



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 - 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

NOTICES OF MOTION AND ORDERS OF THE DAY

No. 47

Thursday 3 September 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 Nationally Significant 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 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.

12 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.

13 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.

14 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.

15 **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.

16 **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.

17 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

18 Closure of Hobart Hospitality Businesses

Given by: Mr *Edmunds*

Date: 13 August 2026

To be moved:

That the Council:

- (1) Notes that seven well-known Hobart hospitality venues - Cargo Bar, Jack Greene, Post Street Social, Observatory Bar, Republic Bar, Franklin Wharf Restaurant and Bar and Franklin Wharf Function Centre - closed after the Pub Banc Group entered voluntary administration;

- (2) Further notes that more than 80 Tasmanian workers were stood down as a result;
- (3) Recognises the enormous social, cultural and economic benefits that come from Tasmania's hospitality sector and acknowledges the significant pressure facing the sector, including rising operational costs and weaker discretionary spending;
- (4) Expresses its support for the workers, contractors, suppliers and small businesses affected by the collapse; and notes the impact this will have on younger Tasmanians in particular;
- (5) Further notes that these closures come at a time when Tasmanian businesses and workers across the state are already facing significant economic uncertainty and job losses, including from a significant hospitality supplier in Boag's Brewery;
- (6) Notes that the hospitality industry has welcomed a growing focus on practical measures to support Tasmania's hospitality industry, saying governments at every level have a role to play in helping businesses through one of the toughest trading environments in recent memory.
- (7) Calls on the Rockliff Government to urgently outline what actual action it is taking to support affected workers, help viable venues reopen and address the pressures facing Tasmania's hospitality sector; and
- (8) Acknowledges that Tasmanian businesses and workers are paying the price for a weak economy, rising costs and need a government with a plan to grow the economy and protect jobs.

19 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

20 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

Orders of the Day

General Business

1 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 Forrest

Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 21 May 2026

Status: Report to be considered and noted

- 2 **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
- 3 **[Statutory Holidays Amendment \(Central Coast Municipality\) Bill 2026 \(24 of 2026\)](#)**
Mover: Mr Hiscutt
Date: Bill as amended reported by Committee of the Whole on 1 September 2026
Status: Consideration of Bill as amended in Committee of the Whole Council
- 4 **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
- 5 **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

Orders of the Day

Government Business

- 1 **[Taxation and Related Legislation \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill 2026 \(21 of 2026\)](#)**
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Reported without amendment by the Committee of the Whole Council on 2 September 2026
Status: Awaiting Third reading
- 2 **[Short Stay Levy Bill 2026 \(13 of 2026\)](#)**
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Second reading debate adjourned on 2 September 2026 (Ms Webb)
Spoken: Ms Rattray, Ms Armitage, Mr Gaffney, Ms Thomas, Mr Hiscutt, Ms Glade-Wright, Mr Edmunds, Ms Forrest, Ms Webb
- 3 **[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
- 4 **[Land Use Planning and Approvals \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill 2026 \(22 of 2026\)](#)**
Mover: Ms Rattray
Date: Read a First time on 11 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

5 [Integrity Commission Amendment \(Mandatory Notifications\) Bill 2025 \(69 of 2025\)](#)

Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

6 [Housing Land Supply \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill 2026 \(15 of 2026\)](#)

Mover: Mr *Vincent*
Date: Read a First time on 18 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

7 [Tasmanian Community Fund Amendment Bill 2025 \(55 of 2025\)](#)

Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Read a First time on 18 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

8 [Monetary Penalties Enforcement Amendment Bill 2026 \(16 of 2026\)](#)

Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Read a First time on 20 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

9 [Public Accounts Committee Amendment Bill 2025 \(49 of 2025\)](#)

Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Read a First time on 23 September 2025
Status: Awaiting Second reading

10 [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 *Ratray*, Mr *Hiscutt*, Ms *Forrest*, Mr *Edmunds*

Tuesday 8 September 2026

Orders of the Day

Government Business

11 [Sentencing Amendment \(Publication of Criminal Activity\) Bill 2026 \(29 of 2026\)](#)

Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Read a First time on 1 September 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

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

12 **Partition Amendment Bill 2025 (Bill No. 35)**

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

Awaiting Government Response

Questions on Notice

59 Human Resources Transformation Project

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 11 August 2026

Question:

