



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 - 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

NOTICES OF MOTION AND ORDERS OF THE DAY

No. 39

Tuesday 11 August 2026

The Council meets at 11.00 am

Notices of Motion

1 Office of the Custodial Inspector Annual Report 2023-24

Given by: Ms *Webb*

Date: 19 August 2025

To be moved:

That the Office of the Custodial Inspector Annual Report 2023-24, and recent public statements of Custodial Inspector Richard Connock, be considered and noted.

2 Tasmania's Forest Carbon 2025 Update Report

Given by: Ms *O'Connor*

Date: 12 September 2025

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

- (1) Notes the release of the report 'Tasmania's Forest Carbon – 2025 Update', a co-sponsored project by the Tasmanian Climate Collective, the Tree Projects and the Wilderness Society, and authored by internationally respected scientist, Dr Jen Sanger.
- (2) Accepts the scientific fact that unlogged forests are the reason Tasmania can claim to be one of the first jurisdictions in the world to become net zero, evidenced by the State's greenhouse accounts from 2012 onwards.
- (3) Notes the report finds Tasmania's forests currently draw down an estimated 22 million tonnes of carbon each year, which would more than triple by 2050 if native forest logging ceases and forests are managed for climate, biodiversity, recreation and tourism.
- (4) Recognises the report finds that ongoing native forest logging and burning is also the State's single biggest emitter, with industrial scale forestry burns accounting for the emission of an estimated 1.6 million tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO₂e) each year.
- (5) Notes with concern federal and state government moves to facilitate the further burning of native forest for biomass, including at Goliath Cement in Railton.
- (6) Agrees that the single most effective step Tasmania can take to reduce emissions is to end native forest logging and burning – the necessary and ethical response to accelerating global heating which will impact on our communities, environment and economy with increasing intensity in the decades ahead.

3 Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission Ministerial Direction

Given by: Ms *Webb*

Date: 23 September 2025

To be moved:

- (1) That the Legislative Council notes:
 - a) The State Government's Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission Ministerial Direction (No. 1) 2022 requiring a mandatory cashless card system for poker machines in Tasmanian hotels, clubs and casinos, including loss limits, breaks in play and optional commitment for time spent playing be developed and implemented;
 - b) The Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission undertook extensive public consultation on the implementation of the proposed poker machine mandatory pre-commitment card;
 - c) The proposed mandatory pre-commitment card was originally scheduled to be implemented by the end of 2024, and intended to cap losses at \$100 per day, or \$5,000 per year;
 - d) The State government announced on the 16 October 2024, that the Department of State Growth had engaged Deloitte Access Economics to undertake an analysis of the social and economic impact of the Government's poker machine mandatory pre-commitment card policy; and
 - e) That the terms of reference or contract provided for the Deloitte Access Economic review have not been released publicly; and
- (2) That the Legislative Council further notes:
 - a) In November 2024, the Premier announced an indefinite pause on proceeding with the proposed mandatory pre-commitment card; and
 - b) In June this year, the Premier further stated a mandatory pre-commitment card will not be introduced in Tasmania unless there is a national approach on the issue;
- (3) That the Legislative Council also notes with concern the state annual poker machine losses for 2024-25 which totalled \$193,908,165, a decade high level of losses from the Tasmanian community; and
- (4) That the Legislative Council calls on the Tasmanian Government to release immediately the 2024 Deloitte Access Economics' social and economic impact review report of the poker machine pre-commitment card policy.

4 Tasmanian Planning Commission Final Integrated Assessment Report

Given by: Ms *O'Connor*

Date: 24 September 2025

To be moved:

That the Tasmanian Planning Commission Final Integrated Assessment Report, released on 17 September 2025, into the proposed Macquarie Point Multipurpose Stadium Project of State Significance be considered and noted.

5 Report of the Office of the Custodial Inspector: Custody – Reception to Release Inspection Report 2025

Given by: Ms Armitage

Date: 4 November 2025

To be moved:

That the Office of the Custodial Inspector's Custody: Reception to Release Inspection Report 2025, be considered and noted.

6 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

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 11 November 2025

To be moved:

That this House notes:

- (1) The independent review established in November 2023 and undertaken by former Australian Public Service Commissioner Peter Woolcott AO, known as 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*; and
- (2) The Independent Review's findings and recommendations.

7 Security Contractor Transport of Young People in Custody: Safeguarding Review 2025

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 3 December 2025

To be moved:

That the *Security Contractor Transport of Young People in Custody: Safeguarding Review 2025* published by the Office of the Custodial Inspector Tasmania on 2 December 2025, be considered and noted.

8 Commission of Inquiry – Susan Neill-Fraser Conviction

Given by: Mr Gaffney

Date: 3 December 2025

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

- (1) Notes there is no Criminal Cases Review Commission in Australia to enable the independent review of convictions post appeal, as is the case in other countries including the United Kingdom, Canada and New Zealand;
- (2) Notes the cases of Lindy Chamberlain, Kathleen Folbigg, Andrew Mallard and Henry Keogh, all of whom had their convictions for murder quashed following significant concerns being raised by supporters regarding miscarriages of justice having occurred in their respective cases;
- (3) Notes the body of evidence and material that has emerged since the conviction of Sue

Neill-Fraser for the murder of Bob Chappell in 2010 that may raise doubt on the soundness of that conviction; and

- (4) Calls on the government to establish a Commission of Inquiry to enquire into and report on the correctness of the conviction of Susan Neill-Fraser for the murder of Bob Chappell.

9 Honouring the Willow Court Historic Site

Given by: Mr *Gaffney*

Date: 10 December 2025

To be moved:

That the Paper 'Honouring the Willow Court Historic Site: Realising the Potential of a World-Class Tasmanian Asset' by Dr Richard Benjamin be considered and noted.

10 Tasmanian Human Rights Act

Given by: Ms *Webb*

Date: 10 December 2025

To be moved:

- (1) That the Legislative Council notes the resolutions of this House passed on the 22 November 2022 and on the 26 November 2024 requesting the Tasmanian Government commence work on developing a Tasmanian Human Rights Act in accordance with the recommendations made by the 2007 Tasmanian Law Reform Institute's *A Charter for Human Rights for Tasmania Final Report*, and again in the TLRI's Update Report of 2024;
- (2) That the Legislative Council further notes that 10 December 2025 is the annual International Human Rights Day which commemorates the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, and that the 2025 theme is "Our Everyday Essentials";
- (3) That the Legislative Council further notes that:
 - (a) Human Rights Acts have been enacted in the Australian Capital Territory for the last 21 years, Victoria for the last 19 years, and Queensland for the last 6 years;
 - (b) In April 2025 the South Australian Parliamentary Social Development Committee formally recommended the enactment of a Human Rights Act for that state;
 - (c) In October 2025 a Bill for a Human Rights Act and to also establish a NSW Human Rights Commission was tabled in the New South Wales State Parliament;
- (4) And that the Legislative Council also notes with disappointment that the Tasmanian government has still failed to heed the previous resolutions of this House to progress a Tasmanian Human Rights Act for the protection of the "Everyday Essentials" crucial for all Tasmanians.

11 Banning the Use of Character References During Sentencing

Given by: Mr *Edmunds*

Date: 6 March 2025

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

(1) Notes:

(a) Announcements and reforms in other states and territories to ban the use of character references during the sentencing of convicted criminals;

(b) The calls by advocates to follow the lead of other Australian jurisdictions such as Victoria, ACT and NSW; and

(c) The 'Your Reference Aint Relevant' campaign which has driven these changes; and

(2) Calls on the Tasmanian Government to introduce legislation in Tasmania to ban the use of character references in sentencing in this state.

12 Report of the 2024-25 Independent Review of the Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008

Given by: Ms *O'Connor*

Date: 26 March 2026

To be moved:

That the Report of the 2024-25 Independent Review of the *Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008*, be considered and noted.

13 Time Limits Sessional Order

Given by: Ms *Armitage*

Date: 19 May 2026

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council agree that, for the duration of the 52nd Parliament (or until further order), the following Sessional Order apply to proceedings in the Legislative Council:

(1) Application – this Sessional Order applies to:

(a) Second reading speeches on bills;

(b) Contributions during Committee stage consideration of a bill or matter (including multiple speaks);

(c) Third reading speeches on bills;

(d) Government or Private members' motions;

(e) Contributions in response to Government or Private members' motions;

(2) Second Reading Speeches – Time Limits

(a) The Member moving the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes.

