LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 - 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

NOTICES OF MOTION AND ORDERS OF THE DAY

No. 54

Thursday 29 October 2026

The Council meets at 11.00am

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 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.

3 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.

4 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.

5 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.

6 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.

7 Banning the Use of Character References During Sentencing

Given by: Mr *Edmunds*
Date: 6 March 2026

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.

8 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.

9 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.

10 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.

11 Australian Medical Association (AMA) Tasmania Briefing Paper, 'Antibiotic use in Tasmania Salmon Farming, Antimicrobial Resistance and Human Health'

Given by: Ms *O'Connor*
Date: 12 August 2026

To be moved:

(1) Notes:
   (a) The Australian Medical Association (AMA) Tasmania Briefing Paper, 'Antibiotic use in Tasmania Salmon Farming, Antimicrobial Resistance and Human Health';
   (b) The Briefing Paper background statement that, "*Antibiotic use in open marine aquaculture is well documented to carry risks of environmental persistence, development of resistant bacteria, and eventual spread of resistance genes into human, animal, and environmental microbiomes";*
   (c) Its call for the precautionary principle to guide antibiotic use in aquaculture, noting that, "*Deploying Florfenicol in Tasmanian waters under emergency powers, without comprehensive assessment or monitoring, carries demonstrable public health and environmental risks*"; and

(2) Recognises AMA Tasmania has recommended:
   (a) Cessation of emergency antibiotic approvals pending full Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) registration, including complete environmental risk assessment and public consultation;
   (b) Comprehensive baseline and ongoing monitoring of antibiotic residues, resistant bacteria, and resistance genes in water, sediments, and wild fish around aquaculture sites;
   (c) Mandatory timely transparency on all antibiotic use in aquaculture including in hatcheries with publicly accessible reporting of quantities, timing and site locations;
   (d) Adoption of a "One Health" framework to ensure aquaculture decisions consider public health impacts and antibiotic microbial resistance risks;

(e) Investment in and exploration of alternative control measures such as; vaccines, improved husbandry, reduced stocking densities (to reduce dependence on antibiotics),investment in new technologies that remove effluent and dosed food for safe disposal;

(f) Independent scientific oversight of any antibiotic use proposals, including peer review by environmental microbiologists and infectious disease specialists;

(3) Calls on the Tasmanian Government to apply the precautionary principle to the use of Florfenicol in Tasmanian waters, and to prioritise public and environmental health in line with the AMA Tasmania recommendations.

12 Bill for an Act to Regulate the Lobbying of Public Officials and for Related Purposes

Given by: Ms *Webb*
Date: 18 August 2026

To be moved:

For the introduction of a Bill for an Act to regulate the lobbying of public officials and for related purposes.

13 Rural Alive & Well 2025-2026 Impact Report

Given by: Ms *Armitage*
Date: 20 August 2026

To be moved:

That the Rural Alive & Well 2025-2026 Impact Report, be considered and noted.

14 Our Mountain's Future Kunanyi/Mount Wellington and Wellington Park Action Plan

Given by: Ms *O'Connor*
Date: 8 September 2026

To be moved:

That the Tasmanian Government's 'Our Mountain's Future Kunanyi/Mount Wellington and Wellington Park Action Plan', be considered and noted.

15 Wilkinsons Point Land Sale

Given by: Ms *Thomas*
Date: 10 September 2026

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council notes:

(1) The Mercury report of 19 August 2026 in which a Government spokesperson confirming negotiations between the Tasmanian Government and LK Group regarding the proposed sale and development of approximately 15 hectares of Crown land at Wilkinsons Point had recommenced, with the spokesperson describing the latest meeting as "very productive" and confirming that, while an agreement had not yet been reached, the Government continues to work closely with LK Group;

(2) That, during the Public Accounts Committee hearing on 10 April 2026, when asked whether the term sheet or proposed agreement would be publicly released before a final

decision was made, the Premier stated that, subject to commercial confidentiality, the Government expected to be open with the Tasmanian public and "as transparent as possible", and confirmed that this was his stated intention;

(3) The Premier's advice, in correspondence to me, the Member for Elwick, dated 22 July 2026, that:
   (a) there is presently no settled timeframe for a final decision;
   (b) there are no current milestones, deadlines, performance requirements, sunset provisions or defined decision points;
   (c) there is no final sale or development agreement in place;
   (d) the Government does not consider that there is further advice requiring release at this time; and
   (e) the Government intends to continue the current process;

(4) That the legislated process for the sale of surplus Crown land comprises nine stages:
   (a) submission of a proposal to Crown Land Services and declaration of the land as surplus land by the Minister for Parks;
   (b) assessment of the proposal and preparation of any subdivision plan;
   (c) referral of the proposal to the Office of the Valuer-General;
   (d) valuation of the land by the Office of the Valuer-General;
   (e) preparation of a minute recommending a reserve price;
   (f) determination of the reserve price by the Director-General of Lands;
   (g) consideration of the disposal by the Minister;
   (h) preparation and execution of a written contract; and
   (i) settlement of the sale by the Office of the Crown Solicitor;

(5) That as of 19 August 2026, the Minister for Parks, with responsibility for Crown land, had neither declared the land proposed for sale at Wilkinsons Point to be surplus Crown land nor received a request for the land to be declared surplus;

(6) That under the *Crown Lands Act 1976*, the Director-General of Lands must fix a reserve price before Crown land is sold, having regard to the valuation of the land, and that every sale must be effected through a written contract; and

(7) That section 178 of the *Local Government Act 1993* requires a council proposing to dispose of public land to publicly advertise its intention, provide the community with 21 days in which to lodge objections, consider any objections received and provide objectors with a right of appeal.

