of vegetation, and ongoing monitoring of site condition.
 - has been utilised for all works previously undertaken on site since the first iteration of the SEMP was prepared in November 2015.
- (4) The SEMP approved by the Environmental Auditor, and the subsequent Site Suitability Statements prepared by the Environmental Auditor, consider the protection of onsite workers, Hobart residents and visitors, and surrounding ecosystems.
They include mitigation or management measures to guide works on site as noted in response to the previous question.
- (5) The SEMP, as developed by the Corporation's remediation consultant, approved by the Environmental Auditor, as tabled in the Legislative Council on 4 December, and as recently reviewed by the EPA through the Order to confirm it was satisfied with the document for enable

initial works to proceed, identifies known areas of contamination and sets out controls to guide its management.

For each stage of works, the contractor's Construction Environmental Management Plan will specify the methods of excavation, storage, treatment and removal of soil.

- (6) The Corporation, with the assistance of expert consultants, is responsible for stockpile inspection, sampling of stockpiles and management of groundwater well protection measures. The data is reviewed, assessed for potential reuse or suitability for disposal, and expert advice is provided on any other actions, such as opportunities to soil farm on site and reduce contamination levels.

The Corporation has undertaken a pre-excavation categorisation sampling and analysis program of the planned excavation areas of the Multipurpose Stadium.

The majority of the soil to be excavated is *Level 2 – Low Level Contaminated Soil*, and has noted in the above advice, the SEMP documents handling requirements.

The pre-excavation categorisation sampling and analysis program has identified small areas of material of a higher waste category, which will be segregated and stockpiled on site for treatment and remediation. The Corporation has successfully implemented onsite remediation as part of previous site improvements.

Accepted methodologies for the contaminants detected in potentially higher impact areas have been documented and accepted by the EPA as the site has been remediated. These include chemical immobilisation for lead impacted stockpiles or biopiling and landfarming techniques for hydrocarbon impacted soil. Where feasible and practical, remediation occurs on site to reduce the levels of contamination. This reduces environmental risks associated with the soil and lowers the costs associated with handling and disposal.

Soil is then removed to waste management facilities licensed by the EPA to accept that category of contaminated soil.

- (7) The majority of the site has been pre-categorised as *Level 2 – Low Level Contaminated Soil* which will allow for its excavation and removal to licensed waste facilities in accordance with the SEMP and the linked CEMP developed by the contractor for the activity.

Some soils of higher contamination levels may require stockpiling on site for treatment accordance with Technical Specification requirements.

The Technical Specification sets a number of standards for works including work health and safety; statutory requirements; site security; site inspections; storage of materials; tools, plant, labour and equipment management; noise and vibration controls; environmental management; and project documentation requirements.

- (8) Contaminated soils will be disposed of at waste management facilities licensed by the EPA.

License conditions include capacity and contamination levels for each waste depot. The licensing process is managed by the EPA. These facilities are licensed to take waste as required more broadly, and are not limited to the acceptance of contaminated material from Macquarie Point.

- (9) There is a duty on an owner, occupier or polluter under section 32 of the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994* to notify the EPA or the Local Council about pollution that causes or may cause environmental harm or nuisance. The Corporation and its Contractors are required to comply with these conditions as is the case with any other party. The CEMP sets out the work practices to be implemented in the event of an incident, as guided by the SEMP.

16 CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION IN TASMANIA.— Ms O'Connor asked the Honourable Leader for the Government —

- (1) How many public submissions were made for the Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008? And when is the government planning on releasing a summary of submissions and a response to them?
- (2) What is the timeline for the Climate Act Review? When does the government plan to release any proposed amendments?
- (3) Given 2035 is just 10 years away, how is the Tasmanian Government plan to contribute towards the new Commonwealth Government emissions reduction target (62-70% by 2035)?
- (4) Tasmania's net zero status relies almost entirely on carbon sequestration by our forests, with little-to-no absolute emissions reduction in other sectors. Does the government have access to, or any plans to fund modelling of the changes in Tasmanian forests carbon carrying capacity against future

climate scenarios? Is there planned modelling on their future impact on the State's emissions profile and net zero status?