(b) The Member who moved the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes in reply.

(c) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.

(3) Government or Private members' motions – Time Limits

(a) The Member moving the motion may speak for up to 60 minutes.

(b) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.

(4) Committee Stage – Time Limits

- (a) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same question, in accordance with the Council’s procedures.
- (b) Each contribution (“speak”) by a Member is limited to 15 minutes.
- (5) Committee Stage - Amendments
 - (a) The Member moving an amendment may speak up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same amendment in accordance with the Council’s Standing Orders.
 - (c) Each contribution (“speak”) by a Member is limited to 10 minutes.
- (6) Third Reading – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 10 minutes.
- (7) Inaugural Speech Time Limits
 - (a) A Member shall be entitled to speak for an unlimited period of time.
- (8) Extensions and Flexibility
 - (a) The time limits in clauses 2-4 may be extended:
 - (i) By leave of the Council; or
 - (ii) On motion, without notice, moved at any time by any Member and determined without debate.
 - (b) A Motion under 5(a)(ii) must specify:
 - (i) The Member(s) to whom the extension applies;
 - (ii) The additional time proposed; and
 - (iii) The reason why an extension is requested.
 - (c) Where a Member is addressing the question and is near the expiry of time, the Chair may allow the Member to conclude their remarks, consistent with orderly conduct of business.
- (9) Effect
 - (a) This Sessional Order operates as a temporary Order of the Council for the purposes set out in Clause 1.

14 Final Report of the House of Assembly Select Committee on Reproductive, Maternal and Paediatric Health Services in Tasmania

Given by: Ms Lovell

Date: 20 May 2026

To be moved:

That the Final Report of the House of Assembly Select Committee on Reproductive, Maternal and Paediatric Health Services in Tasmania be considered and noted.

15 Report of the Auditor-General, No. 10 of 2025-26, Planning and Early Implementation of the Human Resource Information System

Given by: Ms Forrest

Date: 26 May 2026

To be moved:

That the Report of the Auditor-General, No. 10 of 2025-26, Planning and Early Implementation of the Human Resource Information System, be considered and noted.

16 Encyclical Letter Magnifica Humanitas of His Holiness Pope Leo XIV

Given by: Ms O'Connor

Date: 28 May 2026

To be moved:

That the Encyclical Letter Magnifica Humanitas of His Holiness Pope Leo XIV, be considered and noted.

17 Bill for an Act to Amend the Statutory Holidays Act 2000

Given by: Mr Hiscutt

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

For the introduction of a Bill for an Act to amend the Statutory Holidays Act 2000.

18 Overdue Government Response to UTAS Committee Report

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

(1) That the Legislative Council notes:

- (a) That the Final Report of the Select Committee Inquiry into the Provisions of the *University of Tasmania Act 1992* was tabled on the 23 December 2024;
- (b) The Final Report provided 19 Recommendations plus an overarching recommendation that: *“As a priority, the Government conduct a comprehensive review of the University of Tasmania Act 1992, including matters specified in recommendations in this report, and promptly legislate the results of that review”*;
- (c) Further, that the Final Report was considered and noted by the Council on 1 April 2025;
- (d) During the debate of 1 April 2025, the Minister noted two pieces of national work being undertaken, the Australian Government Expert Governance Council’s recommendations to Education Ministers expected in mid-2025 and the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency new guidance and reporting requirements for universities, stating that, *“it is important to wait for these federal recommendations prior to determining the next steps for our state-based legislation”*;

(2) That the Legislative Council further notes that:

- (a) The Expert Council on University Governance, formerly referred to as the Expert Governance Council, presented its *Final Report and Principles* to Education Ministers in mid-2025, with the report formally considered by the Ministers at their meeting on 17 October 2025;
- (b) The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency released its updated *Statement of Regulatory Expectations: Compliance with workplace obligations* in May 2025; and
- (c) Despite both pieces of work completed and released since last year, the government has still not provided a formal response to the Select Committee Inquiry’s Final Report;

- (3) That the Legislative Council also notes the Senate Education and Employment Legislation Committee tabled its Final Report on the *Quality of governance at Australian higher education providers*, on 11 December 2025, which is highly relevant to the University of Tasmania and its Act;
- (4) And that the Legislative Council calls on the Tasmanian government to:
 - (a) Provide a formal and comprehensive response in the Parliament to the Select Committee Inquiry into the Provisions of the *University of Tasmania Act 1992* Final Report, which specifically addresses all findings and recommendations made; and
 - (b) Deliver that response before the Parliament rises at the end of this calendar year.

19 Analysis of Economics of Marinus Link 2026 Update Report

Given by: Ms O'Connor

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

That the report by Professor Bruce Mountain, 'An analysis of the economics of Marinus Link: 2026 update' be considered and noted.

20 Fragrance Sensitivity Recognition Accommodation and Public Awareness

Given by: Ms Forrest

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

(1) The Legislative Council notes:

- (a) fragrance sensitivity, also referred to as multiple chemical sensitivity in its broader form, is a documented and often debilitating health condition affecting a significant proportion of the Australian and Tasmanian population, characterised by adverse physiological responses to fragranced consumer products including perfumes, colognes, air fresheners, cleaning products, and scented personal care items;
- (b) peer-reviewed research published in *Air Quality, Atmosphere & Health* (Steinemann, 2019), drawing on nationally representative surveys across four countries including Australia, found that:
 - (i) approximately one in three adults in Australia (33 per cent), report adverse health effects from fragranced consumer products;
 - (ii) commonly reported health problems include respiratory difficulties, mucosal symptoms, migraine headaches, skin rashes, and asthma attacks;
 - (iii) 7.7 per cent of Australians had lost workdays or a job in the past year due to illness from fragranced product exposure in the workplace;
 - (iv) A single application of perfume can release over 100 different chemical compounds into the air, many of which are not listed on product labels due to trade secret protections;
 - (v) fragrance-free policies have been implemented in workplaces, schools, health care facilities, public buildings, and other indoor environments around the

world, and national surveys indicate that more people prefer fragrance-free rather than fragranced environments;

(vi) among the general population, 47.8 per cent would support a fragrance-free policy in the workplace, compared to only 20.4 per cent who would not.

(2) The Legislative Council acknowledges:

- (a) fragrance sensitivity is an invisible condition and this invisibility contributes to a pattern of scepticism, dismissal, and minimisation that compounds the burden on those living with the condition, creates barriers to disclosure, and discourages people from seeking workplace accommodations or participating fully in public life;
- (b) fragrance sensitivity can have a profound impact on people's professional and personal lives, including their ability to maintain employment, attend events, access public spaces, and perform their work, and many Tasmanians living with this condition do so largely in silence for fear of disbelief or ridicule;
- (c) fragrance sensitivity is a legitimate and debilitating health issue deserving of the same seriousness afforded to other airborne health triggers, including cigarette smoke and known allergens;
- (d) workplaces, government and public institutions should develop and implement fragrance-awareness or fragrance-reduction policies as a reasonable and practical measure to support access and inclusion;
- (e) the culture surrounding invisible illness needs to change, and institutions have a role to play in modelling respectful, evidence-informed responses to accommodation requests; and
- (f) those who raise health and accessibility concerns in institutional settings are entitled to have those concerns treated with confidentiality, dignity, and professionalism.

(3) That the Legislative Council calls on the Government to:

- (a) consider what steps can be taken within government services and public institutions to reduce fragrance exposure and support those with fragrance-related health conditions;
- (b) consider whether public health guidance on fragrance sensitivity could be developed or promoted to assist employers, event organisers, schools, and health care facilities; and
- (c) reflect on the importance of maintaining confidentiality and trust when individuals raise health and accessibility concerns in professional or institutional contexts.