- (1) With regard to the Human Resources Transformation Project (H RTP), that is the re-scoped Human Resources Information System (HRIS) transferred from the Department of Health to the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC):
 - (a) What is the total number of contracts awarded in connection with the H RTP to date?
 - (b) What is the total value of contracts awarded in connection with the H RTP to date?
 - (c) What is the total pricing distribution of contracts awarded in connection with the H RTP to date? and
 - (d) Please provide a full schedule of these contracts including value, award date, contract period, and number of bids received.
- (2) Of the contracts confirmed:
 - (a) how many were priced between \$50,000 and \$99,000 under open-market quoting threshold under the Treasurer's Instructions; and
 - (b) how many were priced between \$99,000 and \$99,999?
- (3) What procurement method (direct sourcing, panel arrangement, labour hire, single-invite quote, or open tender) was used for each of the contracts awarded to date?
- (4) Where multiple sub-threshold contracts have been awarded to the same vendor within a short period, does the Premier accept this could constitute contract splitting in substance even where each individual contract complies with the letter of the threshold?
- (5) Where multiple sub-threshold contracts have been awarded to the same vendor within a short period, does the Treasurer accept this could constitute contract splitting in substance even where each individual contract complies with the letter of the threshold?
- (6) What internal control exists within DPAC to detect and prevent the risk of contract splitting?
- (7) What internal control exists within Treasury to detect and prevent the risk of contract splitting?
- (8) Please confirm:
 - (a) the actual number of bids or quotes received for each of the contracts; and
 - (b) In cases where only one bid or quote was received - in each case, what steps were taken to test market pricing given the absence of competitive tension?
- (9) How many contracts have been awarded above the \$100,000 threshold; and
 - (a) How many of these contracts have been awarded without open-market tender;
 - (b) What was the value of each of these contracts;
 - (c) For each of these contracts, what specific exemption under the Treasurer's Instructions was relied upon; and
 - (d) Was that exemption approved by the appropriate delegate?

- (10) What verification does DPAC undertake of a supplier's claimed Tasmanian presence, including local employment, before applying Buy Local Policy weighting, and was that verification applied to all contracts?
- (11) Were four direct-sourced contracts totalling approximately \$920,000 executed on 24 December 2025; and
 - (a) if so, what was the operational reason for awarding contracts on that date specifically; and
 - (b) were normal approval and delegation processes followed in full?

60 Firmus AI Factory Deployments in Tasmania

Asked by: Mr Gaffney

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 11 August 2026

Question:

With reference to the Firmus AI Factory deployments in Tasmania that have led to a great deal of community discussion and speculation, and seeking objective information regarding the Government's understanding of the current state of play —

- 1) Noting the Minister for Business, Industry and Resources' declarations in a 3 November 2025 media release entitled 'AI Island: Driving economic growth for Tasmania's future', and his description in that media release of an '*AI investment mandate*' together with the role of the Tasmanian Development Board in the new Economic Diversification and Investment Strategy, which is currently out for public consultation:
 - (a) The media release stated that the Tasmanian Development Board will consider how it can use its loan book to back strategic investments that help local businesses adopt AI and digital tools to improve productivity and competitiveness. Does its '*loan book*' include strategic investment to support the development of various Firmus projects and other potential AI infrastructure projects, and if so by how much? and
 - (b) Page 25 of the new strategy paper includes the statement: '*The Advanced Technology Strategy is exploring cluster-based approaches to support the growth of emerging domains of capability*'. Following this are six illustrative areas of strength which includes: '*Energy-intensive digital infrastructure, including AI computing*'. As a result of these statements:
 - (i) What modelling has been completed to support the inclusion of that area of strength in terms of the limits posed by available power?
 - (ii) What levels of surplus power generation are available in Tasmania for energy-intensive digital infrastructure projects, both now and what is planned to come online over the next five years? and
 - (iii) Is there sufficient generation capacity in Tasmania to ensure that existing domestic and industrial users of power will not be disadvantaged by the development of energy-intensive digital infrastructure projects and if not, will there be regulation to ensure existing consumers will not be disadvantaged by such developments?
- 2) When the Premier appeared before Legislative Council Estimates Committee B on 2 June 2026, he was asked how the government assesses and determines what

businesses or industries receive intervention or financial support and what is the threshold of the government stepping in to assist. In his response the Premier spoke of a process involving the Tasmanian Development Board, threshold issues where it relates to a major industrial that consumes a lot of power that may well have impact on other GBEs, such as TasNetworks, and the role of major industrial steering committee of Cabinet.

