



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 – 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

No. 40

TUESDAY, 11 AUGUST 2026

1 COUNCIL MEETS.— The Council met at 11.00 o'clock a.m.

2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL PEOPLE.— The President said:

“We meet today on Tasmanian Aboriginal land. We acknowledge and pay respect to the Tasmanian Aboriginal people and elders, past and present. We recognise them as the first inhabitants and the continuing custodians of this land.”

3 PRAYERS AND REFLECTION.— The President read Prayers.

4 LEAVE TO TABLE ANSWER TO QUESTION AND INCORPORATE ANSWER INTO HANSARD.— *Ordered*, That Ms Rattray have leave to Table answer to Question No. 40 and have the answer incorporated into the Hansard record.

5 GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO REPORT ON FINFISH FARMING IN TASMANIA.— Mr Gaffney asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — With reference to the 2022 Tasmanian Government’s Response to the Legislative Council Government Administration Sub-Committee “A” ‘*Report on Finfish Farming in Tasmania*’, and the report of the Environment Protection Authority’s study ‘*An Environmental Risk Assessment of Florfenicol Use in Marine Salmonid Aquaculture in SE Tasmania 2025 – 2026*’ —

- (1) Have all the recommendations shown within the Governments response to the 2022 ‘*Report of Finfish Farming in Tasmania*’, that it supports or supports in principle, been fully implemented as per the 2022 response and achieved the intended outcomes, and in particular:
- (a) Recommendation 25 – ‘*As a matter of priority, develop, publish and apply state-wide Water Quality Objectives as per the State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997 and as required under the Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994.*’;
 - (b) Recommendation 43 – ‘*Conduct a comprehensive audit of freshwater requirements for the finfish farming industry to inform the development of a policy/strategy on the allocation and management of these resources.*’;
 - (c) Recommendation 44 – ‘*Conduct an independent review of the impacts of current finfish operations on inland waterways, including drinking water supplies and remediation costs borne by TasWater/State Government.*’;
 - (d) Recommendation 45 – ‘*Require all new freshwater finfish hatcheries/smolt production facilities to utilise Recirculating Aquaculture Systems.*’;
 - (e) Recommendation 46 – ‘*Publicly release monitoring data relating to the operation of freshwater finfish operations.*’;
 - (f) Recommendation 47 – ‘*Through the data portal, provide improved public reporting of the environmental management of finfish farming activities, including.*’;

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

The Leader answered:

The Government’s Response to the Legislative Council Government administration Sub-Committee A Report on Finfish Farming in Tasmania, dated 22 August 2022, outlined its intent to introduce a number of initiatives to the then Draft Tasmanian Salmon Industry Plan and provided responses to each of the Sub-Committee’s recommendations.

Those responses were:

- Recommendation 25 – Provisions are in place
- Recommendation 43 – Underway
- Recommendation 44 – Underway
- Recommendation 45 – For consideration in Salmon Plan
- Recommendation 46 – Underway
- Recommendation 47 – Underway – for consideration in Salmon Plan
- Recommendation 48 – For consideration in Salmon Plan
- Recommendation 49 – Underway

The Tasmanian Salmon Industry Plan (the Plan) and associated Implementation Program were finalised on 1 May 2023 following extensive public consultation with the Tasmanian community.

Several actions outlined in the Implementation Program correspond to the Government’s response to the Legislative Council Government Administration Sub-Committee A Report.

It should be noted that since the release of the Plan, and further policy announcements, the Government commissioned an independent Study to examine whether Tasmania's regulatory arrangements are effective in achieving sustainable development, while protecting the State's marine and freshwater environments.

The study will benchmark Tasmania's regulatory framework, examine monitoring, compliance, penalties, biosecurity, animal welfare and environmental performance standards.

Consistent with this Government's approach to continuous improvement, outputs of the study will inform Government policy decisions that seek to balance a sustainable industry with positive outcomes for the Tasmanian environment and community.

Specific responses to parts 1 (a) through (h), and 2 (a) through (c) are as follows.

In regard to part 1 (a), Government has been informed that in accordance with the National Water Quality Management Strategy, and to address the setting of water quality objectives under the State Policy on Water Quality Management 1997, the Independent EPA has developed and published default guideline values for inland surface water catchments, estuarine, coastal and marine ecosystems across Tasmania.

These default guideline values have been applied during environmental impact assessments and in the preparation legal instruments, including but not limited to Environmental Licences for salmon farming in Tasmania.

In regard to parts 1(b) and 1(c), the 2021 Rural Water Use Strategy (RWUS) is the Tasmanian Government's blueprint for managing the State's water resources now and into the future. Rather than just focusing on finfish operations on inland waters, the RWUS is delivering important broadscale reforms to ensure that our freshwater resources are available to support the wide range of water uses and environments that depend on them as well as new opportunities for innovation and growth. Work has focused on building and improving the science and information that informs water management decisions and policies that underpin the State's water management framework.

The RWUS includes several waterway health initiatives aimed to: improve coordination and data sharing of waterway health data; undertake research to better understand trends and drivers of change in river health; deliver a Strategic Directions for Healthy Waterways paper; and establish a new statewide collaborative water quality monitoring program.

An independent review of Tasmania's water accountability framework has been completed, and work has commenced to implement all 23 recommendations aimed to strengthen accountability and help safeguard water security for businesses, urban water supplies and the environment.

A review of Tasmania's water allocation policy framework, including the Surface Water Allocation Decision Framework, is also planned. This review will help ensure policy and regulatory settings are fit for purpose and aligned with the objectives of the *Water Management Act 1999*.

An independent review of Tasmania's water management planning framework has also been completed. The review confirmed the ongoing need for statutory water planning and found Tasmania's framework provides a strong basis for a contemporary and fit-for-purpose approach.

Ongoing work includes sharing findings from the research into the drivers of change in waterway health; clarifying roles and responsibilities for waterway health management; updating stakeholders on progress; and updating catchment yield estimates for Tasmania based on the latest climate science so that the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania (NRE Tas) can continue to allocate and manage water in a sustainable way.

In regard to part 1(d), the Government committed, through the Plan, to progress environmental standards for freshwater finfish farming. Legislation has been amended to provide for the establishment of environmental standards under the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994* (the Act), and standards specific to freshwater hatcheries are to be developed consistent with Government's current policy, informed by the latest technical and science based data. These standards will be applied by the EPA in accordance with provisions of the Act.

Some of Tasmania's largest freshwater finfish hatcheries and nurseries have already adopted recirculating aquaculture systems and the EPA continues to apply comprehensive environmental licensing requirements to regulated facilities, ensuring nutrient discharge from hatcheries remain within acceptable limits, regardless of the hatchery system used.

In regard to part 1(e), the *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994* (the Act) has been amended to include, among other things, section 23AA that provides the EPA Director with the discretion to publish, provide or make available environmental monitoring information. Environmental monitoring information received from freshwater fish farms since 1 January 2022 is now available on the Search Portal accessible via the EPA web page or by request. Information older than 1 January 2022 may also be available by request.

In regard to part 1(f), the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania (NRE Tas) is leading a project to review the salmon farming data portal. Contemporary information relevant to salmon industry regulation is available on various web and social media platforms managed by NRE Tas, EPA and the Tasmanian Department of Health.

In regard to part 1(g) and 1(h), the Independent EPA has published its Compliance and Enforcement Policy on the EPA web page. The Policy clearly sets out the approach and principles applied to compliance and enforcement work undertaken by the EPA. The EPA has a range of options available to promote and support compliance, to deter and penalise offenders, and to remediate damage caused to the environment.

The EPA applies a responsive and risk-based approach to support compliance with legal obligations under environmental legislation and to deter non-compliant behaviour. This approach consists of integrated actions to educate, support, monitor, investigate, and enforce compliance, to continually reduce risk and improve performance and environmental outcomes.

In regard to parts 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c), the EPA has developed and published an environmental risk assessment for Florfenicol using the best available scientific information. This included the establishment of an interim default guideline value for the protection of aquatic organisms. EPA's approach followed the framework and data quality requirements of the National Water Quality Management Strategy for evaluating the impacts of toxicants and other pollutants on environmental water quality.

As outlined in its risk assessment, the EPA reviewed the available scientific papers investigating the impact of florfenicol on the structure, function and resistance of bacterial communities. The Government is aware that the EPA took a precautionary approach in regard to considering the impact of Florfenicol on bacterial communities and antimicrobial resistance, following a one health approach together with the Department of Health. As such the EPA made the decision to undertake extensive environmental monitoring, collecting sediment samples to quantify the impacts of Florfenicol on bacterial communities and investigate the potential for antimicrobial resistance. Analysis of these samples is a key part of a research project being progressed through the Fisheries and Research Development Corporation and led by the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies. Results from this project will be communicated to the public and will inform future environmental monitoring requirements.

6 UNPROCLAIMED TASMANIAN ACTS.— Ms Armitage asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government —

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

The Leader answered:

- (1) There are 17 Tasmanian Acts that have been passed and received Royal Assent that are, wholly or partially, yet to be proclaimed (excluding those under the purview of the Department of Justice).
- (2) Yes. Please see the below list of these Acts and what sections are yet to be proclaimed.