21 Joint Sessional Committee Gender, Gender-based Violence and Equality

Given by: Ms Forrest

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

That the terms of reference for the Joint Sessional Committee on Gender and Equality, as previously agreed to by resolutions of both Houses, be varied as follows:

(1) In the introductory paragraph, *inserting* “, Gender-based Violence” after “Sessional Gender”; and

(2) By *leaving out* paragraph (1) and *inserting instead*:

“(1) (a) Any Bill referred to it by either House in order to examine gender, gender-based violence and equality impacts and any such Bill so referred shall be reported upon within 10 sitting days of its referral;

(b) Any matter related to gender, gender-based violence and equality referred to it by either House; and

(c) Any matter related to gender, gender-based violence and equality, initiated by its own motion; and”.

22 Gambling Advertising and Sponsorship at State-owned or State-funded Venues

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 25 June 2026

To be moved:

- (1) Notes on Tuesday 2 December 2025 the Council passed a resolution calling on the State government to introduce within one year a complete ban on gambling advertising and sponsorship at all state-owned or state-funded venues including the Macquarie Point Stadium, and on players’ uniforms, and further to table an implementation progress report within six months of the passage of that resolution;
- (2) Further notes the six month deadline was 2 June 2026, however the State government has not yet tabled the requested implementation update as it was called on to do by this House;
- (3) Recognises the Federal Government’s gambling advertising reforms announced on 2 April 2026, will partially implement recommendations of the 2023 House of Representatives Standing Committee on Social Policy and Legal Affairs report *You Win Some, You Lose More – Inquiry into Online Gambling and Its Impacts on Those Experiencing Gambling Harm*, and do not preclude the state taking immediate action for state-owned or funded venues;
- (4) Reaffirms that publicly owned state venues should prohibit gambling advertising and sponsorship that normalise or glamorise wagering, consistent with the clear public health responsibility to avoid promoting activities known to cause harm;
- (5) Notes with grave concern the failure of the State government to acknowledge or address the December 2025 resolution passed by this House;
- (6) Formally requests by Thursday 10 September 2026 the State government provides to this House a comprehensive response to the 2 December 2025 resolution, and which is to address both:

- (a) That resolution's call for gambling advertising and sponsorship at all state-owned or state-funded venues, and on players' uniforms; to be prohibited; and
- (b) An implementation timeframe update.

Orders of the Day

General Business

- 1 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 9 of 2026) Follow-up of the Report of the Auditor-General ICT Strategy, Critical Systems and Investment (No. 4 of 2020-21)**
Mover: Ms Forreest
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 26 March 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

- [2 Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill 2026 \(14 of 2026\)](#)**
Mover: Ms Lovell
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

- 3 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 18 of 2026) Review of the Tasmanian Fiscal Sustainability Report 2026**
Mover: Ms Forreest
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 19 May 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

- 4 Interim Report of the Joint Select Committee on Energy Matters (No. 17 of 2026) Inquiry into Energy Prices and Related Matters in Tasmania**
Mover: Ms Forreest
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 21 May 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

- 5 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 19 of 2026) Establishment of a Parliamentary Budget Office**
Mover: Ms Thomas
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 23 June 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

- 6 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 27 of 2026) 18th Australasian Council of Public Accounts Committees (ACPAC) Conference**
Mover: Ms Thomas
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 23 June 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

Orders of the Day

Government Business

- 1** [Residential Parks Bill 2026 \(2 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Progress reported by Committee of the Whole on 25 June 2026
Status: Further consideration in Committee (Clause 69)
- 2** [Police Offences Amendment \(Increased Penalties for Damage to Tasmanian War Memorials\) Bill 2026 \(5 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 19 March 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 3** [Occupational Licensing Amendment Bill 2026 \(6 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 26 March 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 4** [Residential Tenancy Amendment \(Safety Modifications\) Bill 2025 \(59 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 28 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 5** [Justice and Related Legislation \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill 2026 \(12 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 28 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 6** [Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments \(Phasing Out Reform\) Bill 2025 \(66 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Mr Vincent*
Status: Second reading debate adjourned on 15 April 2026 (*Mr Edmunds*)
Spoken: *Mr Vincent, Ms Rattray, Mr Hiscutt, Ms Forrest, Mr Edmunds*
- 7** [Charities and Associations Law \(Miscellaneous\) Amendment Bill 2025 \(65 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 26 March 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 8** [Justice and Related Legislation \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill \(No. 2\) \(39 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 19 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

- 9** [Police Offences Amendment Bill 2025 \(50 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 10** [Integrity Commission Amendment \(Mandatory Notifications\) Bill 2025 \(69 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 11** [Mt Lyell Acid Drainage Reduction \(Repeal\) Bill 2025 \(53 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 12** [Short Stay Levy Bill 2026 \(13 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 13** [Public Accounts Committee Amendment Bill 2025 \(49 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Read a First time on 23 September 2025
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 14** **Family, Domestic and Sexual Violence: Establishment of Joint Standing Committee**
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Message received and made an Order of the Day on 12 September 2025
Status: Message to be considered

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly having agreed to the following Resolution, begs now to transmit the same to the Legislative Council, and to request its concurrence therein—

Resolved,

- (1) That a Joint Standing Committee on Family, Domestic and Sexual Violence be appointed with the power to send for persons and papers, with leave to sit during any adjournment of either House and with leave to adjourn from place to place to inquire into and report upon –
 - (a) Any Bill referred to it by either House in order to examine family, domestic and sexual violence impacts, and any such Bill so referred shall be reported upon within 10 sitting days of its referral;
 - (b) Any matter related to family, domestic and sexual violence referred to it by either House; and
 - (c) Any matter related to family, domestic and sexual violence, initiated by its own motion.
- (2) That Notice of any Motion Inquiry shall be reported to both Houses within two (2) sitting days of the Committee’s Resolution; and
- (3) That the number of Members to serve on the said Committee on the part of the House of Assembly be 3.

House of Assembly, 9 September 2025

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

Bill Pro forma (Pursuant to Standing Order 6)¹

15 Partition Amendment Bill 2025 (Bill No. 35)

Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Introduced on 19 August 2025
Status: Read a First time

Awaiting Government Response

Questions on Notice

39 Year 11 and 12 Extension Schools Program

Asked by: Mr Gaffney
To: Minsiter for Children and Youth
Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

With reference to the Year 11 and 12 Extension Schools program —

- (1) The tabled papers in response to questions asked in Estimates Committee B on 3 June 2026 gave an indication of the latest Extension School enrolment headcounts of Year 11 and 12 students in schools within 30km of a college:
 - (a) What are the separate enrolment numbers of Year 11 and Year 12 students in each of these schools;
 - (b) How many students in Year 11 and Year 12 from each of these schools would have a dual enrolment with a College;
 - (c) For each Extension School that may have students with a dual-enrolment – what are the dual enrolment numbers relating to each College;
 - (d) What are the separate enrolment numbers of Year 11 and Year 12 students in Extension Schools more than 30km from a College: and
 - (e) How many of these students enrolled at Extension Schools more than 30km from a College would have dual enrolment with a College and/or eSchool?

- (2) In Estimates Committee B on 3 June 2026 when asked about the possibility of a review of the Years 11 and 12 Extension Schools program you stated, and I quote directly from the Hansard transcript: *“So this policy is not under review, and at the moment I have no intention of having a formal review around this”*:
 - (a) What is preventing the Government from conducting a reasonable internal cost benefit analysis and comparison of delivering Years 11 and 12 in every High and District School, when compared to its delivery in the College system, in what is now an established 12-year-old policy position;
 - (b) What is preventing the Government from conducting a fully independent review or inquiry in the efficacy of having Y11 and 12 in every High and District School in what is now an established 12-year-old policy position;

- (c) Has the Government studied the specialist senior secondary Year 11 and 12 government Colleges in the ACT, NSW and VIC to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the functionality of those systems, and how they operate in an integrated public education system;
 - (d) What other Government policy areas and programs involving the expenditure of at least \$200m over 10 years have not been subject to a review or revision; and
 - (e) Given the \$228m in Operational Efficiencies expected from DECYP, what level of operational efficiencies in Extension Schools within a 10km, 20km and 30km radius of the local College would be gained from reallocating the Year 11 and 12 staff teams to other DECYP teaching vacancies, and transferring Year 11 and 12 enrolments to the local College?
- (3) Regarding the transfer of non-government school students enrolments into Years 11 and 12 in government schools:
- (a) Over the last three years, what are the number of non-government school students that have transferred their enrolment into Year 11 or Year 12 in government Colleges;
 - (b) Over the last three years, what are the number of non-government school students that have transferred their enrolment into Year 11 or Year 12 in Extension Schools; and
 - (c) What is the distribution of all those enrolments from non-government school students into Years 11 and 12 in government schools in terms of the north west, northern and southern regions?