Further, that the Legislative Council:

(8) Acknowledges that the proposed sale and development of Wilkinsons Point involves a significant publicly owned waterfront asset, substantial proposed private development and potentially significant taxpayer-funded infrastructure, and should therefore be subject to meaningful local community and parliamentary scrutiny before the State is contractually committed; and

(9) Calls on the Tasmanian Government, before finalising or entering into any binding agreement for the sale of Crown land at Wilkinsons Point, to:
   (a) provide to this House the proposed master plan and sufficient details of the proposed development to clearly identify its nature, scale, staging and intended community and economic benefits;
   (b) disclose the proposed sale terms, including the land to be transferred, the proposed sale price, development obligations, timeframes, conditions, protections for the

State and any infrastructure, site preparation, remediation, concessions, incentives or other costs to be met by the Tasmanian taxpayer;

(c) formally engage with Glenorchy City Council on the proposed sale terms and master plan; and

(d) provide Parliament with a reasonable opportunity to consider and debate the proposed transaction before any sale agreement is finalised; or

(e) alternatively, abandon the current exclusive negotiations with LK Group and offer the land for sale through an open and competitive tender process to test the market.

16 Robbery Crime Trends

Given by: Ms *Thomas*
Date: 10 September 2026

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

(1) Notes that Australian Bureau of Statistics Recorded Crime – Victims data for 2025 shows that:

(a) 289 victims of robbery were recorded in Tasmania, an increase of 14 victims, or 5 per cent, compared with 2024;

(b) this was the highest number of robbery victims recorded in Tasmania in the 33-year data series;

(c) robbery victim numbers increased in Tasmania for the fifth consecutive year;

(d) Tasmania's increase occurred while the number of robbery victims nationally fell by 8 per cent;

(e) 52 per cent of robberies recorded in Tasmania occurred at retail locations, compared with 26.6 per cent nationally;

(f) armed robbery decreased by 5 per cent in Tasmania, while unarmed robbery increased by 14 per cent; and

(g) in 60 per cent of Tasmanian robbery cases, an alleged offender was proceeded against within 30 days.

(2) Recognises that robbery is not simply a property offence, but an offence that often involves the use or threat of immediate violence or coercion, which can cause lasting physical, psychological and financial harm to victims, their families and witnesses.

(3) Further recognises the increasing exposure of retail and other customer-facing workers to robbery, violence, threats, intimidation and abuse while performing their ordinary duties, and the serious consequences this can have for their safety, wellbeing and willingness to remain in their employment.

(4) Acknowledges that:

(a) there is significant community concern about robbery, retail crime and violence against workers;

(b) poverty, housing insecurity, social exclusion, addiction, disengagement from education and other forms of disadvantage can increase the risk of offending;

(c) disadvantage neither excuses nor diminishes personal responsibility for criminal conduct;

(d) there has been insufficient investment in early intervention and prevention programs over the last decade; and

(e) an effective response must combine policing, accountability and appropriate sentencing with sustained investment in early intervention, prevention, education, housing, mental health, alcohol and other drug services, and programs for children, young people and families at risk.

(5) Notes community concern that sentencing outcomes for robbery and other serious offences involving violence or threats of violence do not always meet community expectations regarding accountability, deterrence and protection of the public.

(6) Calls on the Tasmanian Government to:

(a) publicly acknowledge the concerning increase in robbery and retail-related offending in Tasmania and develop a coordinated, evidence-based response;

(b) increase resourcing and support for victims of crime, including timely access to counselling, practical assistance, information, advocacy and financial assistance;

(c) expedite the current review of the *Victims of Crime Assistance Act 1976* and publicly release its findings and the Government's response;

(d) urgently introduce legislation establishing Workplace Protection Orders to protect retail and other customer-facing workers from repeated or escalating violence, threats, intimidation and abuse;

(e) urgently introduce the proposed knife crime legislation addressing the sale and supply of knives to minors and strengthening controls relating to knives, machetes and prohibited weapons;

(f) urgently explore options to strengthen the role of appropriately trained personnel in supporting community safety, including greater powers and enhanced training for licensed security guards or the introduction of community safety officers as a second tier of policing, with clearly defined functions, appropriate oversight and accountability, and effective coordination with Tasmania Police; and

(g) review sentencing outcomes for robbery offences, including armed robbery and robbery committed against retail or other customer-facing workers, to enable consideration of whether current sentencing practices adequately reflect:

(i) the seriousness of the offence;

(ii) the use or threatened use of violence;

(iii) the harm caused to victims and witnesses;

(iv) the need for deterrence and community protection; and

(v) the need for rehabilitation and measures that reduce reoffending.

17 Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG) Herbarium Cuts

Given by: Ms *Webb*
Date: 28 October 2026

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

(1) Notes with concern the Tasmanian government's intention to cut resourcing and staffing of the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG) which holds internationally significant natural history collections, including vital educational, interpretative, promotional and senior curatorial roles;
(2) Acknowledges the considerable alarm and disbelief expressed by many in the Tasmanian scientific, cultural history and broader communities in response to the news of the threatened government funding cuts;
(3) Notes the range of urgent representations from local, interstate and international university-based and other professional research institutions expressing significant alarm over the proposed cuts and the impacts they will have on established research projects underway, the health and viability of the TMAG collections, current and future research and capacity, and the reputational damage to Tasmania;
(4) Acknowledges TMAG's collections management is not a passive administrative task but instead requires skilled and continual high-level research, classification and maintenance;
(5) Notes the government's intended staffing and resourcing cuts risks jeopardising the integrity of the TMAG collections and public assets, and also endangers:
    (a) The collections' security and conservation due to inadequate oversight accelerating the physical degradation of vulnerable, unique and irreplaceable type specimens;
    (b) Current and future research throughput as the absence of dedicated research risks collection stagnation, reduced active loans and innovation collaboration, exchanges, and cross-regional biosecurity support;
    (c) Capacity to meet statutory obligations as set out in section 5 'Institutional objectives' of the *Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery Act 2017*;
    (d) Tasmania's access to vital skills, knowledge and expertise.

