



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 – 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

No. 25

THURSDAY, 26 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 **LEAVE TO TABLE ANSWER TO QUESTION AND INCORPORATE ANSWER INTO HANSARD.**—*Ordered*, That Ms *Ratray* have leave to Table answer to Question No. 25 and have the answer incorporated into the Hansard record.
- 5 **ADVICE INFORMING THE TASMANIAN GOVERNMENT’S DECISION TO SHUT DOWN GREYHOUND RACING.**— Ms *Thomas* asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — Further to Premier Jeremy Rockliff’s 9 August 2025 announcement that the Tasmanian Liberal Government will phase out greyhound racing by June 30, 2029, can the Honourable Leader please advise:
 - (1) In relation to the advice informing the Tasmanian Government’s decision to shut down greyhound racing:
 - (a) Prior to the Government’s decision to shut down greyhound racing in Tasmania, did the Government receive any advice or a recommendation from a regulator that the industry should be shut down, including from the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, Tasracing, or the Office of the Racing Integrity Commissioner?
 - (b) If such a recommendation was received, when was it received and will the Government publish that advice on the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania website?
 - (c) If no such recommendation was received, what regulatory advice did the Government rely on in deciding to shut down the industry?
 - (d) Has any regulator, including the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, Tasracing, or the Office of the Racing Integrity Commissioner, ever advised the Government that greyhound racing in Tasmania cannot be regulated to acceptable animal welfare or integrity standards?
 - (e) What data or evidence did the Government rely upon to conclude that animal welfare or integrity problems in greyhound racing mean that greyhound racing no longer aligns with community expectations?
 - (f) In each of the past ten years, how many substantiated breaches relating to greyhound animal welfare were identified by an industry regulator?

- (g) In each of the past ten years, how many integrity or animal welfare breaches relating to greyhound racing resulted in charges, suspensions or disqualifications, or other disciplinary action?
 - (h) Did the Government seek advice from The Department of Treasury and Finance before making the decision to move to shut down greyhound racing?
 - (i) What economic analysis or modelling did the Government rely upon when deciding to move to shut down the greyhound racing industry?
- (2) Other than legislation, is the Tasmanian Government exploring other mechanisms to shutdown greyhound racing?
- (3) In relation to licensed greyhound trainers and kennel inspections, over the past five years:
- (a) How many licensed greyhound trainers were there in Tasmania, in each year?
 - (b) Each year, what proportion of those trainers had their kennels inspected by the Tasracing Integrity Unit or the former Office of Racing Integrity?
 - (c) How many greyhound kennel inspections were undertaken by the Tasracing Integrity Unit and former Office of Racing Integrity each year?
 - (d) What proportion of these inspections were unannounced or intelligence-led inspections?
 - (e) How many separate kennel properties were inspected?
 - (f) How many inspections identified animal welfare or racing rule breaches?
 - (g) How many inspections resulted in compliance actions, charges, suspensions or other disciplinary outcomes?
- (4) Since the commencement of the *Racing Regulation and Integrity Act 2024* in February 2025:
- (a) How many complaints relating to greyhound animal welfare or integrity matters have been received by:
 - (i) Tasracing or the Tasracing Integrity Unit, and
 - (ii) the Racing Integrity Commissioner?
 - (b) How many of those complaints resulted in:
 - (i) a formal investigation; and
 - (ii) no investigation being undertaken?
 - (c) How many investigations have been self-initiated by the Tasracing Integrity Unit?
 - (d) How many investigations have been self-initiated by the Racing Integrity Commissioner?
 - (e) How many investigations has the TasRacing Integrity Unit undertaken in total?
 - (f) How many investigations has the Racing Integrity Commissioner undertaken in total?
 - (g) How many of the greyhound animal welfare and integrity investigations resulted in:
 - (i) disciplinary charges;
 - (ii) licence suspension or disqualification;
 - (iii) other disciplinary action; or
 - (iv) no breach being identified?
- (5) In relation to greyhound euthanasia rates, over the past ten years:
- (a) How many greyhounds registered in Tasmania have been euthanised each year?
 - (b) How many of the greyhounds euthanised over the past ten years were:
 - (i) registered to race at the time of death; and/or
 - (ii) retired from racing but still owned or kept by licensed racing participants at the time of death?