- (a) Where do the current Firmus AI factory projects sit within those parameters?
 - (b) With an anticipated stable power demand of 440MW from the current and proposed Firmus sites that it states will need 1,700MW of reserve capacity from renewables to ensure a continuity of supply, does Hydro Tasmania currently have the capacity to meet the 440MW base load of stable power demand?
 - (c) The ACEN Australia North East Wind Project (NEWP) is being seen as a key to the St Leonards and Longreach AI factories. Given that Hydro Tasmania currently has a 25% interest in the Cape Portland wind farm, is the government (through Hydro Tasmania) seeking an equity stake in the NEWP to support the establishment of the Firmus business case?
 - (d) Firmus has a declared commitment to support the development of new renewable energy projects to the tune of 2 – 2.5 times of that which it consumes. Does the government have an understanding of how it will be achieved, by when, and what guarantees are in place to deliver it?
 - (e) The time it will take to build and commission new renewables means long lead times to bring online the Longreach and Wesley Vales AI factories. The closure of Liberty Bell Bay releases 125MW back to the market and with Rio Tinto Bell Bay's 335MW up for negotiation later this year, will Firmus' ability to pay more for power than major industrials guarantee its priority supply, and is there a risk that higher power costs will affect the viability of Rio Tinto Bell Bay with its 550 direct employees and potentially affect a further 1,000 linked positions in indirect and supply chain businesses? and
 - (f) ABEL Energy is another potential large-scale user of power for its methanol plant with its CEO, who is quoted on page 97 of the Joint Select Committee on Energy Matters interim report tabled on 21 May 2026, as stating that it needed 300MW. Has that requirement been factored in to Hydro Tasmania's modelling of renewable power generation, and where will it sit in terms of its industrial power supply balancing and priorities?
- 3) Given the increasing levels of community concern with AI factory developments, the pressure being placed on local Councils and the implications of the Economic Diversification and Investment Strategy which raises the issue of accelerated planning processes for industrial developments:
- (a) Where do the AI factories and data centres fit within the Tasmanian Planning Scheme?
 - (b) Has the government considered, or is seeking to, give energy priority to Firmus over Rio Tinto to help support both the ACEN Australia wind farm projects and Marinus Link, which in turn would help to support the development of further renewables and AI factories in Tasmania – in other words who or what is in control of what comes first: an available large surplus of power seeking an end user or an AI factory or other large scale consumer seeking power that drives the development of new generation capacity?

- (c) With the anticipated power requirements and water usage will linked projects such as the Firmus AI Factories be subject to examination as a Major Project or Project of State Significance (POSS)? and
 - (d) Does the Government have any modelling or an understanding of what Tasmania's overall capacity for AI factories and data centres might be in terms of power demand, number, size, location and future expansion?
- 4) Firmus is in an obvious concurrent establishment and expansion phase as a private equity partnership, and one that is expected to be floated in the near future on the ASX as an Initial Public Offering (IPO) which is anticipated to be in the order of \$15.5 billion, with multiple billions of dollars of investment and debt already committed to the company which suggests a degree of investor confidence. As a contrast there are a number of professional money managers/investors who are apparently refusing to invest in Firmus because of either the structure of the business or a lack of information at this stage:
- (a) What formal due diligence has the government done on Firmus Technologies which is positioning itself to become Tasmania's largest energy customer?
 - (b) There is apparently no escrow period for pre-IPO shareholders for a Firmus Technologies IPO which is a standard 12-24 month moratorium that prevents early investors from engaging in what is colloquially known as a 'pump and dump' scheme. Does the Government have any concerns with such an anomaly and does it have any assurances from Firmus in this matter?
 - (c) With the formal prospectus rollout delayed until its full end-of-year accounts have been finalised and some other matters have been dealt with and given the potential implications on the power generation infrastructure and supply in Tasmania, has the government seen a copy of the Firmus Technologies draft prospectus, and if not why not? And
 - (d) Given that there are a number of international AI companies looking to expand their reach and operations, and in terms of the Government's perspective, does Firmus' position as an early adopter or beta tester for AI factories in Tasmania give it an exclusive licence for future expansion of its operations in Tasmania?

63 Government Response to Questions on Arts Funding

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 18 August 2026

Question:

With regard to responses provided by the Leader for the Government on 11 August 2026 responding to questions related to the 2026/27 State budget and funding for the Arts:

- (1) Given the answer suggests the \$10 million is incorporated into (not additional to as stated previously) the existing Arts Industry Development and Screen Industry Development lines, does the Minister for the Arts accept that the \$10 million cannot properly be described as new or additional funding to the sector or provide a clear explanation as to how it is additional funding?
- (2) Can the Government provide the dollar value attributed to:
 - (a) the conclusion of election commitments; and
 - (b) efficiency measures, for each forward estimate year, so that the net effect on the arts budget line can be reconciled against the stated \$10 million commitment?