Further, that the Legislative Council notes the motion passed at the Friends of TMAG public meeting of the 8th of October, and calls on the government to:

(6) Immediately reverse the intended job cuts at the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery;
(7) Retain the skilled staff who care for and interpret Tasmania's TMAG state collections;
(8) Commit to providing TMAG with the secure, long-term funding needed to fulfil its public, cultural, scientific and legal responsibilities; and
(9) Reflect the long-term funding commitment in the 2027-28 state budget and forward estimates.

18 Report of the Auditor-General No. 2 of 2026-27 Treasury's Oversight of Government Businesses

Given by: Ms *Forrest*
Date: 28 October 2026

To be moved:

That the *Report of the Auditor-General No. 2 of 2026-27 Treasury's oversight of government businesses*, be considered and noted.

19 Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG) Job Cuts

Given by: Ms *O'Connor*
Date: 28 October 2026

To be moved:

(1) Notes the important role the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery has long played in preserving and presenting Tasmania's historic, cultural, artistic and scientific legacy, including:
   (a) Responsibility for an estimated one million objects that represents the State Collection;
   (b) Operating the Herbarium and Zoology Department, both critical to scientific research and the implementation of important statutory responsibilities, such as biosecurity;
   (c) Educating generations of young Tasmanians;
   (d) Contributing to the local and state economy.
(2) Further notes that TMAG has clear legal responsibilities to preserve and present the State Collection that it must meet;
(3) Acknowledges the commitment of TMAG staff to meet these responsibilities and that inadequate funding has made this difficult for many years;
(4) Highlights existing challenges with TMAG infrastructure, including leaking roofs;
(5) Condemns further cuts to TMAG staffing and the Tasmanian Government's arrogant approach to communication and consultation;
(6) Congratulates the Friends of TMAG, Community and Public Sector Union, colleague institutions globally and the Tasmanian public for strongly objecting to the cuts and raising concerns about the implications for TMAG being able to meet its legal responsibilities;
(7) Calls on the Tasmanian Government to:
   (a) maintain existing staffing levels and positions to allow TMAG to meet its legal responsibilities and the expectations of the public;
   (b) invest in TMAG's buildings to ensure they are fit for purpose and respectfully preserved for future generations.

20 CommBank State of the States Report September 2026

Given by: Mr *Edmunds*
Date: 28 October 2026

To be moved:

That the CommBank State of the States report of September 2026, be considered and noted.

Orders of the Day

General Business

1 **Follow-up of the Report of the Auditor-General - Expressions of Interest for Tourism Investment Opportunities (No. 3 of 2020-2021)**

Mover: Ms *Forrest*
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 1 September 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

2 **Third Interim Report of the Joint Sessional Committee Recommendations made in the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings**

Mover: Ms *Webb*
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 1 September 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

3 **Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts Follow-up of the Report of the Auditor-General Improving Outcomes for Tasmanian Senior Secondary Students (No. 1 of 2022-2023)**

Mover: Ms *Forrest*
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 3 September 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

4 **Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 56 of 2026) Proposed Sale of Wilkinsons Point**

Mover: Ms *Forrest*
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 27 October 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted

Orders of the Day

Government Business

1 **Teachers Registration Bill 2026 (27 of 2026)**

Mover: Ms *Palmer*
Date: Bill reported without amendment by the Committee of the Whole Council on 28 October 2026
Status: Awaiting Third reading

2 **Firearms Amendment (Strengthening Firearms Security) Bill 2026 (30 of 2026)**

Mover: Ms *Rattray*
Status: Second reading debate adjourned on 28 October 2026 (Ms *Forrest)*
Spoken: Ms *Rattray*, Ms *Armitage*, Mr *Hiscutt*, Ms *Lovell*, Ms *Glade-Wright*, Ms *Forrest* (40 minutes remaining)

3 **Tasmanian Community Fund Amendment Bill 2025 (55 of 2025)**
Mover: Ms *Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 18 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

4 **Sentencing Amendment (Good Character) Bill 2026 (28 of 2026)**
Mover: Ms *Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 3 September 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

5 **Monetary Penalties Enforcement Amendment Bill 2026 (16 of 2026)**
Mover: Ms *Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 20 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

6 **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

7 **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*

Tuesday 3 November 2026

8 **Government Business Governance Reforms Bill 2026 (44 of 2026)**
Mover: Ms *Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 27 October 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

Bill *Pro forma* (Pursuant to Standing Order 6)[1]

9 **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

68 Sharp Airlines Services between King Island and Melbourne

Asked by: Ms *Forrest*
To: Minister for Transport
Date: 27 October 2026

Question:

In relation to Sharp Airlines services between King Island and Melbourne,

(1) What is the total value of Tasmania Government funding provided to Sharp Airlines for King Island to mainland Tasmania and King Island to Melbourne services, broken down by financial year for 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27; and
    (a) what is the term and expiry date of the current agreement?

(2) Is the funding a fixed payment, a per-service payment, an underwrite of seats, or another arrangement?

(3) What minimum service delivery requirements are attached to the funding, including:
(a) the minimum number of weekly return services;
(b) minimum seat capacity;
(c) required days and times of operation, including seasonal variation; and
(d) reliability and on-time performance standards?

(4) Does the agreement permit Sharp Airlines to cancel scheduled services for commercial reasons such as low passenger loads or soft loads? If so, under what conditions, and what notice must be given to the Government and to passengers?

(5) Does a cancellation for soft loads count against Sharp Airlines' contracted service obligations, and are there abatement, penalty or claw-back provisions where contracted services are not delivered?

(6) How many cancellations have there been by Sharp Airlines, and the reasons for these cancellations, for the financial years 2024-2025, 2025-2026 and 2026-2027.

(7) What performance reporting does Sharp Airlines provide to the Government, how often, and is it published?

(8) Was the Government, or any agency, consulted or notified before Sharp Airlines decided to cancel the November services and any later services? If so, when?

(9) How many services across what date range were proposed for cancellation?

(10) What is the "review and consultation process" for poorly loaded flights referred to in discussions with Sharp Airlines, who participates in it, and how are island communities consulted?