- (c) How many were euthanised for each of the following reasons:
 - (i) injuries sustained while racing;
 - (ii) injuries sustained while training;
 - (iii) injuries sustained outside racing or training;
 - (iv) illness or disease;
 - (v) old age; and
 - (vi) any other reasons?
 - (d) Of the greyhounds euthanised due to injuries sustained while racing or training, how many were:
 - (i) euthanised immediately at the racetrack or training facility; and
 - (ii) euthanised later following veterinary treatment or assessment?
 - (e) What process must licensed participants follow before a greyhound they own is euthanised, and is this process the same regardless of whether the dog is registered for racing or retired?
- (6) In relation to the breeding of greyhounds:
- (a) What approval and/or notification processes must licensed participants follow to breed a litter?
 - (b) How long does the breeding process typically take, from the time of application to the birth of a litter?
 - (c) How many litters of greyhounds have been bred in Tasmania each year, over the past ten years?
 - (d) How many individual female greyhounds were used for breeding in Tasmania in each of the past ten years?
 - (e) What is the average number of litters produced per breeding female?
 - (f) How many female greyhounds produced three or more litters, over the last ten years?
 - (g) What rules or limits exist on the number of litters a female greyhound may produce in Tasmania?
- (7) In relation to the economic impact of the industry:
- (a) What economic modelling has been undertaken by the Government or Tasracing regarding the economic contribution of greyhound racing in Tasmania?
 - (b) What is the estimated gross value added to the Tasmanian economy attributable specifically to greyhound racing?
 - (c) How much government funding has been provided to support greyhound racing in Tasmania in each of the past five years?
 - (d) Of that funding, how much was provided for:
 - (i) Prizemoney;
 - (ii) infrastructure and capital works;
 - (iii) industry development or breeding incentives; and
 - (iv) administration and regulatory functions?
 - (e) How much revenue to the Tasmanian Government is attributable to greyhound racing in each of the past five years, including revenue from:
 - (i) wagering taxes;
 - (ii) race field fees; and
 - (iii) licence fees?

- (f) Over the past five years, what is the net fiscal impact on the Tasmanian Budget of greyhound racing after accounting for government funding provided and revenue received?
- (g) What has been the total prizemoney paid for greyhound racing in Tasmania in each of the past five years?
- (h) What is the average annual prizemoney earned per greyhound trainer in Tasmania?
- (i) In each of the past five years, how many greyhound trainers earned in prizemoney:
 - (i) \$0;
 - (ii) less than \$10,000;
 - (iii) between \$10,000 and \$50,000; and
 - (iv) more than \$50,000?

The Leader answered:

- (1) (a) No. The decision to shut down greyhound racing was, appropriately, a policy decision of Government.
- (b) Refer to the response to question (1)(a).
- (c) Refer to the response to question (1)(a).
- (d) Refer to the response to question (1)(a).
- (e) Refer to the response to question (1)(a).

In addition, in June 2022 the Tasmanian Parliament e-petition entitled “End Public Funding of Greyhound Racing” received 15,519 signatures.

- (f) One since 1 February 2025 (all other substantiated matters have related to integrity or record-keeping).

Information prior to this date was managed by the former Office of Racing Integrity and are not held in a readily reportable format.

- (g) Since 1 February 2025, 64 integrity charges, involving 30 participants, have been laid, resulting in:
 - 13 reprimands;
 - 33 fines;
 - 4 suspensions; and
 - 7 disqualification periods (3 participants).

Information prior to this date was managed by the former Office of Racing Integrity and was not held in a readily reportable format.

- (h) No. The decision to shut down greyhound racing was, appropriately, a policy decision of Government.
- (i) The Government’s decision to phase out greyhound racing in Tasmania through a staged and considered approach with the Code to end on 30 June 2029, is in recognition that greyhound racing no longer aligns with community expectations.

It is noted that economic modelling of the value of the racing industry and/or the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania has been undertaken by various entities.

In 2020, the Tasmanian Department of Treasury and Finance (Treasury) prepared the report for shareholder Ministers Tasracing Pty Ltd: A Desktop Review of the Costs and Functions of Tasracing . The report benchmarked Tasmania against other states on key metrics.

- (2) The focus of the Government is in passing of the Bill.

(3)	(a)	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
		151	138	131	135	122

- (b) Since 1 February 2025, 131 of the 135 licensed trainers have had their kennels inspected.
Office of Racing Integrity Inspections numbers by financial year:

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Persons licensed or registered	541	489	475
Inspections	133	157	139

- (c) Since 1 February 2025, there have been 115 full inspections and 185 audit inspections undertaken.

For Office of Racing Integrity data refer to question (3)(b).

- (d) The Tasracing Integrity Unit does not maintain this information as a recorded statistic.
(e) 116.
(f) One animal welfare breach.

There have been several breaches of the Rules of Racing, primarily relating to record-keeping. In these instances, participants were provided with education and the necessary rectifications were undertaken.