40 Government Response to Report on Finfish Farming in Tasmania

Asked by: Mr *Gaffney*
 To: Leader for the Government
 Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

With reference to the 2022 Tasmanian Government's Response to the Legislative Council Government Administration Sub-Committee "A" *'Report on Finfish Farming in Tasmania'*, and the report of the Environment Protection Authority's study *'An Environmental Risk Assessment of Florfenicol Use in Marine Salmonid Aquaculture in SE Tasmania 2025 – 2026'* —

- (1) Have all the recommendations shown within the Governments response to the 2022 *'Report of Finfish Farming in Tasmania'*, that it supports or supports in principle, been fully implemented as per the 2022 response and achieved the intended outcomes, and in particular:
- (a) Recommendation 25 – *'As a matter of priority, develop, publish and apply state-wide Water Quality Objectives as per the State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997 and as required under the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994.'*;
 - (b) Recommendation 43 – *'Conduct a comprehensive audit of freshwater requirements for the finfish farming industry to inform the development of a policy/strategy on the allocation and management of these resources.'*;

- (c) Recommendation 44 – *‘Conduct an independent review of the impacts of current finfish operations on inland waterways, including drinking water supplies and remediation costs borne by TasWater/State Government.’;*
 - (d) Recommendation 45 – *‘Require all new freshwater finfish hatcheries/smolt production facilities to utilise Recirculating Aquaculture Systems.’;*
 - (e) Recommendation 46 – *‘Publicly release monitoring data relating to the operation of freshwater finfish operations.’;*
 - (f) Recommendation 47 – *‘Through the data portal, provide improved public reporting of the environmental management of finfish farming activities, including.’;*
 - i. the baseline environmental data underpinning Marine Farming Development Plans and amendments;
 - ii. finfish farming licences, leases and associated management plans;
 - iii. individual lease monitoring data in regard to impact on benthic flora and fauna, water quality, marine life and threatened species; and
 - iv. details of compliance and enforcement activities.’;
 - (g) Recommendation 48 – *‘Review the penalties and scope of liability in regulation of finfish farming to reflect the serious environmental consequences that can arise from breaching regulations and to strengthen their deterrent effect; and*
 - (h) Recommendation 49 – *‘The EPA to develop and publish an enforcement policy relating to finfish farming, including clear guidelines which set scientifically-based performance indicators and a scale of actions.’?*
- (2) The report of the Environment Protection Authority’s (EPA) *‘An Environmental Risk Assessment of Florfenicol Use in Marine Salmonid Aquaculture in SE Tasmania 2025 – 2026’* observed: *‘While this environmental risk assessment provides significant advances in our understanding of florfenicol within the environment and its toxicity to aquatic organisms, it has not addressed the effects on the bacterial community, including the development of antimicrobial resistance.’:*
- (a) Whilst the study examined the effect of florfenicol within the environment and on aquatic organisms, and recognising the EPA’s independent statutory powers, does the Government have an understanding of what, at the time, prevented the environmental risk assessment from considering the effect on the bacteria community and the potential for antimicrobial resistance;
 - (b) Whilst the further study on these two issues is currently being undertaken by the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies - under its own initiative and using the same samples from the initial EPA environmental risk assessment - does the Government have an understanding of when the study will be completed and the results published; and
 - (c) Does the Government have a understanding, in light of the report’s observation, of the scope and potential value in expanding the parameters of future environmental risk assessments to include the effects of florfenicol and florfenicol amine on the bacteria community and the potential for antimicrobial resistance?

41 Ministerial Code of Conduct

Asked by: Ms Webb
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

Regarding the apparent misleading of the Parliament by former-Minister Ogilvie, the Honourable Member for Clark, during Assembly Budget Estimates Committee Scrutiny Hearings on 17 November 2025 in responses to questions on whether she was a subject or party to any Supreme Court matters in the prior 18 months, and which was further compounded by the subsequent deficient clarification tabled by the former Minister on 20 November 2025, can the Premier confirm:

- (1) That former-Minister Ogilvie did mislead the Parliament during the Assembly Budget Estimates Committee Scrutiny hearings of 17 November 2025 regarding whether she was a subject or party to any Supreme Court matters in the prior 18 months; and
- (2) That the original and subsequent statements made by former-Minister Ogilvie during the November 2025 Budget Estimates Committee Scrutiny Hearings breached the *Ministerial Code of Conduct (October 2025)*, including but not limited to, the following Code's sections:
 - (a) Section 9.5;
 - (b) Section 9.6; and
 - (c) Section 9.7

42 Proclaimed Tasmanian Acts

Asked by: Ms Armitage
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

- (1) How many Tasmanian Acts that have been passed and received Royal Assent are, wholly or partially, yet to be proclaimed, aside from those that are under the purview of the Department of Justice; and
- (2) (a) Can a list of these Acts be provided; and
(b) For any Acts that are partially proclaimed, can the sections which are yet to be proclaimed also be provided?

43 MyState Bank Arena Lease

Asked by: Ms Thomas
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

In responses to questions raised during Budget Estimates, the Government confirmed that LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd pays base rent of approximately \$200,000 per annum under the MyState Bank Arena lease, while also receiving a taxpayer-funded hiring fee contribution that has totalled almost \$800,000 since 2021.

The Government has subsequently suggested there is a performance or percentage rent component to the lease.

In relation to the lease of the MyState Bank Arena to LK Stadiums (Tas):

- (1) What is the formula used to calculate the performance or percentage rent payable under the lease?
- (2) What total amount of performance or percentage rent has been paid by LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd in each financial year since the commencement of the lease?
- (3) What was the total rent received by the Crown from LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd in each year of the lease, including both base rent and performance rent?
- (4) Has the total rent received by the Crown from LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd in any year exceeded the value of the hiring fee contribution paid by the Government to LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd?
- (5) What independent assessment was undertaken before entering into the lease to determine market rent for MyState Bank Arena?
- (6) Was the lease subjected to an open competitive process or market testing prior to being awarded to LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd?
- (7) If the Government considers the lease represents value for money for Tasmanian taxpayers, will it release the total net financial benefit received by the Crown under the lease since its commencement?
- (8) How many community groups have received subsidised access to MyState Bank Arena under the non-commercial hiring arrangements since the lease commenced?
- (9) What was the total value of hiring fee discounts provided to community groups in each year of the lease?
- (10) How many community organisations sought access to the venue but were required to pay full commercial rates because they did not qualify under the subsidised arrangements?
- (11) Given the Auditor-General's findings regarding the proposed sale of land at Wilkinsons Point, what assurance can the Government provide that any future arrangement involving LK Group and Wilkinsons Point will be subject to greater transparency and market testing than occurred with the MyState Bank Arena Lease?
- (12) What assurance can the Government provide that the lease arrangements for the Stadium at Macquarie Point is being negotiated in the best interests of Tasmanians, rather than the best interests of the AFL or Cricket Australia as the proposed head tenants?

44 Lake Meadowbank Irrigation System

Asked by: Ms Thomas

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

In regard to the proposed large irrigation scheme which would draw 37.2 gigalitres from Lake Meadowbank, the last Hydro Lake in the Derwent River Catchment:

- (1) Why has the Government chosen to disregard the 2002 report, titled *Environmental Flows for the Lower Derwent River*, commissioned by the Tasmanian government, which advised against any additional summer water extraction from the lower Derwent River?