(11) On Thursday 22 October 2026, Sharp Airlines notified passengers by SMS, email and in a follow-up phone call, that King Island–Essendon services, including SH927 on 19 November 2026, had been cancelled "at the direction of the Tasmanian Government". Your Ministerial Office has since advised that this was incorrect, and that the cancellations were an operational decision by Sharp Airlines due to soft loads. Has the Government sought a public correction from Sharp Airlines of its statement attributing the cancellations to the Government?

(12) Has Sharp Airlines given any assurance about management level approval of future customer communications in similar circumstances?

(13) What requirements, if any, does the agreement place on Sharp Airlines to consider passengers travelling for medical treatment, including those supported under the Patient Travel Assistance Scheme, when cancelling or rescheduling services?

(14) What assistance is available to King Island residents whose medical appointments or treatment are disrupted by cancelled services, including help with rebooking, extra accommodation or travel costs?

(15) Has the Government assessed the impact of the cancellations and the incorrect messaging on King Island tourism operators, including lost bookings and damage to visitor confidence? What is Tourism Tasmania doing to support affected operators and reassure the market?

69 Homes Tasmania

Asked by: Ms *Forrest*
To: Minister for Housing and Planning
Date: 27 October 2026

Question:

(1) For each registered community housing provider receiving Homes Tasmania funding what is the average annual cost per dwelling of:
  (a) Tenancy management?
  (b) Administration?
  (c) Maintenance?
  (d) Tenant support?

(2) What is the equivalent per-dwelling cost where Homes Tasmania manages public housing directly by:
  (a) Tenancy management?
  (b) Administration?
  (c) Maintenance?
  (d) Tenant support?

(3) (a) Has Homes Tasmania benchmarked these costs against commercial property management fees charged by licensed real estate agents in Tasmania?
  (b) If so, what did it find?
  (c) If not, why not?

(4) (a) How much of the funding paid to community housing providers is for tenancy and property management rather than tenant support services?
  (b) How does Homes Tasmania confirm that support funding is spent on support?

(5) (a) Do any Homes Tasmania funding agreements, program guidelines or registration conditions prevent community housing providers from using licensed real estate agents to manage properties?
  (b) If so, where are those rules set out, and what is the policy reason for them?

(6) Has the Government considered allowing affordable rental dwellings to be managed by licensed agents under enforceable affordability and eligibility conditions, with support services delivered separately where tenants need them?

(7) (a) Which providers administer each of the Government's affordable rental and private rental
  incentive programs?
  (b) Were those roles awarded through open competitive tender;

(c) When do these arrangements expire, and will they be retendered?

(8) (a) What pathways exist for private developers and property owners to put existing or new dwellings into government affordable housing programs; and
(b) How many such proposals have been received, approved and declined since 2022;
(c) What direct lines of communication are available to private developers who want to provide affordable rental accommodation;
(d) When a proposal from a private owner or developer is declined:
(i) Are they given written reasons; and
(ii) Is there any review mechanism?

(9) (a) What criteria does Homes Tasmania use to decide whether a location is suitable for affordable or social housing investment; and
(b) Are those criteria published;
(c) Are the criteria applied consistently to providers and private proponents?

(10) (a) What is the number of applicants seeking housing in each Tasmanian council area?
(b) What is that number as a percentage of each council area's population?
(c) What are the number of applicants requiring one-, two- and three-bedroom dwellings in each area?

(11) (a) For each provider funded since the establishment of Homes Tasmania, how many dwellings have been delivered per $1 million of public funding?
(b) Please provide a breakdown of the number of homes, size (number of bedrooms), location and total cost of dwellings.

(12) What is the average total cost per dwelling, including land, for new builds delivered through community housing providers, compared with dwellings delivered directly by Homes Tasmania or through private partnerships?

(13) How does Homes Tasmania assess value for money when choosing between delivery models?

(14) What proportion of applicants on the Housing Tasmania social housing waiting list need a one-bedroom dwelling, and what proportion of dwellings delivered or under construction since 2022 are one-bedroom?

(15) Has the Government analysed whether some projects would deliver more homes per dollar if private owners built and held the dwellings?

(16) (a) Has the Government considered separating construction, ownership, tenancy management and tenant support into distinct contracts rather than routinely bundling them with a single provider; and
(b) If so, what was the conclusion?

(17) What, if any, mechanisms, such as covenants, title restrictions or contractual terms, would be available to hold affordable rent conditions on privately owned dwellings over the long term?

70 Department of Health's Training Procurement Process

Asked by: Ms *Forrest*
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 27 October 2026

Question:

(1) With regard to the Department of Health's Training Procurement Process, in particular Aggression Management Training Services:

(a) The contract awarded to Maybo Australia on 15/02/2019 with a contract period from 18/02/2019 to 17/02/2022, noting this was a recurrent contract – with a contract price in 2019 of $218,100, presumably annually,

(i) Is this contact still in place; and

(ii) If so, how many times has it been extended?

(b) Treasurer's Instructions PP-6 Procurement Processes - Contract Extensions: Goods and Services Effective Date 16 April 2026 notes:

6.1 Contracts relating to the procurement of goods or services must not be extended without undertaking an appropriate procurement process unless the contract contains a specific extension provision (an option to extend) or an extension is approved in accordance with the requirements set out below.

6.2 Provided the original procurement was not a covered procurement, the Accountable Authority is permitted to approve an extension to a contract outside the original term of the contract for a period of no longer than one year, provided the extension does not include a significant expansion to the scope of the original contract and one of the following circumstances exist:

6.2.1 due to exceptional circumstances, the extension is required to enable a full procurement process to be properly undertaken; or

6.2.2 other exceptional circumstances exist that justify an extension.

6.3 Approval under clause 6.2 must occur prior to the contract being extended and auditable documentation regarding the approval must be maintained.

(i) What steps have been taken to ensure TI PP-6 has been followed with regard to the Maybo Australia contract; and

(ii) If TI PP-6 has not been followed, has a new contract been entered into and on what date?