- (3) With those two offsetting factors identified, can the Government confirm the net change (increase or decrease) in real terms to the Arts Industry Development line for each of 2026-27 through 2029-30?
- (4) Has any funding request for the Tasmanian Strategic Touring Fund been received or is one anticipated for 2026-27, and if so, what is the expected timing of a decision?
- (5) Is it the Government's intention that the Fund continue in some form beyond 2026-27, or has a decision been made to discontinue it?
- (6) What savings target was assumed in the 2026-27 budget for the Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancy (TNVR) process in constructing the Arts Tasmania administrative expenses line for 2026-27?
- (7) If the TNVR process does not deliver savings at or near that assumed level, what is the contingency and will the shortfall be met from within the existing arts budget, additional government funding, or through a reduction in program funding?
- (8) Can the Government confirm whether "stable" funding in 2026-27 means the same number of organisations will be funded as in 2025-26, or whether the number of organisations funded may fall while the total dollar amount remains similar?
- (9) Will any currently four-year-funded organisation receive a reduced allocation in 2026-27 relative to 2025-26?
- (10) Once the needs identified through the Cultural and Creative Industries Strategy and the Tasmanian Live Performance Exchange sector report are known, will new funding be allocated to address them, or will any resulting initiatives be funded from within existing Arts Tasmania and Screen Tasmania allocations?
- (11) What is the expected timeframe for receipt of the Tasmanian Live Performance Exchange sector report, and when does the Government expect to respond to its recommendations?
- (12) During Budget Estimates scrutiny, the Director, Creative Tasmania provided the Committee with a specific year-by-year breakdown of the additional \$10 million, including \$0 to Arts in 2026-27 and \$1 million to Arts in 2027-28. The response provided by the Leader stated that no position has been determined for 2027-28, and that a position on 2028-29 to 2029-30 has also not been determined.
 - (a) Can the Government explain why the specific breakdown given by the Director, Creative Tasmania differs from the Leaders response?
 - (b) Was the breakdown given in evidence to Estimates accurate at the time it was given? If so, what has changed since Estimates to make the allocation now "undetermined"?
- (13) The Leader's response stated forward estimates reductions are due to efficiencies, not a decrease in support to the sector, while also stated 2029-30 becomes the new ongoing baseline.
 - (a) Can the Government provide the dollar breakdown of the forward estimates reduction in the Arts Tasmania appropriation between;
 - (i) administrative/efficiency savings; and
 - (ii) any reduction in funding passed through to the sector, for each year 2026-27 to 2029-30?
 - (b) If the reduction is intended to be entirely absorbed through administrative efficiencies with no reduction in sector support, can the Government confirm the dollar value of efficiencies required to achieve this, and identify the specific measures (beyond TNVR) that will deliver savings of that scale?

- (c) Does the Government accept that if efficiency savings of the scale implied are not achieved, sector funding will necessarily be affected in order to meet the reduced forward estimate?

65 Theft of Metal Infrastructure from TasWater Sites

Asked by: Ms Webb

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 20 August 2026

Question:

Regarding the reported spate of recent thefts of metal infrastructure from TasWater sites, can the Government:

- (1) Detail the extent of TasWater metal infrastructure which has been stolen, including:
 - (a) The nature of each asset stolen;
 - (b) Estimated replacement costs for each stolen and or damaged asset item;
 - (c) Estimated time for TasWater crews to repair and replace damaged and stolen assets?
- (2) Detail whether similar targeting of other publicly-owned or placed on public sites metal or aluminium infrastructure, for example sporting facilities, has been identified, and if so :
 - (a) The nature of such asset thefts;
 - (b) Estimated costs to those respective organisations suffering such thefts?
- (3) Please provide an update as to what the government is doing to track and respond to this apparent pattern of thefts targeting metal and aluminium assets?
- (4) Has the establishment of a specific Tasmania Police taskforce to address this emerging pattern of metal infrastructure theft been considered, and if so:
 - (a) When was that established; and
 - (b) What is its scope?