ACT	ADDITIONAL DETAILS
1. <i>Traffic Amendment (Infringement Notices) Act 1997</i>	

2.	<i>Traffic Amendment (Fees) Act 1998</i>	
3.	<i>Australia Acts (Request) Act 1999</i>	
4.	<i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment Act (No. 2) 2001</i>	Section 4
5.	<i>Gas Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2001</i>	Section 30
6.	<i>Electricity Supply Industry Amendment Act 2003</i>	Section 39
7.	<i>Public Sector Superannuation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2009</i>	Part 13
8.	<i>Youth Justice (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2013</i>	Section 44
9.	<i>Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment Act 2013</i>	Sections 3-9, 20, 21, 23, 27, 28(c), 34, 35, 40
10.	<i>Heavy Vehicle National Law (Tasmania) Act 2013</i>	Section 16(c), Section 48
11.	<i>Children, Young Persons and Their Families Amendment Act 2013</i>	Sections 4(c), 7, 11, 17(a) & (c), 19(a), 24, 36, 37, 39 & 45
12.	<i>Land Tax Rating Amendment Act 2014</i>	
13.	<i>Fire Service Amendment (Fire Infringement Notices) Act 2016</i>	
14.	<i>Local Government Amendment (Targeted Review) Act 2017</i>	Sections 44(b), 46 & 47 of Part 3
15.	<i>On-Demand Passenger Transport Services Industry (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2020</i>	Sections 12, 20, 28, 69
16.	<i>Residential Building (Home Warranty Insurance Amendments) Act 2023</i>	
17.	<i>Disability Rights, Inclusion and Safeguarding (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Act 2025</i>	Part 11 sections 37(a), 38(a)-(e)

Ordered, That Ms Rattray, have leave to Table a document listing Acts and Sections of Act that have not yet been proclaimed and have it incorporated into the Hansard record.

7 LAKE MEADOWBANK IRRIGATION SYSTEM.— Ms Thomas asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — In regard to the proposed large irrigation scheme which would draw 37.2 gigalitres from Lake Meadowbank, the last Hydro Lake in the Derwent River Catchment:

- (1) Why has the Government chosen to disregard the 2002 report, titled *Environmental Flows for the Lower Derwent River*, commissioned by the Tasmanian government, which advised against any additional summer water extraction from the lower Derwent River?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that Lake Meadowbank already has a history of algal blooms caused by inadequate water flow during the drier months?
- (3) How does the Minister propose to ensure there will be sufficient water flow in the river during the summer months, or other periods of low flow, to maintain the health of the river?
- (4) How will the Minister ensure that there will be no damage to seagrass beds, leading to adverse effects on fish, birds etc, caused by inadequate water flow?
- (5) What plans does the Minister have for monitoring water quality at Lake Meadowbank, and in the Derwent below Meadowbank Dam?
- (6) Would monitoring of the water quality be done by suitably qualified scientists?
- (7) Are there any contingency plans to release water from Hydro lakes on the Derwent upstream from Lake Meadowbank?
- (8) Given it is likely that the Derwent, and its Hydro lakes, will have reduced water flow during the recently declared El Nino period that is approaching, will the Minister consider postponing the proposed Irrigation Scheme?

The Leader answered:

The Greater South East Irrigation Scheme (GSEIS) is in the preconstruction phase. As is standard for developments of this nature, the GSEIS will undergo rigorous assessment at both State and Australian Government levels, including referral under the Commonwealth's *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. It is anticipated that these evaluations will consider matters of the nature raised in your questions.

Regarding the Scheme, the GSEIS is being designed to improve reliability and provide additional high-surety irrigation water to both existing and new irrigators. It will integrate the existing South-East Stages One, Two and Three Schemes, servicing demand around Gretna, Jordan River Valley, Brighton, Richmond, Dulcot, Cambridge, Colebrook, Campania, Tea Tree, Orielton, Pawleena, Penna, Sorell, Forcett, Elderslie and Broadmarsh.

The GSEIS will transition irrigators off TasWater's drinking water supply, freeing that network capacity to supply Greater Hobart's growing population.

The Government is advised that Lake Meadowbank does not have a record of algal blooms.

The GSEIS will be supplied from Lake Meadowbank. Tasmanian Irrigation has an in-principle agreement to purchase water to supply GSEIS from Hydro Tasmania. The Government is advised that Hydro Tasmania has confirmed that the GSEIS, once commissioned, would not affect its ability to meet its existing downstream summer and winter flow commitments in the Derwent River. This includes Hydro Tasmania maintaining flows downstream of Meadowbank Dam to prevent the salt wedge from extending upstream to the Norske Skog intake for the Boyer Mill and the Bryn Estyn water treatment plant intake opposite. The Government is also advised that this provides a flow regime at all times to protect freshwater quality and river health in the lower Derwent.

The annual volume for GSEIS irrigation at full capacity is approximately 1.3 per cent of the historic average total annual outflows from Meadowbank Dam. The maximum volume of water the GSEIS will use is 1.1 per cent of total Meadowbank Dam outflows during the winter irrigation season and 1.6 per cent in the summer irrigation season.

The Government is advised that assessment under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 is expected to consider any potential impacts of the GSEIS on

Matters of National Environmental Significance and Tasmanian Irrigation has advised that it expects there will be a full public consultation process as part of this assessment process.

In addition to assessment under Commonwealth and State environmental legislation, the Government understands that the GSEIS will be subject to planning approvals under the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, as well as requirements relating to biodiversity, cultural heritage and land management. This includes controls such as threatened species permitting, reserve management processes where applicable, and strict biosecurity and weed hygiene measures during construction and operation.

The Government is advised that any specific environmental monitoring and management arrangements would be identified through the assessment and approvals processes.

Once the GSEIS is commissioned, further environmental protection will be achieved through Farm Water Access Plans which guide the sustainable application of irrigation water on farming properties. These are property specific management plans that must be in place before an irrigator can receive water from Tasmanian Irrigation.

8 HYDRO TASMANIA DIVIDEND.— Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — In relation to the 2026-27 Budget and Budget and Forward Estimates for dividends to be paid by Hydro Tasmania to the Government (detailed in Table 6.9 of 2026-27 Budget Paper 1) and the Budget and Forward Estimates for the Renewable Energy Dividend grant (detailed in table 4.5 of 2026-27 Budget Paper 2 Volume 1:

- (1) In calculating the Hydro dividend estimates included in Table 6.9, what assumptions were made in relation to the size of the Hydro dividend payout ratio applied to projected Hydro profits (for each Budget and Forward Estimate year)?
- (2) When were the Hydro projected profit estimates, on which the Hydro dividend estimates in Table 6.9 were based, received by Treasury and when were the Hydro dividend estimates finalised as part of the Budget development process?
- (3) On Page 80 of Budget Paper 2 Vol 1 it is stated that “The decrease in the Renewable Energy Dividend from 2026-27 reflects forecast Hydro Tasmania dividends being insufficient to trigger the threshold”. In this regard, it is noted that Hydro dividend estimates exceed the base criteria level of \$90 million in two Forward Estimate years. In the Treasurer’s Estimates Hearings on 1 June 2026, it was suggested by Treasury representatives that this reflected a review of the Renewable Energy Dividend policy to be undertaken by 30 June 2028. Is the statement made on Page 80 of Budget Paper 2 Vol 1, therefore, incorrect?
- (4) Based on the Hydro dividend estimate for 2029-30 of \$173.8 million and applying the currently established criteria for the calculation of the Renewable Energy Dividend to that Hydro dividend amount, what would be the estimated Renewable Energy Dividend payment amount?
- (5) Given the payment of a Renewable Energy Dividend is current Government Policy, why was the change in this policy to assume no payment over the 2026-27 Budget and Forward Estimates not reflected in the Policy and Parameter Statement detailed in Table 5.5 of Budget Paper No 1?
- (6) Given the 2026-27 Budget decision to reflect the cessation of the Renewable Energy Dividend prior to the flagged review being undertaken, why was the potential for the payment of a RED to continue post the review not included as a specific expenditure risk in Chapter 4 Risk, Sensitivities and Presentation of Budget Paper 1?
- (7) Was the 2026-27 Budget decision to reflect the cessation of the Renewable Energy Dividend across the 2026-27 Budget Forward Estimates endorsed by Cabinet?
- (8) Does the Treasurer agree with the Secretary of Treasury’s comment made during his Estimates Hearing on 1 June 2026 that the policy context for the payment of the Renewable Energy Dividend has changed since it was established by the Government?
- (9) Noting that the Renewable Energy Dividend was first announced by the Government in August 2023 (which included a reference to a review after four years of operation) and the first payment was

made in the 2023-24 Budget year, will the flagged review be finalised in time for any resulting decision to be reflected in the 2028-29 Budget?

- (10) What are the Terms of Reference for the review of the Renewable Energy Dividend, and will the review include consultation with the community?

The Leader answered:

- (1) Hydro Tasmania's dividend estimates are based on the application of the Government's general dividend policy for Government businesses of 90 per cent of after tax profits.
- (2) Hydro Tasmania's projected profit estimates, including associated dividend estimates, were provided to Treasury on 20 February 2026 through the Budget process for returns to Government and were subsequently considered and endorsed by Treasury's State Forecasting Committee on 26 February 2026 for inclusion in the 2026-27 Budget.
- (3) The statement on page 80 of Budget Paper 2, Volume 1 is not incorrect.

Under the Government's Renewable Energy Dividend policy, the dividend threshold is indexed annually in line with Hobart CPI from a base of \$90 million in 2023-24. As a result, while Hydro Tasmania's forecast dividend exceeds the original base threshold in 2027-28, it does not exceed the estimated indexed threshold for that period.