(c) What procurement methodology and process was undertaken by the Department with regard to Aggression Management Training Services?

(d) How many suppliers were invited to participate in the limited sourcing process; and what was the basis upon which those suppliers were identified?

(e) What process and market assessment were undertaken to determine that the selected solution was the best available;

(i) Which potential suppliers were considered as part of that assessment?

(ii) Why was Threat Protect Training not given the opportunity to demonstrate its methodology, experience and capability, particularly in light of previous engagement with the Department and established experience in delivering specialised healthcare training; and

(f) What formal independent review, complaint or procurement assurance mechanism is available to unsuccessful companies?

71 Environment Impact Statement (EIS) relating to the Leven River Crossing

Asked by: Mr *Gaffney*
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 27 October 2026

Question:

With reference to the North West Transmission Developments, specifically the section crossing the Leven River valley belonging to the Staverton to Hampshire Hills component of the project, known as the Leven River crossing —

(1) In regard to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) relating to the Leven River Crossing:
   (a) When was the survey, or series of surveys and assessments conducted that were later used to inform the EIS;
   (b) What environmental reports, fauna surveys, threatened-species assessments and other evidence have been relied upon in assessing the Leven River crossing;
   (c) Will there be a post-construction assessment of the EIS to assess its accuracy and efficacy, and what form will it take; and
   (d) The Tasmanian Azure Kingfisher (*Ceyx azureus subsp. diemenensis*) is a rare and endangered endemic subspecies only found in Tasmania - with just a few hundred mature specimens left in the wild in the whole of Tasmania:
      (i) How have known Azure Kingfisher sightings and nesting sites along the Leven River crossing area been considered in the environmental assessments and surveys;
      (ii) What assessment has been undertaken of the potential impact of the proposed transmission towers, conductors, construction access, vegetation clearing, machinery, noise and helicopter activity on Azure Kingfishers and other threatened or significant wildlife using this section of the river;
      (iii) How has the potential impact of construction during the Azure Kingfisher breeding and nesting period been specifically assessed and what protection measures have been proposed; and
      (iv) What conditions will be placed on construction and contractor activities to prevent disturbance to known or potential Azure Kingfisher nesting sites and other wildlife habitats?

(2) How will TasNetworks ensure that independent wildlife monitoring will be undertaken before, during and after construction at the Leven River crossing, and will the results be made publicly available?

(3) Before the remaining environmental approvals are granted, how will the Government ensure that the specific environmental concerns relating to the Leven River crossing, including Azure Kingfisher nesting habitats, are fully assessed and addressed?

(4) In relation to the accuracy of the environmental assessment:
   (a) The environmental assessment reportedly concluded that there was no suitable Azure Kingfisher habitat at the Leven River crossing. What evidence supports this conclusion, given the reported sightings and known nesting habitat along the western riverbank; and
   (b) Has the Government independently verified the survey findings against known sightings, nesting records and photographic evidence from the Leven River, and

will this evidence be considered before any further environmental approvals are granted?

(5) In relation to helicopter and other aerial survey activity:
   (a) What assessment has been undertaken of the potential disturbance caused by helicopter flights, drones and other aerial surveys to active nests of threatened birds, including the White-bellied Sea-Eagle and White Goshawk, in the Leven River area; and
   (b) What restrictions will apply during the breeding and nesting period?

(6) In relation to the Leven River Cruises tourism operation:
   How have the environmental and operational impacts on the existing Leven River Cruises passenger pontoon, passenger embarkation and disembarkation areas, and the associated riverbank habitat been assessed, given the proposed transmission line crossing directly above this area?

72 Marinus Link Fibre Optic Cable Capacity

Asked by: Mr *Gaffney*
To: Minister for Energy and Renewables
Date: 27 October 2026

Question:

With reference to the potential market value in the commercial use of spare fibre-optic cable capacity in the Marinus Link interconnector, and to the Doolan v Burnie City Council [2026] TASCAT 134 decision, from which in paragraph 59 the Tribunal observed:

'*The use of excess capacity of the fibre-optic cable and its supporting infrastructure on the site for telecommunications and data connectivity between Victoria and Tasmania unrelated to the transmission of electricity may well fall outside the classification of the use under cl 6.2.2, and constitute a use on the site which is not approved. In respect to the fibre-optic cable through for the shore crossing, such an extended use may also fall outside the exemption.' —*

(1) In regard to a possible extended use of surplus capacity in the fibre-optic cable and supporting infrastructure for telecommunications and data connectivity unrelated to the transmission of electricity:
   (a) Has any possible extended use been formally assessed for planning purposes and if so, what authority assessed it, when was it assessed, and what permit, approval or statutory exemption has been relied upon; and
   (b) If any extended use has not already been assessed for planning purposes, or if its planning status remains unresolved, what further planning approval, determination or exemption does the Government understand will be required before a non-electricity transmission usage can commence?

(2) Following the Tribunal's decision, in considering the steps the Minister or relevant Government Department may have taken to resolve the planning status of the contemplated use of excess capacity of the fibre-optic cable for telecommunications or data connectivity use, unrelated to the transmission of electricity:
   (a) Has the responsible planning authority been asked to confirm in writing whether the use is authorised, exempt from planning approval, or requires a further separate approval;

(b) If such confirmation has been received, what was the conclusion and will the Minister make it public; and

(c) If such a confirmation has not been sought, why not and what precedent is being relied on to support the decision?

(3) Given that the fibre-optic infrastructure will include both capacity required for electricity transmission and a potential extended spare capacity contemplated for telecommunications and data connectivity:

(a) Will the Minister, through Tasmania's shareholder arrangements, seek an immediate temporary pause on installation of the fibre-optic infrastructure until the responsible authority has confirmed in writing that the contemplated non-electricity transmission use is authorised or exempt, or, if separate planning approval is required, until that approval has been granted and taken effect; and

(b) If not, what written advice or risk assessment does the Government rely upon in allowing installation to proceed before that use is authorised or exempt, including the risk that any required planning approval may be refused or may not ultimately take effect?