- (5) The Government's Forestry Climate Action Plan states its Priority Area 1 is Information and Knowledge – It says, "We will ensure our businesses, industries, governments and communities can make informed decisions by providing up-to-date, high quality and user-friendly information about Tasmania's emissions, our future climate, and emissions reduction, sequestration and adaptation opportunities."

If this is the #1 priority where are the figures on the emissions from regeneration burns from Forestry Tasmania?

How much carbon is being emitted by regeneration burns in the forestry sector?

- (6) In relation to Tasmania's industrial plans for burning biomass from Tasmanian Forestry operations, and particularly its use in energy production such as for Cement Australia's Railton Facility, what will be the source of this biomass for current projects and others planned in the future – plantation, native forests, private forests?

Is it coming from State Forests – from Sustainable Timbers Tasmania?

- (7) Has the government considered the increased demand for biomass and reliance on biomass for emissions reduction transition and how that might contrast with the decreased ability of Tasmanian forests to sequester carbon AND the federal government's reliance on forests for the national 2035 target?

- (8) Tasmania's Risk Assessment for Climate Change notes a clear pathway for action is required to support a just transition to a low carbon economy which include Zero Emission Buses (ZEBs).

(a) What are the government's plans to roll out ZEBs once the trial period has ended?

(b) Has the government factored in costs associated with transition to an electric bus fleet? (Including but not limited to; charging networks installation, fleet updates, workforce training).

- (9) Does the minister have any plans for getting the government back on track for delivering 100% of the government vehicle fleet converted to electric by 2030?

The Deputy Leader of the Government (Mr *Vincent*) answered:

- (1) A total of 370 pieces of feedback were received, including 99 written submissions, 202 survey responses, and 69 ideas wall contributions.

In December 2025, the independent review team provided a summary report on the consultation feedback, and a final independent review report.

In accordance with the Act, the final report will be tabled in both Houses of Parliament within 10 sitting days of receipt. Both reports will also be published on the ReCFIT website.

- (2) In accordance with Subsection 18(5) of the Act, the final report prepared by the independent reviewers will be tabled in both Houses of Parliament within 10 sitting days of receipt.

The Climate Change Office will liaise with the Tasmanian Government and key stakeholders (including targeted cross-agency engagement) in early 2026 to consider the independent review findings.

- (3) Tasmania has the most ambitious emissions reduction target of any jurisdiction in Australia. The Tasmanian Government is on track to achieve its legislated target of net zero greenhouse gas emissions, or lower, by 2030 and continues to support business, industry and the community to reduce emissions and contribute towards the new Australian Government emissions reduction target for 2035.

The Tasmanian Government released six sector-based emissions reduction and resilience plans (the Plans) in late 2024. The Plans have broad alignment and complementarity with the six national sectoral plans developed to support the national Net Zero Plan, released in 2025.

Funding of \$3.6 million has been committed to deliver 30 actions across Tasmania's six sectoral Plans and includes four cross-sectoral commitments. Several actions are already underway or complete. Further actions have been identified in the Plans as future funding priorities over the next five years. New plans will be produced every five years in line with legislative requirements. A new Climate Change Action Plan is also required to be developed every five years. The next action plan is to be developed by 2028.

- (4) The government does not have access to, and does not have any plans to fund, modelling of the changes in Tasmanian forests' carbon carrying capacity against future climate scenarios and their future impact on the state's emissions profile and net zero status.
- (5) Emissions from the Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) sector, including those from post-harvest regeneration burns, are calculated and reported by the Australian Government's Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) as part of Australia's National Greenhouse Accounts (ANGA).