In addition, the RED Framework was established with a requirement for review prior to 30 June 2028. Consistent with this design, continuation of the program beyond that date is not automatic and remains subject to Government consideration following the review.

- (4) A notional RED can be calculated based on the 2029-30 Hydro Tasmania dividend estimate. However, this is subject to a range of assumptions, including the Government continuing the program under the same settings, Treasury's CPI forecasts (which determine the indexed threshold) and the number of eligible customer connections.

On this basis, and assuming no growth in eligible customer connections of around 256 000, the notional Renewable Energy Dividend for 2029-30 is estimated to be approximately \$131 per household.

- (5) The treatment of the RED in the 2026-27 Budget and Forward Estimates does not represent a change in Government policy and, accordingly, is not reflected as a policy decision in the Policy and Parameter Statement (PPS).

This approach was also applied in the previous Budget. While Hydro Tasmania's forecast dividends exceeded the estimated indexed threshold in the final Forward Estimate year at that time, no corresponding RED payment was included due to the proximity of the review date and the absence of a government decision regarding continuation of the program.

As you are aware, the PPS captures only changes in policy relative to the previous Budget, the continued application of this established budgeting treatment does not constitute a new policy decision or a change in existing policy settings.

Accordingly, there is no impact to report in Table 5.5 of Budget Paper No. 1.

- (6) There has been no decision to cease the RED and as indicated the Budget does not pre-empt the outcome of the scheduled review.

The RED remains current Government policy and is subject to a review prior to 30 June 2028, at which point the Government will consider whether and how the program should continue.

Chapter 4 of Budget Paper No. 1 captures risks at an aggregate level. Importantly, I would refer you to the "Returns from Government Businesses" risk (BP1 page 82) which explicitly recognises that both the level of dividends and the allocation of dividend revenues are subject to a range of influences, including market conditions, major capital investment requirements, and Government policy decisions. This includes mechanisms such as the RED.

Accordingly, the potential for RED payments to continue beyond the review date is inherently encompassed within this broader risk disclosure, rather than being identified as a separate, specific expenditure risk.

(7) There has been no decision to cease the RED and as indicated the Budget does not pre-empt the outcome of the scheduled review.

(8) The question incorrectly characterises the Secretary's evidence provided at the Estimates Hearings on 1 June 2026.

During the hearing, evidence was provided that the RED has been treated as zero in the Forward Estimates in the absence of certainty as to whether the policy will continue and in what form ahead of the scheduled review. The Secretary's comments regarding the policy context referred to broader market and economic conditions, including changes in wholesale electricity prices, rather than any change to the policy itself.

(9) It is my expectation that the outcome of the review arrangements for the RED will be able to be considered in the development of the 2028-29 Budget.

(10) Detailed Terms of Reference for the review of the RED framework have not yet been finalised.

The Terms of Reference will be developed closer to the review period to ensure they are appropriately informed by the policy's operation to date, as well as prevailing energy market, fiscal and economic conditions alongside the Tasmanian community's needs.

It would be my expectation that as part of a review of this nature, strong consideration be given to appropriate stakeholder engagement as part of the process.

9 PAYMENT IN LIEU OF RATES SCHEME HYDRO TASMANIA.—

Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — With regard to the Payment in Lieu of Rates (PiLoR) scheme for renewable energy generation, consistent with Victoria and other states can the Treasurer respond to the following questions:

(1) Would applying the Victorian-style PiLoR formula (\$67,270 base plus \$1,515 per MW) to Hydro's generating fleet yield an amount broadly equivalent to what Hydro currently pays as its rate equivalent.

(2) Has Treasury considered the PiLoR formula against Hydro's installed generating capacity and comparing it to the actual rate equivalent currently paid?

(a) If so, will the Treasurer table that comparison; and

(b) If Treasury has not undertaken this comparison, will the Treasurer commit to doing so and reporting the result, given it goes directly to whether the current rate equivalent methodology reflects a fair, market-consistent value?

(3) Does the Treasurer accept that the existence of a rate equivalent mechanism for Hydro Tasmania, designed specifically to replicate the rates a private, taxable generator would pay, establishes the in-principle case that privately owned renewable generators should be rated on a comparable, transparent, formula-based basis (i.e. PiLoR), rather than through the bespoke land valuation approach currently applied only to windfarms?

(4) What, if any, fiscal modelling has Treasury undertaken on the Budget and local government revenue implications of formally adopting PiLoR for privately owned renewable generation in Tasmania, including any consequential effect on how Hydro Tasmania's own rate equivalent obligation would be calculated under a consistent methodology?

(5) (a) How often is the rate equivalent paid by Hydro Tasmania calculated and reviewed and does the Treasurer believe that bespoke, non-formula valuation approach risks producing inconsistent or declining returns over time, in contrast to a price-indexed, per-MW PiLoR rate; and

(b) if not, why not?

The Leader answered:

(1) On an indicative basis, applying the Victorian Government's 2025-26 indexed Payment in Lieu of Rates (PiLoR) methodology to Hydro Tasmania's generation fleet would result in a payment that is broadly equivalent to the amount payable under the current Hydro rates equivalent framework.

Hydro Tasmania's 2025 Annual Report indicates total generating capacity of around 2 670 MW across its 31 hydro and thermal power stations. The Annual Report is available online at <https://www.hydro.com.au/sites/default/files/2026-01/hydro-tasmania-annual-report-2025.pdf>

Notionally applying the Victorian methodology, comprising a fixed amount of \$67 270 per power station plus \$1 515 per MW of generating capacity, would produce an indicative payment of approximately \$6.1 million per annum.

This compares with Hydro's actual 2025-26 rates equivalent payment of \$6.1 million.

This comparison is indicative only and has been prepared solely for the purpose of comparing the Victorian PiLoR methodology with the State's existing rates equivalent arrangements for Hydro.

(2) Treasury has not undertaken that comparison.

(a) The only comparison undertaken is the illustrative calculation provided in response to Question 1.

(b) No. Treasury does not consider a comparison between Hydro Tasmania's rates equivalent arrangement and Victoria's PiLoR framework to be an appropriate basis for assessing the State's current rates equivalent framework for Hydro, as the two arrangements were established for different purposes and operate in different legislative, ownership and policy contexts.

(3) The premise that Hydro Tasmania's rates equivalent arrangement establishes an in-principle case for a PiLoR-style framework for privately owned renewable generators is not accepted.

Hydro Tasmania's rates equivalent reflects its unique position as a Government-owned entity with land exempt from rates under legislation and is designed to maintain competitive neutrality.

Privately owned generators do not raise this issue and are governed by the existing rating framework. Policy responsibility sits with the Local Government and Energy portfolios, not the Treasurer.

(4) Treasury has not undertaken fiscal modelling of the Budget or local government revenue implications of formally adopting a PiLoR-style framework for privately owned renewable generation in Tasmania.

As PiLoR payments are generally intended to provide a revenue stream to local government rather than the State Budget, any fiscal impacts would depend on the design of any such framework and have not been assessed.

Treasury has also not modelled any consequential changes to Hydro Tasmania's rates equivalent obligation under a hypothetical PiLoR-based methodology.

As outlined in response to Question 1, an illustrative application of the Victorian formula produces a broadly equivalent amount to the State's current rates equivalent framework. Treasury has not undertaken further modelling beyond that illustrative comparison.

(5) (a) Hydro Tasmania's rates equivalent payment is calculated annually and paid by 31 December each year, with the amount determined by applying an indexation rate to the previous year's payment.

The current methodology is not a bespoke valuation of Hydro Tasmania's assets each year. It is an indexed, formula-based approach, reflecting the average increase in relevant council rates revenue.

The broader methodology was last reviewed in June 2022, when Treasury considered a range of alternative approaches. The preferred approach was to retain the existing methodology on the basis that it best reflects the intent of the rates equivalent arrangement and continued to provide a simple, transparent and reasonably justifiable basis consistent with broader taxation principles.

On that basis, I do not accept the characterisation that the current arrangement is a bespoke, non-formula valuation approach.

(b) The premise of the question is not accepted.

Hydro Tasmania's rates equivalent payment is calculated using a formula-based indexation methodology, rather than a bespoke valuation approach. The use of indexation linked to growth in council rates revenue provides a stable and predictable basis for the payment over time.

Further, as outlined in response to Question 1, an indicative application of the Victorian PiLoR methodology produces a payment that is broadly equivalent to the amount payable under the current Tasmanian framework

Accordingly, there is no evidence that the current arrangement is producing materially different outcomes, or that it risks producing inconsistent or declining returns relative to a PiLoR-style methodology.

10 FUNDING FOR CREATIVE INDUSTRIES.— *Ms Forrest* asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government —

(1) With regard to the 2026/27 State Budget:

(a) is the new funding of \$10 Million for Creative Industries in addition to the figures in the lines for Arts Industry Development and Screen Industry Development; and

(b) can the Government provide a complete breakdown for how the 2026/27 arts budget development line will be allocated including the amounts allocated to:

- i. Competitive Grants;
- ii. Four-year funded organisations;
- iii. The Premier's Arts Prize;
- iv. Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery;
- v. The Tasmanian Strategic Touring Fund;
- vi. Arts Tasmania administrative expenses; and
- vii. All other arts projects or initiatives that will be included in this budget line broken down by project or initiative?