(4) Marinus Link Pty Ltd has publicly stated that commercial use of the spare fibre capacity must be '*ring-fenced*' and not cross-subsidised by the electricity business. It has also stated that part of the fibre capacity is required for electricity control and protection, while substantial spare capacity is available for prospective commercial use, including telecommunications:

(a) What cost-allocation methodology applies to the shared fibre-optic infrastructure;

(b) What additional costs, if any, have been incurred or committed because the project includes spare capacity capable of commercial telecommunications use; and

(c) Has that cost-allocation methodology been independently reviewed to ensure comparable commercial market rates have been factored in to ensure Tasmanian electricity consumers do not subsidise prospective commercial telecommunications activities?

73 MyState Bank Arena Lease

Asked by: Ms *Thomas*
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 27 October 2026

Question:

The Government's response to Question on Notice No. 43 of 2026 in relation to the MyState Bank Arena lease, answered on 20 August 2026, disclosed that:

- the lease to LK Stadiums (Tas) Pty Ltd commenced in November 2021 and was awarded without an open competitive process or market testing;
- although the lease provides for base rent of $200,000 per annum, adjusted for CPI, the State's concurrent obligation to pay an annual CPI-adjusted Hiring Fee Contribution of up to $175,000 results in a net rental return to the Crown of less than $30,000 per year;
- no performance or percentage rent has been paid since the lease commenced;
- the Crown received base rent totalling $1,029,807 between 2021-22 and 2025-26;
- the Government also pays LK Stadiums an annual Hiring Fee Contribution of $175,000, indexed annually;

- between 2021-22 and 2025-26, the Crown received $1,029,807 in rent but paid or was estimated to pay $901,103 in Hiring Fee Contributions, leaving a net return of approximately $128,704 before accounting for any other Crown costs; and
- the Government's comparison for 2025-26 used full-year rent of $234,891 but only six months of Hiring Fee Contributions, totalling $102,769.

In light of these disclosures:

(1) What is the "Agreed Percentage" of Gross Annual Turnover used to calculate percentage rent under clause 4.3 of the lease?
(2) For each accounting period since the lease commenced, what were the amounts recorded for:
    (i) Gross Annual Turnover;
    (ii) Outgoings;
    (iii) Accumulated Operating Losses;
    (iv) the Agreed Percentage of Gross Annual Turnover; and
    (v) Percentage Rent payable?
(3) Has the Crown independently audited or otherwise verified the turnover, outgoings and losses reported by LK Stadiums for each year of the lease? If so, who undertook that verification and what were the findings?
(4) Did the Valuer-General provide advice about the market rental value, base rent, percentage-rent formula and Hiring Fee Contribution?
(5) What independent assessment, if any, was undertaken of the total commercial value of the lease, including naming rights, sponsorship, advertising, food and beverage sales, ticketing, corporate hospitality, car parking and other venue revenue?
(6) Is the Hiring Fee Contribution:
    (i) automatically paid up to the maximum amount each year; or
    (ii) limited to reimbursement of the actual discounts provided to eligible community organisations?
(7) What was the full amount of the Hiring Fee Contribution paid in 2025-26, and will the Government provide a corrected comparison using full-year figures for both the rent received and the Hiring Fee Contribution paid?
(8) For each financial year since the lease commenced, what was the Crown's net financial position after deducting the Hiring Fee Contribution and all Crown-funded outgoings, maintenance, capital works, and other costs from the rent received?
(9) Has LK Stadiums now provided the detailed community-booking information expected in late August 2026?
(10) What does the detailed community-booking information reveal, including:
    (i) how many organisations were provided with subsidised access;
    (ii) how many discrete venue hires with subsidised access were provided;
    (iii) what was the total value of discounts provided;
    (iv) how many not-for-profit organisations paid full commercial rates to hire the venue; and
    (v) how many not-for-profit organisations did not proceed with hiring the venue because they were required to pay commercial rates?

(11) How does the Crown verify that the Hiring Fee Contribution is used to subsidise eligible community access, and what proportion of the contribution was used for that purpose in each year?

(12) Given that the lease was not market-tested and no percentage rent has been paid, will the Government commission and publish an independent value-for-money review before renewing, extending or materially varying the lease and, if so, when?

(13) If not, why not?

74 Victims of Crime Assistance

Asked by: Ms *Thomas*
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 27 October 2026

Question:

The Department of Justice Annual Report 2023–24 shows that the number of applications for Victims of Crime Assistance increased from 375 in 2021–22, to 435 in 2022–23 and 509 in 2023–24, while the number of awards made, including interim awards, increased from 333 to 350 and 358 respectively.

Given the Department of Justice currently advises applicants to allow at least 12 months for an application to be processed, noting that timeframes may depend on the availability of police files, medical reports and other information, and the outcome of court proceedings, can the Government advise:

(1) What are the current average and median processing times for Victims of Crime Assistance applications, measured from receipt of an application to determination?

(2) How do the current average and median processing times compare with those in each of the previous five financial years?

(3) How many applications are currently awaiting determination and, of those, how many have been outstanding for:

(i) more than six months; and

(ii) more than 12 months?

(4) What are the principal reasons for the current processing timeframes, and have staffing or resourcing constraints within the Victims Assistance Unit contributed to those timeframes?

(5) What measures have been implemented to reduce processing times or the number of outstanding applications, and what impact have those measures had to date?

(6) Does the Government have a target or expected timeframe for reducing current processing times, and if so, what is that target or timeframe?

75 Public Works

Asked by: Mr *Hiscutt*
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 28 October 2026

Question:

(1) In relation to *public works* that were above the *relevant monetary threshold*, as defined by the Public Works Committee Act 1914 that were considered by the Public Works Committee between 1 July 2021 and 30 June 2026 and that have been substantially completed, can the Government provide, for each project:
   (a) The estimated cost of completing the work at the time it was submitted
   (b) The final cost of the project upon substantial completion; and
   (c) The dollar and percentage variation between the estimated cost and the final cost?