DCCEEW uses methods to calculate and report Australia's emissions that are in accordance with the guidelines set out by the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The methods are detailed in the National Inventory Reports, which are the Australian Government's submissions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement.

The internationally agreed methods include how LULUCF emissions from forest harvesting events, including post-harvest regeneration burns, are treated. Emissions from post-harvest regeneration burns are included in ANGA for various silvicultural operations and forest types. The emissions from post-harvest regeneration burns from Sustainable Timber Tasmania's operations are reported in the 'multiple use forest' sub-sector of the LULUCF sector.

Net emissions reported for the 'multiple use forest' sub-sector are based on the sequestration from living biomass (both above and below ground) on public lands, including post-harvest regrowth as well as losses from harvesting and post-harvest regeneration burns. The emissions reported by DCCEEW for the 'multiple use forest' sub-sector in ANGA aggregate these sources and sinks and it is not possible to determine the emissions attributed solely to post-harvest regeneration burns.

The Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008 includes a requirement for the Tasmanian Government to prepare a report on Tasmania's greenhouse gas emissions every year. DCCEEW's emissions data reported for Tasmania in ANGA is used as the basis for the greenhouse gas report. Tasmania's most recent emissions data for 2023 are reported in the Tasmanian Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report 2025, which is available on the ReCFIT website:

www.recfit.tas.gov.au/what_is_recfit/climate_change/greenhouse_gas_emissions

The methods are detailed in the National Inventory Report 2023 at www.dcceew.gov.au/climate-change/publications/national-inventory-report-2023

Emissions data by sector and sub-sector for each Australian state and territory can be explored in Australia's National Greenhouse Accounts at www.greenhouseaccounts.climatechange.gov.au/

- (6) The Bioenergy Vision for Tasmania 2023 (the vision) sets out the opportunities for Tasmania's bioenergy industry. The focus of the vision is to create an environment that unlocks investment to deliver against the key drivers of bioenergy adoption: renewable energy generation, greenhouse gas emissions reduction, waste management and resource recovery, jobs creation and economic development.

Tasmania produces 7.8 million tonnes of liquid organic waste and 1.4 million tonnes of solid organic waste from municipal, agricultural, forestry and industrial sources annually.

Industry determines their individual fuel and/or energy requirements and corresponding appropriate bioenergy source. The focus of the Bioenergy Vision for Tasmania is the utilisation of organic waste and residue streams.

Cement Australia plans to use both tyre-derived fuel, and forestry residues (wood waste) from Sustainable Timber Tasmania in their upgraded kiln to replace coal use and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

- (7) The Bioenergy Vision for Tasmania 2023 focuses on organic waste and residue streams. The Vision recognises that producing bioenergy from higher value products such as food crops and high value wood or native vegetation harvested solely for bioenergy production is unlikely to be economically, socially or environmentally sound.

The government does not expect bioenergy to cause an increase in forest harvesting, nor is it aware of any plans or discussions to do so. Bioenergy is generated from forest harvesting and processing residues. This means that bioenergy is not expected to have a significant impact on

forest carbon stocks.

However, there is the potential to significantly decrease emissions from fossil fuels by utilising forest harvesting and processing residues to generate bioenergy. Generating bioenergy displaces the use of fossil fuels, such as the coal used in the kiln at Cement Australia.

- (8) Tasmania's Risk Assessment for Climate Change outlines a range of risks and opportunities, including opportunities to increase public and active transport, and transition transport to low emissions vehicles.

Metro Tasmania is currently undertaking trials of battery electric buses (BEB) in Launceston, and hydrogen electric buses (HEB) in Hobart. As part of the trial, Metro will be providing government with reports on the outcomes of the trials, including:

- practical learnings about the performance and operational requirements and issues associated with zero emissions buses, including but not limited to the buses, depots, and any off-site matters; and
- a commercial and socio-economic cost benefit assessment of both BEB and HEB technologies, and a recommendation on the most appropriate technology type or combination of technology (for example just BEB or HEB, or a mix of the two), to inform a subsequent business case for Metro's transition to zero emission buses (ZEBs).