(2) During budget estimates scrutiny, the Deputy Secretary, Creative Industries, Sport and Visitor Economy said that he was hopeful there will be an increase in the amount of money that will go to arts organisations. Can the Government advise:

(a) will this increase be applied in the 2026-27 budget year, and

(b) given the apparent \$450,000 reduction in the overall arts budget for 2026-27, where will this increase come from?

(3) During budget estimates scrutiny, the Deputy Secretary, Creative Industries, Sport and Visitor Economy stated there would be operational efficiencies made within the arts portfolio. Can the Government provide a breakdown of:

(a) how these efficiencies will be achieved; and

(b) the total savings that will be made through the efficiency measures?

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

(a) if any money has been allocated to addressing the recommendations in the Tasmanian Live Performance sector report; and

(b) whether there has been any money allocated towards future initiatives from the new creative industries strategy, and if so

- i. what amounts have been allocated, and in what budget year; and

- ii. will these amounts be additional to the existing programs, or will further savings need to be made to fund these outcomes?

(5) During budget estimates scrutiny, the Director, Creative Tasmania stated the following:

That the extra \$10m for creative industries announced in the State Growth budget would be allocated \$5m to arts and \$5m to screen.

The Director also provided the following breakdown:

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

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

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

The Leader answered:

(1) 2026-27 State Budget:

- (a) The new funding of \$10 million is incorporated into the figures in the lines for Arts Industry Development and Screen Industry Development.
- (b) Breakdown of how the 2026-27 arts budget development line will be allocated including the amounts allocated to:
 - i. **Competitive grants:** Arts and Cultural Heritage Investment will remain at \$4,465,000 in 2026-27
 - ii. **Four-year funded organisations:** In 2026-27, \$2,175,072 will be provided to multi-year arts organisations through existing agreements.
 - iii. **The Premier's Arts Prize:** The Tasmanian Literary Awards will continue to receive \$130,000 biennially (2026-27 and 2028-29)

- iv. **Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery:** QVMAG will continue to receive funding, however the exact amount is not known due to its indexation against Hobart CPI as required by the Head Deed of 1999. It will be no less than \$1,850,000.
 - v. **The Tasmanian Strategic Touring Fund:** The Tasmanian Strategic Touring Fund has received \$525,000 since 2022, and the department will consider any future funding request.
 - vi. **Arts Tasmania administrative expenses:** This figure is not known as Building Tasmania's Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancy (TNVR) processes are not finalised.
 - vii. **All other arts projects or initiatives that will be included in this budget line broken down by project or initiative:** allocation not yet known. This will be subject to ministerial direction and budget saving measures and will respond to sector developments.
- (2) (a) In 2026-27 the increase of \$1 million will be applied to the Screen Tasmania budget, not the Arts Tasmania budget (please refer to the detail provided in Question 5).
- (b) Reduction in the allocation to the arts budget is due to the conclusion of election commitments and other savings. Amounts available to arts organisations will remain stable in 2026-27 and increase from 2027-28.
- (3) Operational efficiencies in the Arts portfolio
- (a) Efficiencies will be achieved through natural attrition, ongoing business improvement practices, and through a TNVR program. This program is ongoing.
- (b) The total savings that will be made through the efficiency measures are not possible to quantify at this time as the TNVR process is ongoing.
- (4) Tasmanian Live Performance Exchange sector report and Cultural and Creative Industries Strategy
- (a) At the time of writing, the Tasmanian Live Performance Exchange sector report has not been received by Government so a position on any recommendations is not yet possible to determine.
- (b) As the Cultural and Creative Industries Strategy is only in the early stages of development, no money has been allocated towards any future initiatives.
- (5) Application of \$10 million Creative Industries Key Initiative to the Arts Portfolio.
- (a) There will be no increase to funding to the Arts portfolio in 2026-27. Applications have been submitted for Arts Organisations – Annual Programs, which will be assessed by expert peers against the criteria published on Arts Tasmania's website in accordance with the requirements of the *Cultural and Creative Industries Act 2017*. The process is open and competitive.
- (b) A position on allocations for the 2027-28 year has not yet been determined.
- (c) A position for the allocation of additional funding for 2027-28 to 2029-30 has not yet been determined. Applications for arts organisations multi-year funding for 2027-28 onwards will open in early 2027.
- (d) No, indexation will not apply to organisations receiving multi-year funding agreements
- i. No
 - ii. Not applicable
- (6) Overall reduction in overall Arts Tasmania funding over the Forward Estimates
- (a) Reductions in the allocation to Arts Tasmania are the result of efficiencies applied to the business unit, not a decrease in the amount of financial support provided to the sector. It is our understanding that that the 2029-30 figure in the budget papers becomes the new baseline for ongoing appropriation.
- (b) Programs will remain to support new, emerging and existing arts organisations with project funding.

11 KING ISLAND RACING SEASON.— Ms *Forrest* asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — With regard to the upcoming racing season on King Island:

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

The Leader answered:

- (1) No. Tasracing has provided clarity to the King Island Racing Club (KIRC) in relation to requirements needing to be met in order to confirm trial and race dates.
- (2) Yes. The Tasracing FY27 Budget contains funding for the KIRC racing season. The total funding allocated is in excess of \$400,000.

It should be noted the costs detailed below are hard Opex and exclusive of Tasracing's input/carrying costs. That is, Stewards, Track Curator, Racing Operations and other resources already employed but re-directed to KI are not included but should be noted as operating costs incurred. In that context, the total cost of the season exceeds \$400,000.

A breakdown of costs is as follows:

KING ISLAND 2026/2027			
TOTAL costs associated with the King Island Racing Season			
Stakes	Harness	\$	51,300
	Thoroughbred	\$	121,217
	TOTAL	\$	172,517
Wages	Barrier Attendant	\$	5,880
	Clerk of the Course	\$	3,500
	TOTAL	\$	9,380
Riding/Driving Fees	Thoroughbred	\$	51,450
	Harness	\$	6,720
	TOTAL	\$	58,170

Flights	TOTAL	\$ 79,879
Transport	Harness	\$ 6,000
	Thoroughbred	\$ 19,000
	TOTAL	\$ 25,000
Contractors	Ambulance	\$ 10,500
	Doctor	\$ 7,000
	TOTAL	\$ 17,500
Pre Season Track Curation	Flights	\$ 1,600
	Accommodation	\$ 600
	TOTAL	\$ 2,200
Meeting Payment	December (x4)	\$ 11,356
	January (x3)	\$ 8,517
	TOTAL	\$ 19,873

TOTAL EXPENDITURE FOR SEASON	
\$384,519	

- (3) Please refer to (1) and (2) above.
- (4) Prize money is determined by the class of racing and, if a season proceeds, could be expected to be in line with recent seasons. Agreement on the number of race meetings is yet to be determined.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) Tasracing has budgeted \$3k from Club Marketing Support and \$10k from our Ladbrokes Partnership to the KIRC.
- This is in line with previous season payments in terms of amounts.
- Should the coming season proceed, these funds will be made available to the KIRC.
- (7) Tasracing continues to work with the KIRC on options to support viability of the racing season. Continued reduction in horse and participant numbers on King Island remain the primary challenge to viability. It should be noted the King Island season generates notional wagering income, unlike most Tasmanian race meetings, and commercial and budget considerations must be reasonably considered, i.e. funding is not unlimited.
- (8) It is understood the King Island Racing Club is exploring options with owners and trainers to deliver a recommencement of racing for the 2026/27 season. The Club will continue to update Tasracing as to the progress of these discussions and indications of support.
- (9) Tasracing provides no guidance in this regard. Each season will be considered on its viability.

Ordered, That Ms Rattray, have leave to Table a breakdown of total costs associated with the King Island Racing Season.

12 BLUEGUM DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION PROJECT.— Ms Thomas asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — A search of the Government Tenders website for contracts awarded in relation to the Department of Health's Bluegum Digital Health Transformation Project returns more than 130 contract-award results. Many appear to be valued between \$90,000 and

\$100,000 – just below the threshold requiring a tender process – with multiple contracts awarded to the same contractors.

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

In relation to the Bluegum Digital Health Transformation Project:

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

The Leader answered:

The Tasmanian Government remains committed to delivering the Digital Health Transformation Program, which is vitally important for Tasmania and represents one of the most significant investments ever in the modernisation of our health system.

Its successful delivery is critical to improving the quality, safety and efficiency of healthcare services, strengthening digital capabilities across the sector, and ensuring that patients and clinicians are supported by contemporary, reliable and integrated systems.

We are now moving forward into the largest and most complex of the projects (the replacement of the Digital Health Record with an Electronic Medical Record). The Department of Health has advised it is being assessed at each stage through readiness assessments (also described as gateway processes) consistent with the recommendation from a recent Auditor General Report and consistent with the process in place for built infrastructure across Government.

Following engagement with the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department has implemented revised procurement arrangements for ICT labour hire that provide a pathway for the ongoing engagement of specialist ICT resources. The new arrangements include Procurement Review Committee oversight, structured quotation processes for procurements under \$250,000, and open tender (RFT)

processes for procurements of \$250,000 or more. The Threshold for a tender process in the Treasurer's Instructions is \$250,000. Treasury has endorsed these arrangements, including the use of open tendering for ICT labour hire whereas previous advice was that this not available to the Department.