(2) In relation to *public works* that
   (a) were below the *relevant monetary threshold*, as defined by the Public Works Committee Act 1914 at estimation, but subsequently their final cost rose above the *relevant monetary threshold* and;
   (b) commenced between 1 July 2021 and 30 June 2026; and
   (c) that have been substantially completed,

   Can the Government provide, for each project:
      (a) The original estimated cost of completing the work;
      (b) The relevant monetary threshold applicable to the project at the time;
      (c) The final cost of the project upon substantial completion;
      (d) The dollar and percentage increase between the original estimate and the final cost;
      (e) The principal reasons for the increase in cost; and
      (f) Whether, at any stage before completion, the estimated cost of completing the work increased to an amount above the relevant monetary threshold and, if so, whether the project was subsequently referred to the Public Works Committee.

76 Artificial Intelligence (AI) Data Centres

Asked by: Ms *Armitage*
To: Minister for Energy and Renewables
Date: 28 October 2026

Question:

(1) What are the approved or proposed capacities (in megawatts of critical IT load or total power demand, and physical footprint) of the Firmus AI data centres at St Leonards, Bell Bay/Long Reach and Wesley Vale, and of any other AI or data centre proposals currently under consideration in the state?

(2) Is there a direct relationship between the physical size/computing capacity of an AI data centre and the continuous power it requires to operate? If so, what is the typical power intensity for facilities of the scale being developed in Tasmania, and how does this compare with typical conventional/existing industrial/commercial loads?

(3) What is the present voltage and load-carrying capacity of the distribution and transmission infrastructure (including poles and lines) serving the areas around the approved and proposed AI data centre sites?

(4) By how much will those capacities need to increase to service the full demand of these facilities and will this require the construction or upgrade of taller or higher-voltage poles in or near residential streets?

(5) Who is responsible for the cost of any required upgrades to power poles, lines, substations or other network infrastructure needed to connect and supply these AI data centres?

(6) Are large-load users such as data centres required to pay one-hundred percent of connection costs upfront?

(7) Will any portion of these costs ultimately be borne by other electricity consumers or taxpayers, and what transparency and accountability mechanisms apply?

(8) What assessment has been, or will be, undertaken of any health implication for residents living near or under new or upgraded power poles required to service these AI data centres? This includes exposure to electric and magnetic fields, as well as any other relevant factors.

(9) What evidence exists of the long-term employment outcomes of these AI data centres for Tasmanians? Specifically:

(a) How many full-time equivalent construction jobs are expected, and over what period of time?

(b) How many ongoing operational jobs (direct and indirect) are projected once these facilities are running at full capacity?

77 Anatomical Pathology Test Reporting

Asked by: Ms *Thomas*
To: Leader for the Government
Date: 28 October 2026

Question:

During Budget Estimates in June 2026, the Government advised that the backlog of anatomical pathology reports at the Royal Hobart Hospital had reduced from 1,787 outstanding cases identified in November 2025 to fewer than 300. While this improvement is welcome, concerns remain about reporting delays, increasing demand and the sustainability of the pathology workforce. Given these concerns, and the impending cessation of TasTAFE's Certificate IV and Diploma in Laboratory Technology courses in December 2026, I ask the Government:

(1) As at the most recent available reporting date:

(i) How many anatomical pathology reports remain outstanding at each of the Royal Hobart Hospital, Launceston General Hospital and Hospitals North West?

(ii) Of these, how many have exceeded the applicable reporting timeframe or clinical benchmark?

(iii) How many outstanding reports fall within each of the urgent (Category 1), semi-urgent (Category 2) and non-urgent (Category 3) classifications, or their equivalents?

(iv) How many outstanding reports have been awaiting completion for more than 7, 14, 28, 56 and 84 days?

(2) What are the current average, median and longest turnaround times for anatomical pathology reports at each of the Royal Hobart Hospital, Launceston General Hospital and Hospitals North West, broken down by urgency category?

(3) What percentage of reports are being completed within the applicable Department of Health reporting targets?

(4) What percentage of reports are being completed within the Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia's recommended benchmarks of 80 per cent within five working days, 90 per cent within ten working days and 98 per cent within fifteen working days?

(5) How has the number of outstanding anatomical pathology reports changed each month since June 2026 at each of the three hospital services?

(6) What specific measures have been implemented to reduce anatomical pathology reporting backlogs and improve turnaround times?

(7) What further actions are planned, and within what timeframe does the Government expect all anatomical pathology services to consistently meet applicable reporting benchmarks?

(8) What arrangements are in place to ensure the Minister for Health and Secretary of the Department of Health are regularly informed of significant reporting backlogs, delays and associated patient safety risks across all three hospital regions?

(9) In correspondence to me dated 12 March 2026, the Minister for Health advised that additional funding had been allocated for two anatomical pathologists, one medical scientist and one pathology technician at the Royal Hobart Hospital.

(i) How many of these four positions have now been filled?

(ii) For any positions remaining vacant, how long have they been vacant and what recruitment strategies are being undertaken?

(iii) What is the current established, occupied and vacant full-time equivalent staffing for anatomical pathologists, medical scientists, laboratory technicians and other relevant laboratory personnel at the Royal Hobart Hospital and Launceston General Hospital?

(iv) How many laboratory technician positions across Tasmania's public hospital system have been advertised in the past 12 months, and how many remain unfilled?

(10) Noting that TasTAFE's Certificate IV and Diploma in Laboratory Technology courses are due to cease in December 2026, has the Department of Health undertaken a formal assessment of the impact this decision will have on the recruitment, training and retention of laboratory technicians within Tasmania's public hospital system?

(i) if so, what were the findings of that assessment?

(ii) if not, why not?