- (g) Several compliance actions were undertaken, during which directions were issued to rectify records. These actions have also been used as an educational measure for participants.

- (4) (a) (i) 27.

- (ii) In the 2024-25 period 8 complaints received:

- 1 related to animal welfare; and
- 7 related to integrity and process matters.

In the 2025-26 period (up to 28 February 2026) 40 complaints received:

- 3 related to animal welfare;
- 24 related to integrity and process matters; and
- 13 related to the Greyhound Racing Transition.

- (b) (i) Tasracing undertook 27 formal investigations.

- (ii) All complaints were investigated.

- (c) 39.

- (d) 1.

- (e) 164.

- (f) Information regarding investigations undertaken by the Racing Integrity Commissioner is publicly reported by that office in the Commissioner's Annual Report.

- (g) (i) 11.

- (ii) 6.

- (iii) 1.

- (iv) 48.

- (5) (a) Greyhounds registered in Tasmania that have been euthanised each year.

Type	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
At Track (Injury)	26	14	25	7	12	8	7	4	1	2
Illness/Age	45	28	25	16	15	13	13	15	19	15
Injury	114	68	50	43	29	14	20	12	14	7
Not for racing	251	75	46	20	8	0	0	0	0	0
Not for re-home/ GAP	199	98	38	34	10	0	0	4	12	9
TOTAL	635	283	184	120	74	35	40	35	46	33

Note: 2016 – legacy / stewards audit updates were processed during this year, resulting in elevated figures (84 – legacy notifications / 106 – stewards audit updates).

(b) (i) Greyhounds euthanised over the past ten years registered to race at the time of death

Type	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
At Track (Injury)	24	13	25	7	12	8	7	4	1	2
Illness/Age	14	20	11	5	5	7	7	6	11	5
Injury	66	57	39	33	19	12	15	9	13	5
Not for racing	46	49	35	16	5	0	0	0	0	0
Not for re-home/ GAP	48	68	27	20	7	0	0	4	11	9
TOTAL	198	207	137	81	48	27	29	23	36	21

(ii) Greyhounds euthanised over the past ten years retired from racing but still owned or kept by licensed racing participants at the time of death?

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	37	25	24	16	15	12	13	14	18	15

(c) (i) Greyhounds euthanised for injuries sustained while racing.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	29	12	29	8	13	10	11	7	4	4

(ii) Greyhounds euthanised for injuries sustained while training.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	10	7	8	5	3	1	3	0	3	1

(iii) Greyhounds euthanised for injuries sustained outside racing or training.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	82	63	32	29	24	11	12	9	7	3

(iv) Greyhounds euthanised for illness or disease.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	27	26	19	11	10	12	10	11	18	12

(v) old age.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	17	2	6	5	5	2	3	4	1	3

(vi) any other reasons.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	469	173	90	62	19	0	1	4	13	10

(d) Of the greyhounds euthanised due to injuries sustained while racing or training:

(i) euthanised immediately at the racetrack or training facility.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	26	14	24	7	12	7	7	3	1	2

(ii) euthanised later following veterinary treatment or assessment.

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	13	5	13	6	4	4	7	4	6	3

- (e) See the tabled Greyhound Policy GPOL0011 (1.1) – Euthanasia outlines the procedure required to be undertaken in relation to the euthanasia of a greyhound.

Notification of Euthanasia is also cover under the Greyhound Australasia National Rules (GAR 22) and Local Rules 22.11.

GAR 22 (1) stipulates that:

At any time after the result of service pursuant to rule 71, the owner or person responsible for the greyhound at the relevant time must notify the Controlling Body where the greyhound is domiciled in writing:

(b) within 10 days if that greyhound has been humanely euthanised by a veterinarian, and it is a mandatory requirement under the Rules to include a veterinary certificate of euthanasia when lodging the relevant documentation for any greyhound that has been euthanised by that veterinarian;

Euthanasia

L22.11 If a greyhound is required to be euthanised, the only acceptable method of euthanasia is by an overdose of barbiturate administered by a veterinarian.

L22.12 L22.11 shall not apply if immediate euthanasia is obviously essential:

(i) to alleviate the greyhound from suffering following a catastrophic injury or medical condition/illness, and

(ii) the greyhound cannot be transported to a veterinarian within a period of one hour at regular driving speeds, and

(iii) the euthanasia is carried out under the direction of a veterinarian unless every avenue possible has been explored to contact a veterinarian in which case evidence of those efforts must be documented and provided to the TIU.