While ICT contract labour hire is utilised across government and industry to supplement specialist capability, the Bluegum Digital Health Transformation Program represents a uniquely large and complex undertaking within the Tasmanian context. The scale, specialist skill requirements and pace of delivery associated with implementing a statewide digital health transformation necessitate access to highly specialised ICT resources that are not readily available through the local labour market. As a result, the Department's reliance on specialist ICT contract labour for this program is significantly greater than that typically required for standard agency ICT projects.

It's also important to note that the Bluegum Digital Health Transformation Program is not one single project. It is many projects over a 10-year period, some running concurrently and others in sequence.

The projects range in size, cost and complexity and vary in nature from physical infrastructure (such as the installation of WIFI) to software upgrades and software replacements.

The Government notes the significant investment to date for this project, which will grow further as we deliver the Electronic Medical Record in coming years. Given its importance to Tasmania and recognising the scale and complexity of the Program, it is clear that additional Ministerial oversight is needed to ensure the Program remains on track and on Budget.

Following ongoing discussions, the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Wellbeing has written to the Treasurer to initiate monthly reporting on the progress and financial performance of the Program. This will include monthly meetings, chaired by the Secretary of the Department of Health, with the Minister, the Treasurer, and appropriate senior officials and project leaders in attendance.

This will provide an additional level of ministerial oversight and scrutiny over the project, providing monthly opportunities to review project milestones, monitor expenditure against budget, consider emerging risks and issues, and ensure timely escalation of all matters of concern. It will also provide greater assurance that project delivery remains on track, governance arrangements are operating effectively, and public funds are being managed responsibly and transparently.

Further, in relation to the answer provided to Budget Estimates Questions on Notice on 12 June 2026, the Department wishes to clarify that labour-hire expenditure from 1 July 2022 to date, when including both Horizon 1 and Horizon 2, total expenditure was identified as \$50.6 million, superseding the previously reported figure of \$36.5 million.

The original quoted figure related only to expenditure incurred in Horizon 1 of the Program only. However, for absolute clarity and transparency in relation to these further questions, the revised figure provided in the answers below reflects the full labour hire expenditure associated with delivering Bluegum Health Transformation Program and related Bluegum-funded activities for the period 1 July 2022 to date across both Horizon 1 and Horizon 2.

Finally, as per the Minister's offer during estimates, the Department of Health does remain available to brief Members, either individually or collectively, on the Program, should this be something that Members wish to take up.

- (1) 692 Bluegum-related contracts valued between \$50,000 and \$99,999 have been awarded to date, with a combined value of \$59.8 million.

Note – contract values do not necessarily reflect actual expenditure against purchase orders, and actual spend may be lower than the value of contracts awarded.

- (2) 50 Bluegum-related contracts valued under \$50,000 have been awarded to date, with a combined value of \$1.5 million.

Note – contract values do not necessarily reflect actual expenditure against purchase orders, and actual spend may be lower than the value of contracts awarded.

- (3) Of the \$50.6m total expenditure:

- \$1.04 million was spent on contracts valued under \$50,000; and
- \$49.5 million was spent on contracts valued between \$50,000 and \$100,000.

While the awarded contracts total approximately \$61m, the reported figure of \$50.6m reflects expected/actual expenditure. Contract values represent the maximum approved value and do not necessarily translate into full expenditure, meaning actual spend may be lower than the total value of contracts awarded.

The Department of Health has advised they did not identify any individual labour-hire contracts with a value exceeding \$100,000. Accordingly, no open tender processes were conducted for contracts above that value.

(4) (a) and (b)

Entity Name	No. Contracts Awarded	Total Value of Contracts Awarded
Ignite Project Services Pty Ltd	86	\$6,957,870.41
GSD Advisors Pty Ltd	58	\$5,121,209.20
Hays Specialist Recruitment (Australia) Pty Limited	40	\$3,050,874.96
2PM Services	38	\$2,990,360.40
VisionAZ Pty Ltd	37	\$3,076,604.21
The Trustee for Tasmanian IT Unit Trust	36	\$3,126,202.48
Phase 2 Consulting	34	\$2,927,993.60
The Project Lab	34	\$2,696,068.10
Lecarrow Pty Ltd	27	\$2,178,372.84
Knight Errant Pty Ltd	27	\$2,005,448.41
indiGroup Pty Ltd	22	\$1,938,635.93
Think Resourcing Pty Ltd	21	\$1,739,395.78
Cloud Delivered Pty Ltd	19	\$1,682,440.32
Miraki Pty Ltd	17	\$1,438,798.76
Lime Recruitment Pty Ltd	16	\$1,453,395.84
K2 Projects (TAS) Pty Ltd	12	\$974,098.56
SISUCON	12	\$963,088.00
Conexus Technology	12	\$842,062.00
Arnol Consulting Pty Ltd	11	\$983,082.48
CGI Technologies and Solutions	11	\$955,400.16
Efficiency Tasmania	11	\$870,120.64
Blue Gum Ridge Pty Ltd	10	\$877,482.80
Booker Consulting Pty Ltd	8	\$658,893.76
Vision42	8	\$631,820.00
SpouseCORP	8	\$752,904.72
Red Apple IT Pty Ltd	6	\$464,895.14
Data#3 Limited	6	\$481,882.72
Phase 2 Consulting	6	\$510,180.00
Troocoo Pty Ltd	6	\$563,649.76
KISS Software Pty Ltd	6	\$531,900.00
Design Psychology Pty Ltd	5	\$435,950.00
9Yards Consulting Pty Ltd	5	\$450,900.00
XO1 Consulting	5	\$459,040.00
Intuit Technologies	4	\$367,500.00
Be Marketing Pty Ltd	4	\$364,800.00
Think Creative Studios	4	\$345,877.60
Personix Pty Ltd	4	\$339,005.44

Entity Name	No. Contracts Awarded	Total Value of Contracts Awarded
KPMG	4	\$212,813.68
GMC Advisors	4	\$316,208.00
Cathara Consulting Pty Ltd	4	\$379,508.40
Leecarrow Pty Ltd	4	\$347,010.00
HealthConsult Pty Ltd	3	\$170,000.00
Powerhouse Partners Pty Ltd	3	\$288,000.00
Turimetta Consulting Pty Ltd	3	\$262,200.00
Chu & Company Pty Ltd	3	\$192,000.00
Stewart David Dowrick	3	\$213,250.00
Randstad Pty Limited	3	\$81,468.64
Oakham Contracting	3	\$187,704.00
WrightMoves Consulting Pty Ltd	3	\$219,480.00
Scott David Leckie	3	\$258,560.00
MYITANDAPPS PTY LTD	2	\$162,000.00
Capgemini Australia Pty Ltd	2	\$152,700.00
Tektology Consulting	2	\$144,000.00
Lynn Maree Pitt	2	\$122,750.00
Pixel Effect Pty Ltd	2	\$192,400.00
Karana Health Consulting Pty Ltd	2	\$196,080.00
FTI Consulting (Australia) Pty Ltd	2	\$189,000.00
Resonance Consulting Pty Ltd	2	\$192,960.00
Precision Sourcing Australia Pty Ltd	1	\$62,640.00
Purple Cow Services Pty Ltd	1	\$98,392.32
Andrew Pyke Consulting	1	\$86,184.00
Transform IT Recruitment Pty Ltd	1	\$70,030.00
The Trustee for TelCols Trust	1	\$87,577.60
Digital Health Dojo Pty Ltd	1	\$99,840.00
Sandstone Services	1	\$86,400.00
Grand Total	742	\$61,279,361.66

Note – contract values do not necessarily reflect actual expenditure against purchase orders, and actual spend may be lower than the value of contracts awarded.

- (c) The contracts were procured through the Department's approved ICT labour-hire procurement arrangements. This was a request for quotation process.

These arrangements incorporated competitive market-testing processes appropriate to the procurement category and provided access to specialist ICT resources through approved labour-hire suppliers. This included the use of a Request for Contractor Resource (RFR) process, through which resource requirements were released to registered labour-hire suppliers (agencies). More than 40 approved agencies were eligible to participate in relevant sourcing activities and submit candidate nominations.

Candidates were assessed against the requirements of the role, including relevant skills, experience, capability, availability and proposed rates. The Department selected candidates that best met its operational requirements and represented the best overall value for the engagement.

Following evaluation and selection, participating agencies were notified of the outcome, and contracts were executed with the successful suppliers. Once the Department became aware of the requirement to publish contract award information under the approved ICT labour-hire

procurement arrangements in place at the time, details of awarded contracts were published on Tenders Tasmania as part of the Department's ongoing procurement reporting processes.

- (5) For ICT contract labour hire, the procurement arrangements applicable at the time (as described above) relied on labour hire and market testing processes with competitive quotations used rather than open tender processes for individual engagements.

Value for money was supported through access to a broad market of labour hire suppliers, enabling the Department to compare candidates and rates across multiple providers for new resource requirements. Proposed rates were tested against prevailing market conditions through each RFR process, while assessment considered capability, experience, availability and price to identify the best overall value. The use of labour hire arrangements also enabled the Department to engage specialist resources only for the period required, avoiding the ongoing costs associated with recruiting and maintaining permanent positions where needs were temporary, project-based or time-limited.