- (2) Is the Minister aware that Lake Meadowbank already has a history of algal blooms caused by inadequate water flow during the drier months?
- (3) How does the Minister propose to ensure there will be sufficient water flow in the river during the summer months, or other periods of low flow, to maintain the health of the river?
- (4) How will the Minister ensure that there will be no damage to seagrass beds, leading to adverse effects on fish, birds etc, caused by inadequate water flow?
- (5) What plans does the Minister have for monitoring water quality at Lake Meadowbank, and in the Derwent below Meadowbank Dam?
- (6) Would monitoring of the water quality be done by suitably qualified scientists?
- (7) Are there any contingency plans to release water from Hydro lakes on the Derwent upstream from Lake Meadowbank?
- (8) Given it is likely that the Derwent, and its Hydro lakes, will have reduced water flow during the recently declared El Nino period that is approaching, will the Minister consider postponing the proposed Irrigation Scheme?

45 Competitive Neutrality Entura

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Minister for Energy and Renewables

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

With regard to matters related to competitive neutrality and other related matters, can the Minister provide answers to the following questions:

- (1) Hydro Tasmania has stated that Entura directs around 60 per cent of its effort to Hydro Tasmania.
 - (a) What share of Entura's revenue, in both percentage and dollar terms, came from Hydro Tasmania and related State entities in each of the last three financial years;
 - (b) Over the same period, what proportion of Hydro Tasmania's contestable engineering, testing and commissioning work was awarded to Entura without an open competitive tender; and
 - (c) What is the policy basis for directing that work to Entura rather than openly tendering it to the Tasmanian market, and absent competitive tension, how is value for money demonstrated?
- (2) When Entura tenders against private firms, how is full cost attribution applied so that no advantage arises from Hydro Tasmania ownership, including cost of capital, tax equivalent payments, guarantees and shared overhead?
- (3) (a) Does Entura's external pricing include a competitive neutrality adjustment as contemplated by the national competition policy principles; and
 - (2) if so, how is it calculated, and who verifies it?
- (4) What is Entura's published operating model, and how does it define the niche it was established to serve versus services already supplied by Tasmanian private firms?

- (5) Given that Entura's results are consolidated into Hydro Tasmania's accounts, will the Minister request Hydro Tasmania publish Entura's revenue split between internal and external work, and the competitive neutrality measures it applies?
- (6) Has the Tasmanian Economic Regulator ever assessed Entura for competitive neutrality compliance, and if not, would the shareholder Ministers refer the matter?
- (7) Given Marinus Link and the broader transmission pipeline, what steps is Hydro Tasmania taking to maximise contestable participation by Tasmanian private firms rather than directing work to Entura?
- (8) Will the shareholder Ministers commit to a competitive neutrality review of Entura's operating model and report the outcome to Parliament?
- (9) What share of Entura's revenue comes from clients other than Hydro Tasmania, and what share from interstate and overseas work?
- (10) (a) Is Entura's national and international commercial expansion within the charter Hydro Tasmania was established under, and have the shareholder Ministers and the Board sanctioned it; and
b) if so, please provide an explanation?
- (11) What public capital and commercial risk are committed to that interstate and overseas activity, and is Entura's performance reported to Parliament separately from Hydro Tasmania's core results?

46 Hydro Tasmania Generation Assets

Asked by: *Ms Forrest*

To: Minister for Energy and Renewables

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

Regarding the generation assets of Hydro Tasmania, can the Minister:

- (1) Please provide a breakdown of electricity generated (in GWh) by each of the 30 power stations in the fleet for:
 - (a) the 2025 drought year;
 - (b) the 2022 above-average year; and
 - (c) the 1994–1996 baseline period used to set the original REC baseline figures?
- (2) Are there any power stations in the fleet where generation output has declined materially relative to historical averages for hydrological reasons that are comparable, and if so, is this attributable to asset condition rather than inflows?
- (3) Following the transformer fire at Reece power station, what full independent review of transformer condition across the Hydro Tasmania generation fleet was undertaken:
 - (a) What were the findings, and
 - (b) what remediation actions have been completed or are planned?
- (4) (a) Has Hydro Tasmania engaged any external engineering assessment of the overall condition of its generation fleet in the past five years; and
b) if so, what were the key findings of that assessment regarding life expectancy of critical components including turbines, stators, transformers and penstocks?

- (5) (a) How many transformers across the Hydro generation fleet have been assessed as requiring replacement or significant refurbishment;
- (b) what is the estimated capital cost; and
- (c) what is the estimated timeline for that work?
- (6) Please provide a breakdown by power station of the number of generating units across the fleet that are currently offline for:
 - (a) Maintenance;
 - (b) Refurbishment; and/or
 - (c) unplanned reasons?
- (7) Regarding the Gordon Number 2 major refurbishment:
 - (a) what was the original expected completion date; and
 - (b) if the works continue or continued beyond that date:
 - (i) when was it, or is expected to be completed; and
 - (ii) what was the original budget and the total cost to date or completion?
- (8) Regarding the following refurbishments to Poatina 2 machine, Lemonthyme, recently completed in the past 5 years are Poatina 3, Rowallan, Lake Echo, Trevallyn 1 and 2, Wilmot, for each, please advise:
 - (a) what was the original expected completion date; and
 - (i) when were the works completed; and
 - (b) what was the original budget; and
 - (ii) what was the total cost to date or completion?
- (9) Please provide a breakdown by power station of number of generating units across the fleet that are currently offline and indicate the expected return-to-service date for each.
- (10) (a) What is the total capital expenditure budget allocated for asset maintenance, refurbishment and replacement of generation assets in the 2026–27 financial year; and
- (b) how does this compare to the previous two financial years?

47 Hydro Tasmania Dividend

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Minsiter for Energy and Renewables

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

In relation to the 2026-27 Budget and Budget and Forward Estimates for dividends to be paid by Hydro Tasmania to the Government (detailed in Table 6.9 of 2026-27 Budget Paper 1) and the Budget and Forward Estimates for the Renewable Energy Dividend grant (detailed in table 4.5 of 2026-27 Budget Paper 2 Vol 1 I ask the Treasurer:

- (1) In calculating the Hydro dividend estimates included in Table 6.9, what assumptions were made in relation to the size of the Hydro dividend payout ratio applied to projected Hydro profits (for each Budget and Forward Estimate year)?
- (2) When were the Hydro projected profit estimates, on which the Hydro dividend estimates in Table 6.9 were based, received by Treasury and when were the Hydro dividend estimates finalised as part of the Budget development process?

- (3) On Page 80 of Budget Paper 2 Vol 1 it is stated that “The decrease in the Renewable Energy Dividend from 2026-27 reflects forecast Hydro Tasmania dividends being insufficient to trigger the threshold”. In this regard, it is noted that Hydro dividend estimates exceed the base criteria level of \$90 million in two Forward Estimate years. In the Treasurer’s Estimates Hearings on 1 June 2026, it was suggested by Treasury representatives that this reflected a review of the Renewable Energy Dividend policy to be undertaken by 30 June 2028. Is the statement made on Page 80 of Budget Paper 2 Vol 1, therefore, incorrect?
- (4) Based on the Hydro dividend estimate for 2029-30 of \$173.8 million and applying the currently established criteria for the calculation of the Renewable Energy Dividend to that Hydro dividend amount, what would be the estimated Renewable Energy Dividend payment amount?
- (5) Given the payment of a Renewable Energy Dividend is current Government Policy, why was the change in this policy to assume no payment over the 2026-27 Budget and Forward Estimates not reflected in the Policy and Parameter Statement detailed in Table 5.5 of Budget Paper No 1?
- (6) Given the 2026-27 Budget decision to reflect the cessation of the Renewable Energy Dividend prior to the flagged review being undertaken, why was the potential for the payment of a RED to continue post the review not included as a specific expenditure risk in Chapter 4 Risk, Sensitivities and Presentation of Budget Paper 1?
- (7) Was the 2026-27 Budget decision to reflect the cessation of the Renewable Energy Dividend across the 2026-27 Budget Forward Estimates endorsed by Cabinet?
- (8) Does the Treasurer agree with the Secretary of Treasury’s comment made during his Estimates Hearing on 1 June 2026 that the policy context for the payment of the Renewable Energy Dividend has changed since it was established by the Government?
- (9) Noting that the Renewable Energy Dividend was first announced by the Government in August 2023 (which included a reference to a review after four years of operation) and the first payment was made in the 2023-24 Budget year, will the flagged review be finalised in time for any resulting decision to be reflected in the 2028-29 Budget?
- (10) What are the Terms of Reference for the review of the Renewable Energy Dividend, and will the review include consultation with the community?