L22.13 The only acceptable option for euthanasia under L22.12 to end the animal's suffering shall be by the use of a firearm by a person who is appropriately licenced under the Firearms Act 1996 and competent to ensure the humane euthanasia of the animal.

L22.14 Where euthanasia is carried out under the direction of a veterinarian the owner or person responsible for the greyhound must obtain a written certificate or letter from the veterinarian providing details of the direction to euthanase under L22.12.

These rules cover both active and retired greyhounds if in the care of a registered person.

- (6) (a) A breeding factsheet will be tabled which outlines the processes and forms required to breed greyhounds in Tasmania.
- (b) Once licensed, the greyhound bitch is required to be registered. Registration includes DNA sampling and vaccination updates.

Once the bitch is in season, gestation is generally nine weeks once a service is successful.

- (c)

	Services*	Litters	Live Pups	Dec Pups
2016	28	21	126	12
2017	35	29	169	8
2018	35	26	165	15
2019	22	15	75	11
2020	15	12	86	8
2021	15	9	49	1
2022	13	11	70	3
2023	4	4	21	1
2024	11	6	35	6
2025	27	6	35	2

(d)

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
TOTAL	27	32	33	21	15	15	12	4	11	9

(e) Over the last 10 years, the average has been 1.4 litters per female.

(f) 13 breeding females.

(g) The following national rules apply:

57 Limit on the age at which a breeding female can be serviced

- (1) The owner of a breeding female, or person with authority to breed that female, must not cause any breeding female to be serviced if she is over ten years of age or older.
- (2) The owner of a breeding female, or person with the authority to breed that female, must not cause any breeding female to be serviced if she is over eight years of age, except if prior to each service:
 - (a) veterinary certification of appropriate health and fitness of the breeding female which confirms that it is appropriate for her to whelp is obtained (which must be done within 120 days prior to the date of the further service); and
 - (b) the written approval of a Controlling Body is obtained.
- (3) If any approval is granted by a Controlling Body under subrule (1) of this rule, one further service only will be permitted under that approval, irrespective of the result of that service. (Update effective 01.11.2024)

58 Limit on the number of litters that can be whelped by a breeding female

- (1) The owner of a breeding female, or person with authority to breed that female, must not cause any breeding female to whelp more than five litters.
- (2) The owner of a breeding female, or person with the authority to breed that female, must not cause any breeding female to whelp more than three litters. Except if prior to each service:
 - (a) veterinary certification of appropriate health and fitness of the breeding female which confirms that it is appropriate for her to whelp is obtained (which must be done within 120 days prior to the date of the further service); and
 - (b) the written approval of a Controlling Body is obtained.
- (3) If any approval is granted by a Controlling Body under subrule (1) of this rule, one further service only will be permitted under that approval, irrespective of the result of that service. (Update effective 01.11.2024)

59 Limit on number of litters that can be whelped in an 18 month period

The owner of a breeding female, or person with authority to breed that female, must not cause her to whelp more than two litters in any 18 month period. (effective 1.11.2024)

59A Limit on the number of litters that can be whelped by caesarean section of a breeding female

- (1) The owner of a breeding female, or person with the authority to breed that female, must not cause any breeding female to be serviced after having two caesarean sections, except if, prior to the next service:
 - (a) veterinary certification of appropriate health and fitness of the breeding female which confirms that it is appropriate for her to whelp is obtained (which must be done within 120 days prior to the date of the further service); and
 - (b) the written approval of a Controlling Body is obtained.
- (2) If any approval is granted by a Controlling Body under subrule (1) of this rule, one further service only will be permitted under that approval, irrespective of the result of that service.

- (7) (a) Economic modelling of the value of the racing industry and/or the greyhound racing industry in Tasmania has been undertaken by various entities.

In 2020, the Tasmanian Department of Treasury and Finance prepared a report for shareholder Ministers: *Tasracing Pty Ltd: A Desktop Review of the Costs and Functions of Tasracing*. Treasury in that Report undertook an analysis of previous reports concerning the economic value of the racing industry and noted analyses that rely upon an economic multiplier “can be inherently unreliable and problematic”.

Tasracing also undertakes regular Size and Scope studies of the Tasmanian Racing Industry. The latest of these was conducted by IER Pty Ltd in 2023 and was based on 2021-22 financial results. A copy of the IER Pty Ltd report is provided at Attachment 3.

While not undertaken by Government, the Government was aware of an independent assessment completed in May 2025 by economist Saul Eslake. His report, *The Financing of Greyhound Racing in Tasmania*, analysed the financial position of the greyhound code and the extent of government funding, concluding that greyhound racing contributes approximately 0.2% of gross state product and employment, while remaining heavily reliant on public funding, including \$12.70 per head of population in 2023-24, more than double the national average.