66 Procurement for the Department of Health's Bluegum Digital Health Transformation

Asked by: Ms Thomas

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 1 September 2026

Question:

Further to the Government's 11 August 2026 responses to my Questions on Notice regarding procurement for the Department of Health's Bluegum Digital Health Transformation:

- (1) Did the Department of Health have an overarching procurement strategy or plan for the engagement of contractors and labour-hire personnel under Bluegum?
 - (a) If yes, who approved it and will the Government table it?
 - (b) If no, why was a project involving more than \$61 million in contracted labour-hire expenditure undertaken without such a plan or strategy?
- (2) What roles within the Departments of Health and Treasury were responsible for monitoring the cumulative number and value of Bluegum contracts and what internal controls existed to identify and prevent the risk of contract splitting where multiple

- contracts below the tender threshold were awarded to the same provider (ie. awarding more than one contract to the same contractor for the same or overlapping time periods and/or more than one contract to the same contractor to deliver separate but related outputs, resulting in individual contract values coming in below \$100,000)?
- (3) The Government's answers identified one provider as receiving 86 separate contracts worth more than \$6.9 million.
 - (a) Why was this substantial body of work not aggregated and subjected to an open competitive tender process?
 - (b) Was an open tender ever considered and, if so, why was it not pursued?
 - (c) Does the Government accept that repeatedly awarding sub-threshold contracts to the same provider may create a risk of contract splitting in substance, even where individual contracts comply with the applicable procurement threshold?
 - (4) Of the 692 Bluegum contracts valued below \$100,000:
 - (a) how many were valued between \$90,000 and \$99,999;
 - (b) how many contractors were provided concurrent contracts (multiple contracts for the same time period) and why was this allowed;
 - (c) how many involved extensions, renewals or subsequent engagements with the same provider for substantially the same or related work;
 - (d) how many contracts were renewed within one month following expiry of the previous contract; and
 - (e) in determining the appropriate procurement method, was the cumulative or reasonably anticipated value of those related engagements taken into account?
 - (5) For each Bluegum contract where competitive quotations were required:
 - (a) how many quotations or bids were actually received; and
 - (b) where only one quotation or bid was received, what steps were taken to test market pricing and demonstrate value for money in the absence of competitive tension?
 - (6) For any Bluegum procurement where the ordinarily applicable competitive procurement requirements were not followed:
 - (a) what exemption, exception or other provision of the Treasurer's Instructions or procurement framework was relied upon;
 - (b) how many contracts were awarded under each exemption or provision and what was their combined value; and
 - (c) was each use approved by the appropriate delegate?
 - (7) Has the Department sought advice from Treasury, internal audit, a probity adviser or any other independent source about whether the pattern of repeated sub-\$100,000 Bluegum contracts complied with both the requirements and intent of the Government's procurement framework?
 - (a) If so, what advice was received and will it be tabled?
 - (b) If not, why not?
 - (8) In relation to the procurement approach adopted for the Bluegum Digital Health Transformation:
 - (a) When did the Secretary of the Department of Health first become aware of the number and cumulative value of contracts being awarded below the \$100,000 open tender threshold, and is the Secretary satisfied the approach complied with the Government's procurement framework and represented value for money?

- (b) When did the Secretary of the Department of Treasury and Finance first become aware of the number and cumulative value of Bluegum contracts being awarded below the \$100,000 threshold, and is the Secretary satisfied the approach was consistent with the requirements and intent of the Government's procurement framework?
 - (c) When did the Treasurer first become aware of the number and cumulative value of Bluegum contracts being awarded below the \$100,000 threshold, and is the Treasurer satisfied the procurement approach complied with the Treasurer's Instructions, including their intent?
 - (d) When did the Minister for Health first become aware of the number and cumulative value of Bluegum contracts being awarded below the \$100,000 threshold, and is the Minister satisfied the procurement approach was appropriate, complied with the Treasurer's Instructions and represented value for money for Tasmanian taxpayers?
- (9) Will the Government undertake an independent review of procurement practices associated with Bluegum?
 - (a) If yes, who will conduct it and will the findings be made public?
 - (b) If no, why not?

Summary of Bills

Read First Time

No. 35 of 2025	Partition Amendment Bill (<i>pro forma</i>)
No. 49 of 2025	Public Accounts Committee Amendment Bill
No. 55 of 2025	Tasmanian Community Fund Amendment Bill
No. 65 of 2025	Charities and Associations Law (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill
No. 69 of 2025	Integrity Commission Amendment (Mandatory Notifications) Bill
No. 15	Housing Land Supply (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 16	Monetary Penalties Enforcement Amendment Bill
No. 22	Land Use Planning and Approvals (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 29	Sentencing Amendment (Publication of Criminal Activity) Bill

Second Reading Adjourned

No. 66 of 2025	Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments (Phasing Out Reform) Bill
No. 13	Short Stay Levy Bill

Second Reading Negatived

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

Consideration of Bill as Amended in Committee of Whole Council

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

Awaiting Third Reading

No. 21	Taxation and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) 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

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	
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	
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	
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. 2	Residential Parks Bill	
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	
No. 6	Occupational Licensing Amendment Bill	
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	
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

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

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>