A report covering the first 12 months of the BEB trial is expected in early 2026, to be followed by the HEB report in mid-late 2026.

The Department of State Growth is currently working with a consultancy to finalise procurement pathways for the transition to ZEBs. Options will be presented to government to decide on the preferred approach. The procurement pathways factor in costs associated with resourcing and transitioning from the current diesel fleets to ZEBs and depot transition costs (charging infrastructure).

- (9) The Tasmanian Government has implemented a range of policies and initiatives to support the fleet transition, including:
- (a) a new whole-of-government contract for purchasing passenger and light commercial vehicles;
 - (b) education resources for staff, including fact sheets and short instructional videos;
 - (c) assessing 110 government parking sites across the state for EV charging infrastructure;
 - (d) providing advice to agencies about installing charging infrastructure on their sites;
 - (e) updating operational fleet management policies;
 - (f) a procurement process for a panel of charging infrastructure suppliers (an open Request for Tender is scheduled for release in January 2026); and
 - (g) financial support for agencies to purchase EVs and charging infrastructure.

The government will consider what further measures may be required to support the transition of the fleet to EVs.

17 MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE.— *Ordered*, That Mr *Vincent* have leave to move a Motion without Notice.

18 SESSIONAL ORDER: AFTERNOON BREAK.— *Ordered*, That for the remainder of this Session of Parliament, whenever the Council is sitting at 4 o'clock pm on a Tuesday or Wednesday, the sitting will be suspended for thirty minutes. (Mr *Vincent*)

19 SPECIAL INTEREST MATTERS.— The President advised the Chamber of six Members who had indicated their desire to speak:—

- (1) Ms *Forrest* – Hellyer College update;
- (2) Mr *Hiscutt* – Jeanne Koetsier – Central Coast Council Citizen of the Year;
- (3) Mr *Gaffney* – Men's Resources Tasmania – Building Pathways, Peer Support and Transition to Community Programs.
- (4) Ms *Palmer* – Riverside Aquatic Centre;

- (5) Ms *Webb* – Introducing the Kinborough Reconciliation Action Group (KRAG); and
- (6) Ms *O'Connor* – Hobart Neighbourhood Greenways study; and

At the conclusion of Special Interest Matters the Council proceeded to Orders of the Day.

20 DEATHS AND INJURIES FROM QUAD BIKES OR ATV USE IN TASMANIA.— A Motion was made (Ms *O'Connor*) and the Question was proposed, That the Legislative Council:

- (1) Notes with concern the high rate of deaths and injuries from quad bike or ATV use in Tasmania, with more than 20 deaths since the year 2000.
- (2) Further notes more than 1400 Australians are seriously injured in quad bike accidents each year.
- (3) Expresses its sincere condolences to grieving loved ones, including the devastated parents of 14 year old Jocelyn Daguman who died in an ATV accident at Boyer in February 2023.
- (4) Recognises the findings of both Coroner Cooper in 2017 and Coroner Webster in 2024, who recommended stronger regulation of quad bike use to save lives.
- (5) Agrees with Coroner Cooper's recommendations, following his investigation into seven quad bike deaths between 2012-2015, to provide for increased community education promoting the use of helmets and seatbelts, and legislation that:
 - (a) Requires mandatory training and licensing of all persons using quad bikes.
 - (b) Prohibits children under the age of 16 from operating adult quad bikes.
 - (c) Prohibits children under the age of 16 from operating youth-sized quad bikes other than in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
 - (d) Prohibits children under the age of 6 from operating any quad bike under any circumstances.
- (6) Recognises there has been a substandard response to the Coroners' recommendations by the Rockliff Government.
- (7) Calls on the Rockliff Government to act to prevent such tragedies in the future and implement all the Coroner's recommendations to strengthen quad bike and ATV safety in Tasmania.