- (b) The IER Size and Scope study in 2023 estimated greyhound-related direct expenditure at \$51.3 million in 2021-22, with the total value added by the greyhound industry in the same year estimated at \$59.7 million.
- (c) Tasracing operates as a tri-code organisation, meaning that much of the funding provided by Government is used to provide industry-wide benefits that are not allocated between the individual codes. This includes functions such as human resources, finance, insurances, corporate governance and administration. A significant portion of the infrastructure, such as parking areas and grandstands, is also multi-code in nature. Accordingly, Tasracing does not normally undertake strict code-based allocation of all costs. This level of allocation is normally limited to “code funding”, which includes prizemoney, bonuses and other direct costs.

In response to the Government’s announcement that the Greyhound Code would be wound up, Tasracing undertook a detailed review of the 2024-2025 financial year results to determine the net financial impact of each racing code for that year.

The review showed that the Greyhound Code required \$3.2 million in funding to cover the net loss between commercial revenues and operational costs. In addition, a further \$0.9 million was required to meet the net cost of the Greyhound Adoption Program (GAP).

Tasracing considers the results of this review to be reasonably indicative of the annual funding requirement of the Greyhound Code, noting this reflects a return to typical operating conditions following the extraordinary COVID-affected period 2020-21 to 2022-23.

	Greyhound	GAP	Harness	Thoroughbred	Integrity	Unallocated	Govt Funding	Totals
Race Field Fees	\$8,129,421	\$0	\$3,376,662	\$10,470,359	\$0	\$0		\$21,976,441
International Fees	\$269,647	\$0	\$133,853	\$521,385	\$0	\$0		\$924,885
Other Revenue	\$25,955	\$38,678	\$309,516	\$1,974,214	\$1,833,043	\$2,850,309		\$7,031,716
Govt Grants							\$36,871,975	\$36,871,975
POCT							\$7,303,677	\$7,303,677
Total Revenue	\$8,425,023	\$38,678	\$3,820,032	\$12,965,958	\$1,833,043	\$2,850,309	\$44,175,652	\$74,108,695
Code Funding	-\$7,488,990	\$0	\$10,065,046	-\$20,397,045	\$0	\$0		-\$3,951,081
Labour	-\$857,900	-\$619,077	-\$817,440	-\$2,281,056	-\$1,010,864	-\$5,107,549		-\$10,693,887
Depreciation	-\$742,131	-\$12,265	-\$898,731	-\$2,866,796	-\$2,521	-\$266,124		-\$4,788,568
Other Expenses	-\$2,549,609	-\$271,584	-\$3,308,507	-\$9,010,515	-\$764,039	-\$5,978,420		-\$21,882,674
Total Expenditure	\$11,638,630	-\$902,927	\$15,089,724	-\$34,555,412	-\$1,777,424	\$11,352,094	\$0	-\$75,316,210
Total	-\$3,213,607	-\$864,248	\$11,269,693	-\$21,589,454	\$55,619	-\$8,501,785	\$44,175,652	-\$1,207,516

- (d) (i) Prize money is a component of Code Fund allocated annually to each of the three codes.

The following shows the code funding allocated to the Greyhound Code and the proportion of that allocation attributed to prizemoney:

	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
--	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Greyhound Code Funding	5,206,954	5,930,429	7,025,319	7,306,332	7,488,990
Greyhound Prizemoney	5,087,020	5,599,286	6,534,955	6,966,475	7,040,306

- (ii) Capital expenditure on Greyhound Code specific projects totalled \$4 million over the past five years. This excludes any capital expenditure on multi-code projects.

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26 (YTD)
Greyhound Capital Expenditure	327,565	844,550	346,335	1,642,233	848,563

- (iii) Code funding is directly allocated funding by Tasracing towards prizemoney and other industry supporting costs. For Greyhound, this includes racing bonuses, welfare program contributions and vaccination assistance.

The total non-prizemoney code funding amounts for greyhound over the past five years are:

	2020-21*	2021-22*	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Other Code Funding	119,934	331,143	490,364	339,857	448,684
includes					
- Welfare related programs	-135,100	-203,612	-222,132	-230,681	-238,992
- Racing Bonuses	-160,200	-159,000	-164,400	-160,290	-166,200
- Vaccination assistance	-51,800	-53,600	-49,800	-31,200	-28,000
BALANCE	-227,166	-85,069	54,032	-82,314	15,492

- (iv) Tasracing operates on a tri-code basis, meaning that most functional costs outside of code funding are not allocated on a code-by-code basis. Tasracing has, however, undertaken a review of the 2024-25 financial results to provide this allocation where possible (refer to question 7c).