For the Bluegum Health Transformation Program specifically, the use of labour hire arrangements enabled the Department to access specialised digital health, clinical informatics, technical and project delivery capability that was not readily available through normal recruitment processes. These resources were engaged to address defined capability gaps and support the delivery of a large-scale, time-limited health transformation program. Access to specialist expertise supported program delivery, reduced the risk of delays to critical transformation initiatives, and enabled the Department to scale resources in line with changing program requirements. This approach also avoided the ongoing costs associated with retaining specialist skills beyond the life of the Program where those capabilities may not have been required on a permanent basis

Value for money was further supported through regular review of contractor requirements and engagement outcomes. Contractor engagements were maintained only where there was an ongoing business need and the resource continued to provide value in addressing capability or delivery requirements. Engagements were concluded or not renewed where the requirement ceased, the work was completed, or the engagement no longer represented the most appropriate use of public funds.

Based on these factors, the Department has advised they are satisfied that value for money was achieved.

- (6) Executed contract values were determined at the time of engagement based on the specific resource requirement, anticipated duration, operational need and prevailing market rates applicable at the time.

All new contractor engagements were established through a consistent procurement and assessment process under the Department's approved ICT labour-hire arrangements in place at the time. Contract values were an outcome of that process and reflected the scope, duration and requirements of the engagement, together with the parameters of the approved procurement arrangements.

- (7) This was the preferred approach during Horizon One and the program has included directly employed staff since its commencement. In October 2024, additional recruitment activity was undertaken as part of the program's workforce strategy to increase fixed-term employment and reduce reliance on labour hire where appropriate. The plan targeted the conversion of more than 40 contractor positions to salaried employment as part of a long-term, sustainable workforce model.

Following approval of the strategy, the Department undertook a substantial recruitment campaign to fill specialist digital, technical and project delivery roles. However, the response from the market was limited, reflecting well-documented shortages of experienced digital health and ICT professionals. While some appointments were successfully made, the number of suitable candidates was significantly below the Department's requirements.

As a result, contractor resources continued to be required to ensure the Program could maintain delivery momentum and access critical specialist capability.

Consistent with the Workforce Strategy, opportunities to increase fixed-term employment and reduce reliance on labour hire will continue to be prioritised where appropriate and where suitably qualified candidates can be sourced; while recognising that some specialist contractor capability may still be required where skills cannot be sourced through the employment market.

- (8) Labour-hire contractors are assigned to specific projects and workstreams within the Bluegum Program and are overseen by Departmental officers who are accountable for delivery, outcomes and performance of those projects and workstreams.

Contractors provide specialised capability across technical, digital transformation and project delivery functions and work within established program governance, priorities and delivery schedules.

Their activities are coordinated and monitored through established planning, reporting and governance arrangements, which provide oversight of progress, management of dependencies and assurance that work remains aligned with program objectives, delivery milestones and expected outcomes.

- (9) Contractors engaged on the Bluegum Program work alongside Department staff as part of multidisciplinary teams responsible for delivering program outcomes.

The Bluegum Program brings together clinical, technical, digital transformation and project delivery expertise. Contractors provide specialised skills and experience that complement departmental capability in areas critical to program delivery and operate under the direction of Departmental officers responsible for those functions and workstreams.

Contractors work within shared delivery plans, priorities and milestones, enabling clinical, technical and operational resources to work together towards common program objectives. This integrated delivery model ensures specialised capability is applied where required to support successful delivery of the Program.

- (10) The Government is aware that contractor and labour-hire resources are commonly utilised across governments and industry to supplement specialist capability during the delivery of large and complex digital transformation programs.

These include electronic medical record implementations, broader digital health transformation programs undertaken across Australian jurisdictions, and other major government digital transformation initiatives that have utilised specialist contractor and labour-hire resources as part of their workforce model.

Specific examples are:

- Within Queensland Health several digital health transformation initiatives have used specialist ICT contractor and labour-hire resources to supplement internal capability. This includes an Integrated Electronic Medical Record (ieMR) program, the Surgical Treatment and Rehabilitation Service (STARS) Hospital commissioning program, Sunshine Coast University Hospital (SCUH) commissioning, statewide electronic referrals initiatives and electronic medication management programs. These programs were delivered through a combination of government employees, technology vendors, implementation partners and specialist ICT contractor resources engaged to support program management, solution design, system configuration, technical delivery, testing, training, change management and deployment activities. Queensland Health's experience demonstrates that the use of specialist external resources is a common delivery model for large-scale and complex health technology transformations where specialist skills are required for defined periods and may not be available within the existing public sector workforce.
- SA Health's statewide Sunrise EMR & PAS program, which is now operational across all South Australian public hospitals and healthcare facilities, utilised specialist external contractors and consulting resources to support EMR rollout, project advisory services, architecture, governance and digital health workforce augmentation activities.
- Within Tasmania, TasNetworks' enterprise-wide SAP transformation is an example of a large and complex digital transformation program delivered using a combination of internal resources and specialist external expertise. TasNetworks engaged DXC Technology as its implementation partner and utilised specialist SAP skills to support the implementation of SAP S/4HANA and associated business transformation activities. The project successfully replaced numerous legacy systems and established a single integrated platform across the organisation.

In addition, as referenced previously, the recruitment of suitably qualified digital health and ICT specialists remains challenging, reflecting a highly competitive national market for these skills. Larger jurisdictions that have established digital health programs often have access to a broader

pool of experienced personnel and existing implementation capability developed through previous EMR and digital transformation initiatives.

For Tasmania, specialist contractors and labour-hire arrangements have provided an important mechanism for accessing scarce expertise and maintaining delivery momentum on a large-scale, time-sensitive transformation program while continuing to grow internal capability and increase direct employment where possible.

Additionally, while comparable programs such as those listed above utilised contractor and labour-hire resources as part of their workforce model, it is important to remember that delivery approaches, governance arrangements, program scope and workforce requirements vary significantly between organisations and jurisdictions. Therefore, direct comparisons between individual projects must be considered in their specific operational context.

The Department continues to monitor and consider lessons from comparable programs to inform delivery approaches, governance and continuous improvement activities within the Bluegum Program.

Ordered, That Ms *Ratray*, have leave to Table a document showing the number of individual entities awarded Bluegum-related contracts, including the number of contracts awarded and the total value of contracts awarded.

13 REFORMING TRADE WASTE FRAMEWORK.— Mr *Edmunds* asked the Honourable the Leader of the Government — On 26 June 2025, the Premier issued a media statement titled: “Reforming trade waste framework to future-proof major employers”, which criticised TasWater for “unrealistic timeframes to comply with trade waste requirements”.

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

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

The Leader answered:

- (1) The Government has engaged RM Consulting Group (RMCG) to conduct an independent review of the economic and environmental regulatory framework governing trade waste services in Tasmania. The review is intended to examine the extent to which the current framework provides businesses, TasWater and regulators with a workable pathway to achieving environmental outcomes in a way that is economically sustainable and supportive of industry development.

The review commenced in April 2026 and includes a staged stakeholder engagement process.

Initial consultation has been undertaken by RMCG with relevant Government agencies, regulators and TasWater through meetings and discussions to inform the review and the design of the broader stakeholder engagement program.

RMCG has also consulted with the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (TCCI) to assist in identifying trade waste customers that may be appropriate for detailed consultation.

The Australian Industry Group (Ai Group) has not been directly engaged as part of the review to date.

No major trade waste producers have been directly consulted as part of the review at this stage. RMCG is currently identifying participants for the next phase of consultation, which will occur between July 2026 and August 2026 and will include stakeholder surveys, targeted interviews and follow-up discussions with trade waste customers across all categories, peak industry bodies, TasWater, the Local Government Association of Tasmania and councils. Targeted interviews will include selected Category 3 and Category 4 trade waste producers.

- (2) RMCG is required to provide its final report to the Government by the end of September 2026. The Government will consider the findings and recommendations of the review before determining any

future policy or legislative changes. Any decisions regarding future reforms will be announced following consideration of the review's outcomes.

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

Can the Minister please advise:

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

The Minister answered:

- (1) The former Chair of the Heritage Council has been indemnified for legal costs, capped at \$108,000. As of 9 July 2026, a total \$80,625 (excluding GST) has been paid.
- (2) The *Policy and Guidelines for the Grant of Indemnities and Legal Assistance to Public Officers of the State of Tasmania* outlines the types of matters for which legal assistance could be granted. However, the Policy and Guidelines state that nothing in them prevents Cabinet from agreeing to indemnify or provide legal assistance to any public officer.

Legal assistance was provided for the purposes of taking action in the Supreme Court.

- (3) The matter is ongoing, awaiting a decision.
- (4) Cabinet approved the legal fees for the former Chair of the Council on 5 May 2025.

15 LEAVE TO TABLE ANSWER TO QUESTION AND INCORPORATE ANSWER INTO HANSARD.— *Ordered*, That Ms Palmer have leave to Table answer to Question No. 56 and have the answer incorporated into the Hansard record.

16 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS.— Mr Edmunds asked the Honourable the Minister for Education — With regard to school psychologists:

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

(d) Short term/contract

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

The Minister answered:

- (1) As at 31 March 2026, there were 2,105 students on the waiting list to see a school psychologist.
- (2) As at 31 March 2026, the maximum wait time for School Psychology was 1,784 days for an assessment.

It is important to note that there can be complex reasons that impact the wait time for an assessment. Wait times also do not reflect what other supports a student may be receiving prior to an assessment, including those delivered through the School Support and Wellbeing Team.