48 Payment in Lieu of Rates Scheme for Renewable Energy Generation

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Minister for Energy and Renewables

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

With regard to the Payment in Lieu of Rates (PiLoR) scheme for renewable energy generation, consistent with Victoria and other states can the Minister for Energy and Renewables respond to the following:

- (1) Renewable generation plant is currently classified as a chattel rather than a capital improvement to land, and is therefore not rateable in the ordinary way.

- (a) What is the legal or administrative origin of this classification, and has the Government reviewed whether it remains appropriate given the scale of current and committed wind, solar and battery investment in Tasmania; and
 - (b) does this classification apply equally to Hydro Tasmania's generating assets, and if so, has the Minister sought advice on whether it is consistent with the Commonwealth's competitive neutrality framework?
- (2) Does the Minister support, in principle, a nationally consistent rating treatment for renewable generation assets (i.e. PiLoR), given operators of multi-state portfolios already budget for and accept this model elsewhere?
- (3) Has the Minister or the Department had any direct engagement with any windfarm operators or proponents, on the rates treatment of their Tasmanian current or future assets, including any complaints or concerns raised about administrative complexity under the current multi-landholder valuation approach?

49 Government Response to the Future of Local Government Review's Final Report

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Minister for Local Government

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

The Future of Local Government Review's Final Report (October 2023) recommended the Government examine alternative revenue from major commercial operations (Recommendation 17) and undertake a Review of Rating (Recommendation 23), partly in response to council concerns - including Central Highlands Council's own submission to the Review - about rate exemptions on assets such as wind farms, which the Council argued required a structural, equity-based fix rather than a project-by-project approach.

- (1) Can the Minister for Local Government confirm the Government's formal response to Recommendations 17 and 23, and what work, if any, has been undertaken on each since the Government's response was released in May 2024;
 - (a) Was a Payment in Lieu of Rates scheme (PiLoR), of the kind operating in Victoria, considered as the mechanism for implementing either recommendation;
 - (b) If so, why was it not adopted; and
 - (c) If not, why not?
- (2) Was Treasury asked to model the revenue implications of a PiLoR-style scheme for Tasmanian councils as part of this work?
- (3) Why did the Government direct or permit the Valuer-General to apply a bespoke land valuation methodology to windfarm sites, rather than progressing PiLoR?
- (4) (a) Was this an administrative decision by the Office of the Valuer-General under the Valuation of Land Act 2001, or a policy direction from Government; and
 - (b) if it was a policy decision which Minister, if not you, approved it?
- (5) (a) Can the Minister confirm whether solar farms remain unrated under the standard 'chattels' exclusion, while windfarms alone have been brought into a valuation-based rating approach; and

- (b) if so, what is the policy rationale for treating the two technologies differently, and when will solar be addressed?
- (6) Under the current Valuer-General approach, rates liability falls on the host landholder rather than the plant operator:
 - (a) Has the Government sought assurance, contractual or otherwise, that lease arrangements between operators and landholders ensure rates costs are passed through to the operator; and
 - (b) At the Ark Energy St Patricks Plains site, where the project spans five separate landholdings, can the Minister confirm whether this results in five separate valuations and five separate billing processes, and what additional administrative cost this places on the relevant council compared with a single PiLoR assessment?
- (7) (a) How does the yield to local government under the Valuer-General's site-by-site valuation approach compare with what the same site would generate under the Victorian-style PiLoR formula (currently a \$67,270 base plus \$1,515 per MW); and
 - (b) Has this comparison been done, and will the Minister release it?
- (8) PiLoR is price-indexed annually and tracks consistent megawatt output for the life of the asset, whereas land valuations are periodic and may decline as a generation asset ages.
 - (a) Does the Government accept that the current approach risks declining real rate revenue to host councils over time, in contrast to PiLoR; and
 - (b) what plan, if any, does the Government have to review or replace the current valuation approach to address this risk?
- (9) Given that most wind farm operators in Tasmania already operate PiLoR-compliant assets in other states, what assessment has the Government made of investor and operator views on Tasmania's divergent approach, and the case for national consistency?
- (10) (a) Will the Government consider introducing legislation to adopt a PiLoR scheme for renewable energy generation in Tasmania; and
 - (b) if not, why not?

50 Payment in Lieu of Rates Scheme Hydro Tasmania

Asked by: Ms Forrest
 To: Leader for the Government
 Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

With regard to the Payment in Lieu of Rates (PiLoR) scheme for renewable energy generation, consistent with Victoria and other states can the Treasurer respond to the following questions:

- (1) Would applying the Victorian-style PiLoR formula (\$67,270 base plus \$1,515 per MW) to Hydro's generating fleet yield an amount broadly equivalent to what Hydro currently pays as its rate equivalent.
- (2) Has Treasury considered the PiLoR formula against Hydro's installed generating capacity and comparing it to the actual rate equivalent currently paid?
 - (a) If so, will the Treasurer table that comparison; and
 - (b) If Treasury has not undertaken this comparison, will the Treasurer commit to doing so and reporting the result, given it goes directly to whether the current rate equivalent methodology reflects a fair, market-consistent value?

- (3) Does the Treasurer accept that the existence of a rate equivalent mechanism for Hydro Tasmania, designed specifically to replicate the rates a private, taxable generator would pay, establishes the in-principle case that privately owned renewable generators should be rated on a comparable, transparent, formula-based basis (i.e. PiLoR), rather than through the bespoke land valuation approach currently applied only to windfarms?
- (4) What, if any, fiscal modelling has Treasury undertaken on the Budget and local government revenue implications of formally adopting PiLoR for privately owned renewable generation in Tasmania, including any consequential effect on how Hydro Tasmania's own rate equivalent obligation would be calculated under a consistent methodology?
- (5) (a) How often is the rate equivalent paid by Hydro Tasmania calculated and reviewed and does the Treasurer believe that bespoke, non-formula valuation approach risks producing inconsistent or declining returns over time, in contrast to a price-indexed, per-MW PiLoR rate; and
(b) if not, why not?

51 Funding for Creative Industries

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

- (1) With regard to the 2026/27 State Budget:
 - (a) is the new funding of \$10 Million for Creative Industries in addition to the figures in the lines for Arts Industry Development and Screen Industry Development; and
 - (b) can the Government provide a complete breakdown for how the 2026/27 arts budget development line will be allocated including the amounts allocated to:
 - i. Competitive Grants;
 - ii. Four-year funded organisations;
 - iii. The Premier's Arts Prize;
 - iv. Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery;
 - v. The Tasmanian Strategic Touring Fund;
 - vi. Arts Tasmania administrative expenses; and
 - vii. All other arts projects or initiatives that will be included in this budget line broken down by project or initiative?
- (2) During budget estimates scrutiny, the Deputy Secretary, Creative Industries, Sport and Visitor Economy said that he was hopeful there will be an increase in the amount of money that will go to arts organisations. Can the Government advise:
 - (a) will this increase be applied in the 2026-27 budget year, and
 - (b) given the apparent \$450,000 reduction in the overall arts budget for 2026-27, where will this increase come from?
- (3) During budget estimates scrutiny, the Deputy Secretary, Creative Industries, Sport and Visitor Economy stated there would be operational efficiencies made within the arts portfolio. Can the Government provide a breakdown of:
 - (a) how these efficiencies will be achieved; and
 - (b) the total savings that will be made through the efficiency measures?

(4) During budget estimates scrutiny, the Deputy Secretary, Creative Industries, Sport and Visitor Economy mentioned that a new creative industry strategy is currently in development. Additionally, the Tasmanian Live Performance Exchange sector report is due shortly. Can the Government advise:

- (a) if any money has been allocated to addressing the recommendations in the Tasmanian Live Performance sector report; and
- (b) whether there has been any money allocated towards future initiatives from the new creative industries strategy, and if so
 - i. what amounts have been allocated, and in what budget year; and
 - ii. will these amounts be additional to the existing programs, or will further savings need to be made to fund these outcomes?