This analysis showed that outside of code funding, the Greyhound Code was responsible for an additional \$4.15 million in costs. This included \$858,000 in labour costs, \$742,000 in depreciation and \$2.66 million in other costs including facility maintenance, race day operations and club funding.

- (e) (i) On the advice of Treasury, I am advised that it is not possible to determine the proportion of Tasmanian wagering tax revenue attributable specifically to the Greyhound Code.

Wagering operators are not required to report Point of Consumption Tax (POCT) liabilities by racing code or jurisdiction. POCT revenue is provided to Government in aggregate form and therefore cannot be disaggregated to identify any component related solely to greyhound racing in Tasmania.

Accordingly, no separate POCT revenue figure for greyhound racing is available for any of the past five years.

- (ii) Racefield fee revenue (domestic and international) generated by the Greyhound Code over the past five years has been:

	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Greyhound Racefield Fees	9,566,677	10,619,296	9,921,733	8,079,320	8,399,068

- (iii) From 1 February 2024 to 30 June 2025, Tasracing received licence fee payments of \$6,965.

From 1 July 2025 to 28 February 2026, Tasracing received licence fee payments of \$7,164.

All licence payments received by Tasracing are subsequently paid to the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania for the purpose of supporting the Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner.

- (f) Please refer to (7)(c).
 (g) Prizemoney is a component of Code Fund allocated annually to each of the three codes.

The following shows the code funding allocated to the Greyhound Code and how much of that allocation relates to prizemoney:

	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Greyhound Code Funding	5,206,954	5,930,429	7,025,319	7,306,332	7,488,990
Greyhound Prizemoney	5,087,020	5,599,286	6,534,955	6,966,475	7,040,306

(h)

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025 - Feb 26
Average earnings per trainer (\$)	21,796	26,821	32,305	32,016	26,977

(i)

Earnings brackets	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025 - Feb 26
i. \$0	56	37	30	36	27
ii. less than \$10,000	43	40	35	35	43
iii. between \$10,000 and \$50,000	35	44	40	43	35
iv. more than \$50,000	17	17	26	21	17
	151	138	131	135	122

Ordered, That Ms Rattray, have leave to Table the following documents:

- Tasracing Greyhound Policies – Euthanasia;
- Tasracing Breeding Factsheet; and
- Size and Scope of the Tasmanian Racing Industry, prepared by IER, August 2023.

6 ISSUING OF SCHOOL LEVIES.— Mr *Edmunds* asked the Honourable the Minister for Education — With regard to the issuing of school levies:

- (1) Do all children at all public schools have hard copy school levies invoices issued by mail?
- (2) Is this method of collecting levies led by individual schools or the department?
- (3) How many children were issued with at least one levies notice in each of the previous five financial years?
- (4) How much money was spent in each of the previous five financial years on mailing out school levies to parents and guardians?
- (5) What is the Government or Department’s policy on how regularly it issues bills for levies that are outstanding?
- (6) How many levies notices are issued before the bill is referred to collectors?
- (7) (a) Why are bills issued for each sibling individually when they live in the same household and;
 (b) how many households have multiple children that have bills issued?

The Minister answered:

- (1) I am advised that hard copy school levy invoices are currently issued by mail for the majority children at Tasmanian government schools. There are some exceptions including:
 - Where a parent or guardian chooses to pay levies prior to an invoice being issued;

- Invoices not being issued for pre-approved Students Assistance Scheme (STAS) students; and
- Some schools choosing to not issue levies.

(2) I am advised that schools initiate levies through the student management system during Term One each school year.

The Department's central Financial Services team then oversees the process for hard copy invoices to be generated and mailed to parents and guardians.

Levies are issued and managed within the parameters of the following legislation and policy instruments:

- The *Education Act 2016*;
- The Secretary's Instruction No. 9 for School Levies and Charges; and
- The Department for Education, Children and Young People's School Levies Charges Procedure.

I understand that within these parameters:

- Schools must provide all families with a range of flexible payment options for payment of levies, including payment plans continuing throughout the school year; and
- Debt collection services must not be utilised when following up outstanding levies.

If a student has been approved for STAS, a levy does not need to be entered by schools.

(3) I have interpreted this question as a request for the number of students for whom at least one levy-related invoice has been issued in each of the last five years.

School levies are issued on a school year basis and, as such, the response to this question has been provided on this basis rather than over financial years.