(11) In correspondence to me dated 12 March 2026, the Minister for Health acknowledged that the cessation of TasTAFE's Laboratory Technology courses would likely affect recruitment at the Royal Hobart Hospital, and advised that this was being mitigated through the recruitment of Bachelor of Laboratory Science graduates into technician positions. Given the Minister's response:

(i) Does the Government intend to rely on university-qualified graduates to fill laboratory technician positions that have traditionally been accessible to Certificate IV or Diploma-qualified workers?

(ii) If so, what assessment has been undertaken of the availability of suitably qualified university graduates willing to undertake these positions?

(iii) What are the salary and employment cost implications of employing university-qualified graduates in these positions compared with vocationally qualified laboratory technicians?

(iv) Does the Government consider it appropriate and sustainable to rely on university graduates to fill positions for which vocational qualifications have previously been sufficient?

(12) Following the cessation of TasTAFE's Laboratory Technology courses:

(i) What specific training pathways will be available for Tasmanians seeking to enter the public hospital system in entry-level laboratory technician positions?

(ii) Is the Minister aware which registered training organisations will provide the necessary Certificate IV and Diploma qualifications, and whether these courses will be available to Tasmanian students without requiring interstate travel?

(iii) Is the Minister aware of any arrangements established to provide the practical laboratory training, supervision and workplace experience required to develop competent laboratory technicians for public hospital settings?

(iv) Is the Minister aware of whether any consultation has occurred between the Department of Health, TasTAFE, Skills Tasmania, relevant training providers and public hospital pathology services regarding the cessation of these courses and the development of replacement training pathways?

(13) Has the Minister for Health or Department of Health requested that the Government reconsider its decision to cease delivery of the courses?

(14) Given the increasing demand for anatomical pathology services, ongoing recruitment challenges and the impending loss of Tasmania's local vocational training pathway, has the Department of Health developed a workforce plan identifying the projected number of anatomical pathologists, medical scientists and laboratory technicians required across Tasmania's public hospital system over the next five years?

(15) How does the Government intend to ensure that the cessation of TasTAFE's Laboratory Technology courses does not further constrain laboratory workforce capacity, increase reporting delays or compromise timely diagnosis and treatment for Tasmanian patients?

Summary of Bills

Read First Time

No. 35 of 2025	Partition Amendment Bill *(pro forma)*
No. 49 of 2025	Public Accounts Committee Amendment Bill
No. 55 of 2025	Tasmanian Community Fund Amendment Bill
No. 16	Monetary Penalties Enforcement Amendment Bill
No. 28	Sentencing Amendment (Good Character) Bill
No. 44	Government Business Governance Reforms Bill

Second Reading Adjourned

No. 66 of 2025	Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill
No.30	Firearms Amendment (Strengthening Firearms Security) Bill

Second Reading Negatived

No. 57 of 2025	Budget Accountability and Oversight Committee Bill

Awaiting Third Reading

No. 27	Teacher Registration Bill

Read Third Time and Transmitted to the House of Assembly

No. 24	Statutory Holidays Amendment (Central Coast Municipality) Bill

Returned to the House of Assembly with Amendments

No. 39 of 2025	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill (No. 2)
No. 12	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 15	Housing Land Supply (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 22	Land Use Planning and Approvals (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill

Third Reading Negatived

No. 13	Short Stay Levy 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. 50 of 2025	Police Offences Amendment Bill	Act No. 17 of 2026
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. 53 of 2025	Mt Lyell Acid Drainage Reduction (Repeal) Bill	Act No. 12 of 2026
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. 59 of 2025	Residential Tenancy Amendment (Safety Modifications) Bill	Act No. 16 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. 65 of 2025	Charities and Associations Law (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill	Act No. 20 of 2026
No. 69 of 2025	Integrity Commission Amendment (Mandatory Notifications) Bill	Act No. 21 of 2026
No. 1	Building Amendment Bill	Act No. 6 of 2026
No. 2	Residential Parks Bill	Act No. 13 of 2026
No. 3	Grange Resources (Tasmania) Pty Ltd (Alternative Application Period) Bill	Act No. 3 of 2026
No. 5	Police Offences Amendment (Increased Penalties for Damage to Tasmanian War Memorials) Bill	Act No. 14 of 2026
No. 6	Occupational Licensing Amendment Bill	Act No. 15 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	Act No. 10 of 2026
No. 9	Help to Buy (Commonwealth Powers) Bill	Act No. 4 of 2026
No. 10	Local Government Amendment (Targeted Reform) Bill	Act No. 11 of 2026
No. 11	Petroleum Reporting (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill	Act No. 1 of 2026
No. 14	Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill	Act No. 18 of 2026
No. 18	Appropriation Bill (No. 1)	Act No. 7 of 2026
No. 19	Appropriation Bill (No. 2)	Act No. 8 of 2026
No. 20	First Home Owner Grant Amendment Bill	Act No. 9 of 2026
No. 21	Taxation and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill	Act No. 19 of 2026
No. 29	Sentencing Amendment (Publication of Criminal Activity) Bill	

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, Gender-based Violence 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*

- Recent developments relating to government policy on poker machine harm minimisation: Ms *Webb* (substitute member with leave from Government Administration B)
- Proposed Poker Machine Harm Minimisation Policies – Short Inquiry Process (SIP)

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

- University of Tasmania Annual Report 2025 – Short Inquiry Process (SIP)

Select Committees

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

Government Business Scrutiny Committee A: Ms *Forrest*, Ms *Glade-Wright*, Ms *Lovell*, Ms *O'Connor* and Ms *Thomas*

Government Business Scrutiny Committee B: Ms *Armitage*, Mr *Edmunds*, Mr *Gaffney*, Mr *Hiscutt* and Ms *Webb*

[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 [*Tuesdays only*] Motions and Orders of the Day [*Government Business takes precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays*]
1.00 pm	Break
2.30 pm	Question Time
3.00 pm	Resumption of Motions and Orders of the Day
4.00 pm	Break [*Tuesdays and Wednesdays only*]
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