(5) During budget estimates scrutiny, the Director, Creative Tasmania stated the following: That the extra \$10m for creative industries announced in the State Growth budget would be allocated \$5m to arts and \$5m to screen.

The Director also provided the following breakdown:

- (a) 2026-27 - \$1m screen / \$0 Arts
- (b) 2027-28 - \$1m screen / \$1m Arts
- (c) 2028-29 - \$1.5m screen / \$1.5m Arts
- (d) 2029-30 - \$1.5m screen / \$2m Arts

The Director noted that the most significant increase would be applied at the beginning of the next multi-year cycle (2027-28), and that there is a plan to move more arts organisations to multi-year agreements. Can the Government advise:

- (a) How does the Government intend to support arts organisations in 2026-2027 to ensure there are no further closures before the additional funding becomes available in 2027-28?
 - (b) (i) Is the additional \$1m for Arts in 2027-2028 allocated only to multi-year agreements; and
 - (ii) if not, please provide a breakdown of how this will be applied?
 - (c) Given that the next round of multi-year funding agreements is expected to commence in 2027-28, how does the Government intend to allocate the additional funding provided in 2028-29 and 2029-30, once multi-year funding commitments have already been established?
 - (d) (i) Will organisations receiving multi-year funding agreements from 2027-28 receive annual CPI indexation during the life of those agreements; and
 - (ii) If so, will the cost of indexation be funded from the additional arts investment announced in the Budget, or from existing Arts Tasmania funding allocations?
- (6) The Budget papers indicate a reduction in overall Arts Tasmania funding over the Forward Estimates, while the Government has also indicated an intention to expand the number of organisations receiving multi-year funding. In this context:
- (a) How does the Government intend to sustain both existing and additional multi-year funding commitments beyond the four-year period covered by the announced \$5 million investment; and

- (b) if the additional arts funding is largely committed to multi-year funding agreements from 2027–28 onwards, what measures will the Government take to ensure that opportunities remain available for new and emerging organisations to access Arts Tasmania funding in future funding rounds?

52 King Island Racing Season

Asked by: Ms Forrest
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

With regard to the upcoming racing season on King Island:

- (1) Have the race dates and trial dates been formally approved by TasRacing?
- (2) (a) Has TasRacing approved funding for the 2026-27 King Island racing season; and
(b) if so, what level of financial support has been allocated?
- (3) Has the King Island program been incorporated into TasRacing's approved 2026-27 racing calendar and budget?
- (4) Has prize money been determined for the four race meetings?
- (5) Will trainer participation subsidies, transport assistance or other support measures be available to encourage mainland participation?
- (6) Has TasRacing entered into a formal funding, operational or race-program agreement with the King Island Racing Club for the 2026-27 season?
- (7) Following the cancellation of the 2025-26 season due to insufficient horse and trainer numbers, what measures have been implemented to improve the viability of the 2026-27 season?
- (8) Has TasRacing received indications of support from trainers and owners sufficient to give confidence that the announced program can proceed as scheduled?
- (9) What is TasRacing's longer-term commitment to maintaining racing on King Island?

53 Bluegum Digital Transformation Project

Asked by: Ms Thomas
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 24 June 2026

Question:

A search of the Government Tenders website for contracts awarded in relation to the Department of Health's Bluegum Digital Health Transformation Project returns more than 130 contract-award results. Many appear to be valued between \$90,000 and \$100,000 – just below the threshold requiring a tender process – with multiple contracts awarded to the same contractors.

During Budget Estimates hearings, the Secretary suggested this reflects a “problem with the Treasurer’s Instructions” requiring the Department to procure services in this way.

In relation to the Bluegum Digital Health Transformation Project:

- (1) How many Bluegum-related contracts valued between \$50,000 and \$99,999 have been awarded to date, and what is their total value?
- (2) How many Bluegum-related contracts valued under \$50,000 have been awarded to date, and what is their total value?
- (3) Of the \$36.5 million spent on labour hire:
 - (a) how much was spent on contracts valued under \$50,000;
 - (b) how much was spent on contracts valued between \$50,000 and \$100,000;
 - (c) how much was spent on contracts valued above \$100,000; and
 - (d) for each contract above \$100,000, whether an open tender process was conducted?
- (4) How many individual entities have been awarded Bluegum-related contracts? For each entity, please provide:
 - (a) the number of contracts awarded;
 - (b) the total value of contracts awarded; and
 - (c) whether those contracts were awarded through open tender, limited tender, direct engagement, or another procurement method?
- (5) How is the Government satisfied it is achieving best value for taxpayer money where contracts are awarded without an open tender process?
- (6) How are contract values determined, particularly where multiple contracts appear to fall just below the \$100,000 tender threshold?
- (7) The Department has indicated it will seek to directly employ a fixed-term workforce to deliver Horizon 2. Why was this approach not adopted for Horizon 1?
- (8) How is the work of multiple labour-hire contractors coordinated and overseen, and by whom?
- (9) How do the contractors engaged on the Bluegum project operate as an integrated project team?
- (10) (a) is the Government aware of comparable digital transformation projects, in Tasmania or elsewhere, successfully delivered through this labour-hire procurement model; and
(b) if so, please provide examples.

54 Heritage Council Legal Fees

Asked by: Ms Lovell

To: Minister for Parks and Heritage

Date: 24 June 2026

Question:

In relation to an answer to a question on notice taken during the House of Assembly Budget Estimates hearing, the former Minister for Heritage confirmed that current or former members of the Heritage Council have had publicly funded legal fees since 1 July 2022, and that it had not been possible to determine whether the legal matters were ongoing.

Can the Minister please advise:

- (1) Which members have had legal fees covered by Tasmanian taxpayers and how much they have each accrued?
- (2) What is the basis of the legal matter/s for which they have received legal assistance?
- (3) Why it cannot be determined whether the legal matters are ongoing or not?

(4) Who approved the legal fees for each member of the council?

55 Reforming Trade Waste Framework

Asked by: Mr *Edmunds*

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 25 June 2026

Question:

On 26 June 2025, the Premier issued a media statement titled: “Reforming trade waste framework to future-proof major employers”, which criticised TasWater for “unrealistic timeframes to comply with trade waste requirements”.

The media statement went on to say direct consultation will be conducted with “TasWater, major trade waste producers, the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and AiGroup.”

- (1) Can the Government provide details on what engagement has occurred with each of these named bodies, which “major trade waste producers” it has engaged with and how, and when this engagement has occurred; and
- (2) is there a timeline on when the Parliament and Tasmanians can expect any policy detail on this announcement?

56 School Psychologists

Asked by: Mr Edmunds

To: Minister for *Education*

Date: 25 June 2026

Question:

With regard to school psychologists:

- (1) How many students are on waiting lists for an assessment by a school psychologist?
- (2) What is the maximum wait time for an assessment?
- (3) What is the average waiting time for an assessment?
- (4) How much direct intervention and follow-up following initial assessment is also delivered by a school psychologist, as opposed to by a social worker?
- (5) (a) What is the current (2026) establishment number of school psychologists for DECYP; and
(b) how does this compare to 2025, 2024 and 2023?
- (6) (a) How is the establishment number determined; and
(b) if by formula, what is the formula?
- (7) How many of the total positions are school-based (student facing)?
- (8) What is the breakdown of the type of school psychology positions in terms of:
 - (a) Full time;
 - (b) Part time;
 - (c) Permanent; and
 - (d) Short term/contract

- (9) How many school psychology positions, and FTE, are vacant (broken down into regions)?
- (10) What is the current (2026) school psychologist centrally funded FTE allocation for each school/college in the state?
- (11) In 2025 how many school psychology positions were advertised, by region?
- (12) For each round of recruitment for each position, how many total applications were received; how many applicants were short-listed; how many were interviewed; and how many were deemed suitable for recruitment (broken down by region)?

57 School Social Workers

Asked by: Mr *Edmunds*
To: Minister for Education
Date: 25 June 2026

Question:

With regard to school social workers:

- (1) How many students are on waiting lists to see a Social Worker?
- (2) What is the maximum wait time to see a Social Worker?
- (3) What is the average waiting time to see a Social Worker?