I am advised that the numbers over the last five years are:

2025: 35,846
2024: 36,829
2023: 36,864
2022: 37,633
2021: 38,638

(4) I am advised that the cost for mailing school levies to parents and guardians in each of the previous five financial years was:

2024-25: \$70,264
2023-24: \$57,144
2022-23: \$52,123
2021-22: \$55,965
2020-21: \$42,353

These costs include the printing and mailing of school invoices and related statements.

(5) As noted in my response to question two, schools enter levy invoices through the student management system on an annual basis.

The Department's central Financial Services team then oversees the process for the hard copy invoices to be generated and mailed to parents and guardians.

I am further advised that statements, reflecting all outstanding amounts owing to a school, are generated and mailed on a monthly basis during the school year. This process is also overseen by the central Financial Services team.

- (6) As previously noted, Government policy is that school levy debts are not to be referred to external debt collectors.
- (7) (a) I am advised that the Department for Education, Children and Young People's current policy to issue invoices individually is due to multiple factors, including:
- Constraints and settings of the current financial system.
 - Changing family circumstances including responsibility for invoices at times resting with different individuals within a family.
 - Siblings attending different schools and colleges.
- (b) I am advised that as at 19 March 2026 there were 16,074 households with two or more students enrolled in a government school or college which were responsible for levies.

Finally, I would like to note that I have requested further information from the Department regarding its levy issuing processes.

It is my expectation that all processes are undertaken in an efficient and cost-effective manner with staff workloads always front of mind.

7 PAPERS.— The Clerk of the Council laid upon the Table the following Papers:—

- (1) State Grants Commission 2024-25 Annual Report (including 2025-26 Financial Assistance Grant Recommendations). Dated November 2025.
- (2) *Industrial Hemp Act 2015*: Statutory Rules 2026, No. 5, Industrial Hemp Regulations 2026.
- (3) State Policies and Projects (Macquarie Point Precinct) Order 2025. Register of Approvals and Amendments of Relevant Documents. 4 December 2025 – 31 December 2025.
- (4) Tasmanian Ports Company Pty Ltd: Members' Statement of Expectations. Dated January 2026.
- (5) Tasmanian Health Service Annual Service Plan - Amendment 1. 2025-26.

8 REPORT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.— Ms *Forrest* presented a Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts on its Follow-Up of the Report of the Auditor-General on ICT Strategy, Critical Systems and Investment (No. 4 Of 2020-2021).

Ordered, That the Report be received. (Ms *Forrest*)

Ordered, That the Report be printed. (Ms *Forrest*)

Ordered, That consideration of the Report and its noting be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next. (Ms *Forrest*)

9 LEAVE TO TABLE PAPER.— *Ordered*, That Ms *Ratray* have leave to Table a paper.

10 GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE WOOLCOTT REVIEW.— Ms *Ratray* laid upon the Table of the Council the Tasmanian Government response to the Independent Review into the actions taken in response to the information and concerns raised by the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings (the Woolcott Review).

11 BILL NO. 6.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly hath passed a Bill, intituled — 'A Bill for an Act to amend the *Occupational Licensing Act 2005*, the *Building Act 2016* and the *Residential Building Work Contracts and Dispute Resolution Act 2016*',

to which the House desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

House of Assembly, 25 March 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

The Bill was read the First time.

Ordered, That the Second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.
(Ms Rattray)

12 BILL NO. 3.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly hath passed a Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to provide for an alternative period for making application for renewal in respect of certain mining leases’,

to which the House desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

House of Assembly, 25 March 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

The Bill was read the First time.

Ordered, That the Second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.
(Ms Rattray)

13 SITTING SUSPENDED.— *Resolved*, That the Sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the Division bells for the purpose of a briefing. (Ms Rattray)

The Sitting was suspended at 11.15 o'clock a.m. and resumed at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

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

15 BILL NO. 58 OF 2025.— The Order of the Day was read for resuming the Debate on the Question, That the University of Tasmania (Protection of Land) Bill 2025 be now read the Second time.

The Question was again proposed, and the Council resumed the Debate.

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned. (Ms Forrest)

16 BILL NO. 65 OF 2025.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly hath passed a Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to amend the *Collections for Charities Act 2001* and the *Associations Incorporation Act 1964*’,

to which the House desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

House of Assembly, 26 March 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

The Bill was read the First time.

Ordered, That the Second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.
(Ms Rattray)

17 SITTING SUSPENDED.— *Resolved*, That the Sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the Division bells for the purpose of a dinner break. (Ms Rattray)

The Sitting was suspended at 6.55 o'clock p.m. and resumed at 9.28 o'clock p.m.