A Debate arose thereupon.

21 SITTING SUSPENDED.— It being 1.00 o'clock p.m. the Sitting of the Council was suspended.

The Council resumed the Sitting at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

22 LEAVE OF ABSENCE FORFEITED.— Ms *Rattray*, having attended the service of the Council before the expiration of her leave, forfeited the balance of such leave.

23 QUESTION TIME.— The President called for Questions without Notice. There were seven Questions asked.

24 DEATHS AND INJURIES FROM QUAD BIKES OR ATV USE IN TASMANIA.— The Council resumed Debate on the Question, That:—

The Legislative Council:

- (1) Notes with concern the high rate of deaths and injuries from quad bike or ATV use in Tasmania, with more than 20 deaths since the year 2000.
- (2) Further notes more than 1400 Australians are seriously injured in quad bike accidents each year.
- (3) Expresses its sincere condolences to grieving loved ones, including the devastated parents of 14 year old Jocelyn Daguman who died in an ATV accident at Boyer in February 2023.

- (4) Recognises the findings of both Coroner Cooper in 2017 and Coroner Webster in 2024, who recommended stronger regulation of quad bike use to save lives.
- (5) Agrees with Coroner Cooper's recommendations, following his investigation into seven quad bike deaths between 2012-2015, to provide for increased community education promoting the use of helmets and seatbelts, and legislation that:
 - (a) Requires mandatory training and licensing of all persons using quad bikes.
 - (b) Prohibits children under the age of 16 from operating adult quad bikes.
 - (c) Prohibits children under the age of 16 from operating youth-sized quad bikes other than in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.
 - (d) Prohibits children under the age of 6 from operating any quad bike under any circumstances.
- (6) Recognises there has been a substandard response to the Coroners' recommendations by the Rockliff Government.
- (7) Calls on the Rockliff Government to act to prevent such tragedies in the future and implement all the Coroner's recommendations to strengthen quad bike and ATV safety in Tasmania.

Amendments were proposed to be made to the motion (Ms *Lovell*):—

First Amendment

Paragraph (5)

Leave out subparagraph 5(a)

Second Amendment

Paragraph (7)

Leave out 'all'

A Debate arose thereupon.

Motion made and Question put, That the Amendments be agreed to.

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

Debate resumed on the Question that the Motion as amended be agreed to.

25 SITTING SUSPENDED.— It being 4.00 o'clock p.m. the Sitting of the Council was suspended.

The Council resumed the Sitting at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

26 DEATHS AND INJURIES FROM QUAD BIKES OR ATV USE IN TASMANIA.— The Council resumed Debate on the Question, That the motion as amended be agreed to.

A Debate arose thereupon.

And the Question being put.

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

27 GETTING BACK ON TRACK: INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF TASMANIA'S RIGHT TO INFORMATION FRAMEWORK.— A Motion was made (Ms *Webb*) and the Question was proposed, That the *Getting Back on Track: Independent Review of Tasmania's Right to Information Framework*, undertaken by Professor Tim McCormack and Adjunct Associate Professor Rick Snell, and released on 29 September 2025, be considered and noted.

A Debate arose thereupon.

And the Question being put.

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

28 TASMANIAN VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT 2024-25.— A Motion was made (Mr *Gaffney*) and the Question was proposed, That the Tasmanian Voluntary Assisted Dying Commission Annual Report 2024-25 be considered and noted.

A Debate arose thereupon.

And the Question being put,

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

29 ADJOURNMENT.— *Resolved*, That the Council will, at its rising adjourn until 11.00 o'clock a.m. on Wednesday, 18 March 2026. (Ms *Ratray*)

Resolved, That the Council do now adjourn. (Ms *Ratray*)

The Council adjourned at 7.23 o'clock p.m.

C.L. VICKERS, *Clerk of the Council.*