- (3) As at 31 March 2026, the average wait time to see a school psychologist for assessment was 273 days.
- (4) An assessment is only one part of the intervention that a school psychologist may provide. Direct intervention and follow-up after an assessment include:
- supporting staff to implement classroom strategies to support learning responsive to the developmental and cognitive needs
 - working with staff and students to develop and implement individualised behaviour support strategies
 - individual learning plan input for the student
 - therapy with the student based on the learning and behavioural needs identified through an assessment (again noting that some students also don't require an assessment prior to accessing therapy)
 - mental health intervention
 - external referral to, and communication with (for example), GPs, Child Youth Mental Health Services (CYMHS), paediatricians, occupational and physical therapists, and non-government agency programs relevant to the student's needs
 - attending care team meetings to support the student's psychological needs.

The assessment identifies the interventions required which the school psychologist has a professional responsibility to provide. The above list provides examples only.

- (5) The Tasmanian Government recognises the workforce challenges faced across all jurisdictions, including access to school psychologists, and continues to implement measures to not only attract more psychologists into our system but to also strengthen student support services across Tasmania.

Since 2014, there has been an increase of 104.75 full-time equivalent (FTE) professional support staff (as at 31 March 2026), expanding the capacity to provide direct support to children and young people in schools.

Our government is also investing in workforce development to support future supply. This includes funding 20 scholarships for students training as speech and language pathologists and school psychologists. Eighteen scholarship recipients are now working in Tasmanian Government schools and a recruitment process is being finalised in relation to the remaining two graduate school

psychology scholarships. These scholarships build on earlier initiatives, including nine scholarships made available from 2024 for speech pathology.

In addition, a permanent relief pool of 12 FTE (4 FTE school psychologists, 4 FTE social workers, 4 FTE speech and language pathologists) has been established to improve flexibility in service delivery and support schools to respond to varying student needs.

With the signing of the new Teacher's Agreement, we will also be establishing a Statewide School Psychological Assessment Team with an additional 7 FTE dedicated school psychologists to reduce long wait times, increase equity of access and free school-based psychologists to focus on core early intervention and wellbeing activities.

(6)

Approved Establishment	March 31 2022	March 31 2023	March 31 2024	March 31 2025	March 31 2026
School Psychology	72.45	76.45	79.05	80.25	82.25

- (7) Approved establishment numbers have increased over time in response to growing demand, supported by a \$7.3 million investment in the 2026-27 Budget and Forward Estimates. This investment is for additional support staff, including school psychologists.

Additionally, Tasmanian Government initiatives and investment have supported further workforce growth, including a \$500,000 investment to fund 10 additional school psychology and speech and language pathology scholarships. Other initiatives include school psychology resources to support critical incident response, student safety and wellbeing, a permanent relief pool and the development of a psychology assessment hub model to support waitlist management.

- (8) All base-level and Advanced Skills school psychology positions are school-based/student facing. All senior school psychologists also have a school-based/student facing component to their roles, in addition to their mandated supervisory and leadership responsibilities (under Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA)). The Professional Practice Lead – School Psychology role (1 FTE) is the only position that is not school-based/student facing – this position provides statewide practice oversight for school psychology. This is an additional role and is *not* included in the current establishment of 82.25 for school psychology.

(9)

Status	FTE	Headcount
Full-time	37.90	38
Part-time	52.72	76
Total	90.62	114

Status	FTE	Headcount
Permanent	80.31	102
Fixed Term	10.31	12
Total	90.62	114

- (10) As at 31 March, 2026, all permanent school psychology positions were fully allocated. There was a fixed term (temporary) vacancy of 1.2 FTE in the north of the state.

- (11) As at 31 March 2026, the total centrally funded budget allocation for school psychologist positions across Tasmania is 82.25 full-time equivalent (FTE). As part of the recently renegotiated Teachers' Agreement, an additional 6 FTE school psychologists and 1 FTE Advanced Skill school

psychologist will be added to the Approved Establishment profile post 1 July 2026 for a dedicated school psychology assessment hub.

A static, school-by-school allocation table does not accurately reflect service delivery at a point in time.

Allocations are managed across approximately 200 Child and Family Learning Centres, schools and colleges, and are adjusted in response to student need, data and service demand.

To ensure appropriate support is given where it is needed, staffing allocations are informed by a range of data and local factors. These include caseload size and complexity, enrolment numbers, the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA), disability data, family violence notifications, critical incidents, and rurality and remoteness.

- (12) In 2025, a total of 15 psychology positions were advertised, including School Psychologists, Senior School Psychologists, Advanced Skills Psychologists and Graduate Psychologists — nine in the North and six in the South.

17 LEAVE TO TABLE ANSWER TO QUESTION AND INCORPORATE ANSWER INTO HANSARD.— *Ordered*, That Ms *Palmer* have leave to Table answer to Question No. 57 and have the answer incorporated into the Hansard record.

18 SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS.— Mr *Edmunds* asked the Honourable the Minister for Education — With regard to school social workers:

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

The Minister answered:

- (1) As at 31 March 2026, there were 332 students on the waiting list to see a social worker.
- (2) As at 31 March 2026, the maximum wait time for school social workers was 370 days.

It should be noted that single data points and outliers should be interpreted with caution. Extended waiting periods can often be driven by complex individual circumstances. In addition, wait-time measures do not reflect the range of supports that students may be receiving while awaiting assessment, including those delivered through the School Support and Wellbeing Team.

- (3) As at 31 March 2026, the average wait time to see a social worker was 7.5 days.

19 LEAVE TO TABLE ANSWER TO QUESTION AND INCORPORATE ANSWER INTO HANSARD.—*Ordered*, That Ms *Palmer* have leave to Table answer to Question No. 58 and have the answer incorporated into the Hansard record.

20 SCHOOL SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS.— Mr *Edmunds* asked the Honourable the Minister for Education — With regard to school speech pathologists:

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

The Minister answered:

- (1) As at 31 March 2026, there were 472 students on the waiting list to see a speech and language pathologist.
- (2) As at 31 March 2026, the maximum wait time for school speech and language pathology was 14 months.

It should be noted that single data points and outliers should be interpreted with caution. Extended waiting periods can often be driven by complex individual circumstances. In addition, wait-time

measures do not reflect the range of supports that students may be receiving while awaiting assessment, including those delivered through the School Support and Wellbeing team.

- (3) As at 31 March 2026, the average wait time to see a speech pathologist was 117 days.

21 YEAR 11 AND 12 EXTENSION SCHOOLS PROGRAM.— Mr *Gaffney* asked the Honourable the Minister for Education — With reference to the Year 11 and 12 Extension Schools program —

- (1) The tabled papers in response to questions asked in Estimates Committee B on 3 June 2026 gave an indication of the latest Extension School enrolment headcounts of Year 11 and 12 students in schools within 30km of a college:
- (a) What are the separate enrolment numbers of Year 11 and Year 12 students in each of these schools;
 - (b) How many students in Year 11 and Year 12 from each of these schools would have a dual enrolment with a College;
 - (c) For each Extension School that may have students with a dual-enrolment – what are the dual enrolment numbers relating to each College;
 - (d) What are the separate enrolment numbers of Year 11 and Year 12 students in Extension Schools more than 30km from a College: and
 - (e) How many of these students enrolled at Extension Schools more than 30km from a College would have dual enrolment with a College and/or eSchool?
- (2) In Estimates Committee B on 3 June 2026 when asked about the possibility of a review of the Years 11 and 12 Extension Schools program you stated, and I quote directly from the Hansard transcript: *“So this policy is not under review, and at the moment I have no intention of having a formal review around this”*:
- (a) What is preventing the Government from conducting a reasonable internal cost benefit analysis and comparison of delivering Years 11 and 12 in every High and District School, when compared to its delivery in the College system, in what is now an established 12-year-old policy position;
 - (b) What is preventing the Government from conducting a fully independent review or inquiry in the efficacy of having Y11 and 12 in every High and District School in what is now an established 12-year-old policy position;
 - (c) Has the Government studied the specialist senior secondary Year 11 and 12 government Colleges in the ACT, NSW and VIC to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the functionality of those systems, and how they operate in an integrated public education system;
 - (d) What other Government policy areas and programs involving the expenditure of at least \$200m over 10 years have not been subject to a review or revision; and
 - (e) Given the \$228m in Operational Efficiencies expected from DECYP, what level of operational efficiencies in Extension Schools within a 10km, 20km and 30km radius of the local College would be gained from reallocating the Year 11 and 12 staff teams to other DECYP teaching vacancies, and transferring Year 11 and 12 enrolments to the local College?
- (3) Regarding the transfer of non-government school students enrolments into Years 11 and 12 in government schools:
- (a) Over the last three years, what are the number of non-government school students that have transferred their enrolment into Year 11 or Year 12 in government Colleges;
 - (b) Over the last three years, what are the number of non-government school students that have transferred their enrolment into Year 11 or Year 12 in Extension Schools; and
 - (c) What is the distribution of all those enrolments from non-government school students into Years 11 and 12 in government schools in terms of the north west, northern and southern regions?