18 BILL NO. 58 OF 2025.— The Council, according to Order, resumed the Debate on the Question, That the University of Tasmania (Protection of Land) Bill 2025 be now read the Second time.

Ordered, That the Debate be adjourned. (Mr Edmunds)

19 BILL NO. 11.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly hath passed a Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to amend the *Australian Consumer Law (Tasmania) Act 2010*, the *Australian Consumer Law (Tasmania) Infringement Regulations 2021*, the *Energy Co-ordination and Planning Act 1995* and the *Petroleum Products Emergency Act 1994*’, to which the House desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

House of Assembly, 26 March 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

The Bill was read the First time.

20 MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE.— *Ordered*, That Ms *Ratray* have leave to move a Motion without Notice.

21 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.— *Ordered*, A Motion was made (Ms *Ratray*), and the Question proposed, That so much of Standing Orders be suspended to allow the Bill to pass through its remaining stages at such time as the Council may appoint and without an endorsed copy having been distributed to Members.

A Debate arose thereupon.

And the Question being put,

The Committee divided.

AYES 8

NOES 4

Ms *Armitage*

Ms *Forrest*

Mr *Edmunds*

Mr *Gaffney*

Mr *Hiscutt*

Ms *Thomas* (Teller)

Ms *Lovell* (Teller)

Ms *Webb*

Ms *O’Connor*

Ms *Palmer*

Ms *Ratray*

Mr *Vincent*

Pair: Mr *Duigan*

Pair: Mr *Harriss*

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

22 BILL NO. 11.— A Motion was made (Ms *Ratray*), and the Question was proposed, That the Petroleum Reporting (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026 be now read the Second time.

A Debate arose thereupon.

And the Council having continued to sit after midnight.

FRIDAY, 27 MARCH 2026.

And the Question being put,

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

And the Bill was, accordingly, read the Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole Council.

And the President having left the Chair, the Council resolved itself into the said Committee.

(In the Committee)

Ms *Forrest* in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 18 agreed to.

Clause 19, Amendment made. (Ms *Webb*)

Page 14, after paragraph (c).

Insert the following paragraph.

- (d) by inserting the following subsection after subsection (2):
- (2A) If a period of emergency restriction has been declared under this section for 90 days or more within a 120-day period, a resolution of both Houses of Parliament is required that authorises –
- (a) any extension of that period of emergency restriction under this section; or
 - (b) any further period of emergency restriction that is to be declared in the 120 days immediately following that 120-day period.

Clause 19 as amended agreed to.

Clause 20 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill to be reported with Amendment.

The Council being resumed, Ms *Forrest* reported that the Committee had gone through the Bill, and directed her to report the same to the Council with Amendment.

Ordered, That the Petroleum Reporting (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026, as amended in the Committee, be now taken into consideration. (Ms *Ratray*)

The Council, accordingly, proceeded to take the same into consideration.

The Amendments were read the First time.

The said Amendments, being read the Second time, were agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill as amended in the Committee, be now read the Third time. (Ms *Ratray*)

The Bill was read the Third time and passed.

23 BILL NO. 11.— A Message to the House of Assembly:—

HONOURABLE SPEAKER,

The Legislative Council having this day agreed, with Amendment, to a Bill intituled —

‘A Bill for an Act to The House of Assembly hath passed a Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to amend the *Australian Consumer Law (Tasmania) Act 2010*, the *Australian Consumer Law (Tasmania) Infringement Regulations 2021*, the *Energy Co-ordination and Planning Act 1995* and the *Petroleum Products Emergency Act 1994*’,

now returns the same to the House of Assembly, and requests its concurrence therein.

Legislative Council, 27 March 2026

C.M. FARRELL, *President*

24 SITTING SUSPENDED.— *Resolved*, That the Sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the Division bells. (Ms *Ratray*)

The Sitting was suspended at 1.01 o'clock a.m. and resumed at 1.54 o'clock a.m.

25 BILL NO. 11.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly doth agree to the Amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to amend the *Australian Consumer Law (Tasmania) Act 2010*, the *Australian Consumer Law (Tasmania) Infringement Regulations 2021*, the *Energy Co-ordination and Planning Act 1995* and the *Petroleum Products Emergency Act 1994*’.

House of Assembly, 27 March 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

26 ADJOURNMENT.— *Resolved*, That the Council will, at its rising adjourn until 11.00 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, 14 April 2026. (Ms Rattray)

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

The Council adjourned at 1.56 o'clock a.m.

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

Briefings:

- *Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill 2025*
- *Petroleum Reporting (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026*