58 School Speech Pathologists

Asked by: Mr *Edmunds*
To: Minister for Education

Question:

With regard to school speech pathologists:

- (1) How many students are on waiting lists to see a speech pathologist?
- (2) What is the maximum wait time to see a speech pathologist?
- (3) What is the average waiting time to see a speech pathologist?

Summary of Bills

Read First Time

No. 35 of 2025	Partition Amendment Bill (<i>pro forma</i>)
No. 39 of 2025	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill (No. 2)
No. 49 of 2025	Public Accounts Committee Amendment Bill
No. 50 of 2025	Police Offences Amendment Bill
No. 53 of 2025	Mt Lyell Acid Drainage Reduction (Repeal) Bill
No. 59 of 2025	Residential Tenancy Amendment (Safety Modifications) Bill
No. 65 of 2025	Charities and Associations Law (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill
No. 69 of 2025	Integrity Commission Amendment (Mandatory Notifications) Bill
No. 5	Police Offences Amendment (Increased Penalties for Damage to Tasmanian War Memorials) Bill
No. 6	Occupational Licensing Amendment Bill
No. 12	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026
No. 13	Short Stay Levy Bill
No. 14	Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill

Second Reading Adjourned

No. 66 of 2025	Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill
----------------	---

Second Reading Negatived

No. 57 of 2025	Budget Accountability and Oversight Committee Bill
----------------	--

Further Consideration of Bill in Committee of Whole Council

No. 2	Residential Parks Bill
-------	------------------------

Returned to the House of Assembly with Amendments

No. 10	Local Government Amendment (Targeted Reform) Bill
--------	---

Agreed to by Both Houses

No. 36 of 2025	Government Business Governance Reforms Bill	Act No. 18 of 2025
No. 37 of 2025	Commissions of Inquiry Amendment (Private Sessions Information) Bill	Act No. 19 of 2025
No. 38 of 2025	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill	Act No. 17 of 2025
No. 40 of 2025	Residential Tenancy Amendment (Pets) Bill	Act No. 22 of 2025
No. 41 of 2025	Sentencing Amendment (Aggravating Factors) Bill	Act No. 33 of 2025
No. 42 of 2025	Government Business (Sale Reforms) Bill	Act No. 20 of 2025
No. 43 of 2025	Taxation and Related Legislation (First Home Owner and Payroll Relief) Bill	Act No. 31 of 2025
No. 44 of 2025	Custodial Inspector Amendment (Protection from Reprisal) Bill	Act No. 27 of 2025
No. 45 of 2025	Poisons Amendment (Interstate Prescriptions) Bill	Act No. 26 of 2025
No. 46 of 2025	Dangerous Criminals and High Risk Offenders Amendment Bill	Act No. 23 of 2025
No. 47 of 2025	Justice Miscellaneous (Explosives Offences) Bill	Act No. 32 of 2025
No. 51 of 2025	Expungement of Historical Offences Amendment Bill	Act No. 21 of 2025
No. 52 of 2025	Terrorism Legislation (Extension) Bill	Act No. 25 of 2025
No. 54 of 2025	Commission for Children and Young People Bill	Act No. 30 of 2025
No. 58 of 2025	University of Tasmania (Protection of Land) Bill	Act No. 2 of 2026
No. 60 of 2025	Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Amendment Bill	Act No. 24 of 2025
No. 63 of 2025	Appropriation Bill (No. 1)	Act No. 28 of 2025
No. 64 of 2025	Appropriation Bill (No. 2)	Act No. 29 of 2025
No. 1	Building Amendment Bill	Act No. 6 of 2026
No. 3	Grange Resources (Tasmania) Pty Ltd (Alternative Application Period) Bill	Act No. 3 of 2026
No. 7	Education and Care Services National Law (Application) Amendment Bill	Act No. 5 of 2026
No. 8	Public Health Amendment (Prohibited Tobacco and Other Products) Bill	
No. 9	Help to Buy (Commonwealth Powers) Bill	Act No. 4 of 2026
No. 11	Petroleum Reporting (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill	Act No. 1 of 2026

No. 18	Appropriation Bill (No. 1)	No. 18
No. 19	Appropriation Bill (No. 2)	No. 19
No. 20	First Home Owner Grant Amendment Bill	No. 20

Current Committees and Membership

Standing Committees

Committee of Privileges: Mr Farrell, Ms Forrest, Ms Armitage, Mr Gaffney and Ms Rattray

Standing Orders Committee: Mr Farrell (The President), Ms Forrest (The Chair of Committees), Ms Armitage, Ms Rattray and Ms Thomas

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works (Joint)¹: Mr Hiscutt and Ms Rattray

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Subordinate Legislation (Joint): Ms Forrest, Ms Glade-Wright and Mr Hiscutt

Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (Joint): Mr Edmunds, Ms Forrest and Ms Thomas

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Integrity (Joint): Ms Armitage, Ms O'Connor and Ms Webb

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Electoral Matters (Joint): Mr Gaffney, Ms O'Connor, Ms Thomas and Ms Webb

Greyhound Racing Transition (Joint): Ms O'Connor, Ms Webb and Ms Rattray

Sessional Committees

House Committee (Joint): Mr Farrell (The President), Ms Forrest and Ms Rattray

Library Committee (Joint): Ms Armitage, Mr Farrell, Ms Forrest, Mr Gaffney, Mr Hiscutt and Ms Rattray

Final Report of Commission of Inquiry (Joint): Ms Lovell, Ms O'Connor and Ms Webb

Workplace Culture Oversight (Joint): Mr Farrell, Ms Forrest, Ms Lovell and Ms Rattray

Gender and Equality (Joint): Mr Edmunds, Ms Forrest, Ms Thomas and Ms Glade-Wright

Government Administration A: Ms Forrest, Ms Glade-Wright, Ms Lovell, Ms O'Connor and Ms Thomas

Government Administration B: Ms Armitage, Mr Edmunds, Mr Gaffney, Mr Hiscutt and Ms Webb

Select Committees

Energy Matters (Joint): Mr Edmunds, Ms Forrest, Mr Hiscutt and Ms Lovell

¹ Joint Committees are made up of Members from both Houses. For House of Assembly Members of these Committees please see the House of Assembly Notice Paper.

Dates of Meetings of the Legislative Council

The following are the Council's proposed sitting dates for 2026. These dates are indicative only and subject to change.

March	6 (QC), 17, 18, 19, 20 (QC), 24, 25, 26, 27 (QC)
April	14, 15, 16, 17 (QC)
May	15 (QC), 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28
June	19 (QC), 23, 24, 25
August	11, 12, 13, 14 (QC), 18, 19, 20, 21 (QC)
September	1, 2, 3, 4 (QC), 8, 9, 10, 11 (QC)
October	27, 28, 29, 30 (QC)
November	17, 18, 19, 20 (QC), 24, 25, 26, 27 (QC)
December	1, 2, 3

The sitting schedule is available at:

https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0037/98569/52nd-Parliament_Combined-sitting-schedule-2026-FINAL.pdf

Meetings of the Legislative Council (Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays)

11.00 am	Acknowledgement of Country and Prayers Presentation of Petitions Notices of Questions Notices of Motions Answers to Questions on Notice Tabling of Papers Messages Special Interest Matters [<i>Tuesdays only</i>] Motions and Orders of the Day [<i>Government Business takes precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays</i>]
1.00 pm	Break
2.30 pm	Question Time
3.00 pm	Resumption of Motions and Orders of the Day
4.00 pm	Break [<i>Tuesdays and Wednesdays only</i>]
4.30 pm	Resumption of Motions and Orders of the Day Adjournment

Quorum Calls of the Legislative Council (Fridays)

When the Legislative Council sits on a Friday it is called a Quorum Call. This sitting is primarily for the purpose of receiving Messages from the House of Assembly, and the Council does not conduct any substantive business.

9.30 am	Acknowledgement of Country and Prayers Presentation of Petitions Notices of Questions Notices of Motions Answers to Questions on Notice Tabling of Papers Messages Adjournment
----------------	---

Standing and Sessional Orders of the Legislative Council

The work of the Legislative Council is governed by its Standing and Sessional Orders, as agreed by the Council. The Council's Standing Orders are available at:

<https://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/legislative-council/lcstandingorders>