The Minister answered:

1(a)

School	Year 11 students	Year 12 students
Bayview Secondary College	45	33
Brighton High School	13	14
Brooks High School	-	-
Burnie High School	8	<5
Campania District School	<5	<5
Clarence High School	<5	-
Cosgrove High School	-	<5
Cressy District High School	<5	-
Devonport High School	19	18
Exeter High School	11	<5
Hobart City High School	19	9
Huonville High School	33	24
JRLF - Senior School	20	14
Kings Meadows High School	<5	-
Kingston High School	6	-
Latrobe High School	5	8
Launceston Big Picture School	24	18
Lilydale District School	<5	12
Montrose Bay High School	-	-
New Norfolk High School	18	11
North West Support School	6	10
Northern Support School	9	8
Parklands High School	6	6
Penguin District School	<5	-
Prospect High School	6	-
Queechy High School	9	7
Reece High School	<5	<5
Riverside High School	5	<5
Rose Bay High School	<5	-
Sheffield School	6	7
Sorell School	44	32
Southern Support School	6	10
Taroona High School	31	17
Ulverstone Secondary College	63	43
Woodbridge School	8	<5
Wynyard High School	8	<5
Yolla District School	15	15

Notes:

1. All numbers reported are from Census 1, 2026
2. Year 13 students are included in the Year 12 count.
3. Empty cells containing '-' indicates a student count is 0.
4. Counts of fewer than 5 are suppressed to protect privacy.
5. Total headcount includes all students undertaking some part of their enrolment at the school, even if the majority of their courses are at another school or College. As a result, students may be counted against multiple schools.

(1)(b)

School	Year 11 students	Year 12 students
Bayview Secondary College	14	5
Brighton High School	<5	-
Brooks High School	-	-
Burnie High School	8	<5

Campania District School	<5	-
Clarence High School	<5	-
Cosgrove High School	-	-
Cressy District High School	-	-
Devonport High School	-	-
Exeter High School	<5	<5
Hobart City High School	6	<5
Huonville High School	11	6
JRLF - Senior School	-	-
Kings Meadows High School	-	-
Kingston High School	6	-
Latrobe High School	<5	<5
Launceston Big Picture School	<5	-
Lilydale District School	<5	<5
Montrose Bay High School	-	-
New Norfolk High School	-	-
North West Support School	-	-
Northern Support School	-	-
Parklands High School	5	6
Penguin District School	<5	-
Prospect High School	6	-
Queechy High School	<5	-
Reece High School	-	-
Riverside High School	5	<5
Rose Bay High School	-	-
Sheffield School	<5	<5
Sorell School	22	25
Southern Support School	<5	-
Taroona High School	28	11
Ulverstone Secondary College	11	6
Woodbridge School	8	<5
Wynyard High School	5	-
Yolla District School	15	15

Notes:

1. All numbers reported are from Census 1, 2026
2. Year 13 students are included in the Year 12 count.
3. Empty cells containing '-' indicates a student count is 0.
4. Counts of fewer than 5 are suppressed to protect privacy.
5. The count shows the number of students undertaking some part of their enrolment at the school and some part of their enrolment at a College.
6. The number of students in any kind of shared enrolment is likely to be higher than the count shown here, as students may share their enrolment between two extension schools, or with the Tasmanian eSchool.

(1)(c)

School	CC	DC	EC	He C	Ho C	LC	NC	RC
Ashley School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bayview Secondary College	<5	-	-	-	-	-	-	18
Bothwell District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brighton High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<5
Brooks High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burnie High School	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
Campania District School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<5

Campbell Town District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cape Barren Island School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clarence High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<5
Cosgrove High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cressy District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deloraine High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Devonport High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dover District School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Exeter High School	-	-	-	-	-	<5	-	-
Flinders Island District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Glenora District School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hobart City High School	-	-	7	-	<5	-	-	-
Huonville High School	-	-	-	-	17	-	-	-
JRLF - Senior School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
King Island District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kings Meadows High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kingston High School	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-
Latrobe High School	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Launceston Big Picture School	-	-	-	-	-	-	<5	-
Lilydale District School	-	-	-	-	-	<5	<5	-
Montrose Bay High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mountain Heights School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Norfolk High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North West Support School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Support School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oatlands District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parklands High School	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
Penguin District School	-	-	-	<5	-	-	-	-
Port Dalrymple School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prospect High School	-	-	-	-	-	<5	<5	-
Queechy High School	-	-	-	-	-	<5	-	-
Reece High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Riverside High School	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-
Rose Bay High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rosebery District School	-	-	-	<5	-	-	-	-
Scottsdale High School	-	-	-	-	-	<5	<5	-
Sheffield School	-	<5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smithton High School	-	-	-	<5	-	-	-	-
Sorell School	<5	-	-	-	<5	-	-	45
Southern Support School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<5
St Helens District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St Marys District School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taroona High School	-	-	<5	-	35	-	-	<5
Tasman District School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<5
Tasmanian eSchool	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Triabunna District School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ulverstone Secondary College	-	15	-	<5	-	-	-	-
Winnaleah District High School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Woodbridge School	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-
Wynyard High School	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
Yolla District School	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-

Notes:

1. All numbers reported are from Census 1, 2026

2. Column headings refer to Claremont College, Don College, Elizabeth College, Hellyer College, Hobart College, Launceston College, Newstead College and Rosny College respectively
3. All Year 11, 12 and 13 students are included.
4. Empty cells containing '-' indicates a student count is 0.
5. Counts of fewer than 5 are suppressed to protect privacy.
6. The count shows the number of students undertaking some part of their enrolment at the school and some part of their enrolment at a College.
7. The number of students in any kind of shared enrolment is likely to be higher than the count shown here, as students may share their enrolment between two extension schools, or with the Tasmanian eSchool.

1(d)

School	Year 11 students	Year 12 students
Ashley School	5	6
Bothwell District High School	-	-
Campbell Town District High School	<5	<5
Cape Barren Island School	-	-
Deloraine High School	6	9
Dover District School	-	-
Flinders Island District High School	<5	-
Glenora District School	7	9
King Island District High School	-	-
Mountain Heights School	7	5
Oatlands District High School	<5	-
Port Dalrymple School	13	12
Rosebery District School	<5	<5
Scottsdale High School	14	18
Smithton High School	28	21
St Helens District High School	11	10
St Marys District School	7	7
Tasman District School	<5	<5
Tasmanian eSchool*	64	79
Triabunna District School	5	7
Winnaleah District High School	<5	<5

Notes:

1. All numbers reported are from Census 1, 2026
2. Year 13 students are included in the Year 12 count.
3. Empty cells containing '-' indicates a student count is 0.
4. Counts of fewer than 5 are suppressed to protect privacy.
5. Total headcount includes all students undertaking some part of their enrolment at the school, even if the majority of their courses are at another school or College. As a result, students may be counted against multiple schools.
6. *The Tasmanian eSchool is physically located within 30km of a College, however as it is an online provider servicing students statewide, interstate and overseas, it is not considered to be 'close' to a College for the purposes of this question.

1(e)

School	Year 11 students	Year 12 students
Ashley School	-	-
Bothwell District High School	-	-
Campbell Town District High School	-	<5

Cape Barren Island School	-	-
Deloraine High School	-	<5
Dover District School	-	-
Flinders Island District High School	<5	-
Glenora District School	<5	<5
King Island District High School	-	-
Mountain Heights School	-	-
Oatlands District High School	<5	-
Port Dalrymple School	-	-
Rosebery District School	<5	<5
Scottsdale High School	7	8
Smithton High School	<5	<5
St Helens District High School	<5	<5
St Marys District School	-	-
Tasman District School	<5	<5
Triabunna District School	<5	<5
Winnaleah District High School	<5	-

Notes:

1. All numbers reported are from Census 1, 2026
2. Year 13 students are included in the Year 12 count.
3. Empty cells containing '-' indicates a student count is 0.
4. Counts of fewer than 5 are suppressed to protect privacy.
5. The count shows the number of students undertaking some part of their enrolment at the school and some part of their enrolment at a College or the Tasmanian eSchool. (Note this is different to the response to question 1b, which refers to a College only.)
6. The number of students in any kind of shared enrolment may be slightly higher than the count shown here, as students may share their enrolment between two extension schools.
7. The Tasmanian eSchool is not shown as it is not appropriate for this context.

- (2)(a) The Department for Education, Children and Young People (DECYP) regularly evaluates evidence, data and stakeholder feedback to inform policy development.

What current evidence shows is extension schools are servicing a different cohort from colleges, with higher levels of learning plans, disability adjustments, socio-economic disadvantage, First Nations identification and part-time enrolment.

Whilst colleges provide a broader range of subjects, specialist facilities and diverse learning opportunities, extension schools help maintain local access and support flexible pathways that help students remain engaged in education.

The Government's focus is not on where students are enrolled, it is on ensuring students are participating, progressing and successfully transitioning into further education, training, or employment.

While a formal review of the Extension School model is not currently underway, the Department continues to monitor participation, attainment, and learner outcomes across the education system.

This work occurs alongside broader strategic reform activity, including implementation of the Independent Education Review recommendations, development of the Tasmanian Definition of Educational Success, and Education TOGETHER. These activities provide opportunities to consider how the education system supports learners across all phases of education, including senior secondary schooling.

- (2)(b) The Government has no current plans to commission an independent review specifically focused on the Years 11 and 12 Extension School program. The policy has been implemented to improve access, equity and participation in senior secondary education by providing students with greater choice about where and how they complete Years 11 and 12.

Available evidence continues to demonstrate demand for local senior secondary options, including in communities located within 30km of a college.

The Department will continue to consider available evidence, stakeholder feedback and emerging priorities in determining future policy and service delivery directions.

- (2)(c) Developments across Australian jurisdictions and national and international evidence are considered regularly. This includes consideration of a range of approaches to senior secondary education delivery, incorporating, but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- approaches to curriculum design and delivery;
- assessment; senior secondary certification;
- school and college models;
- rural and regional provision;
- responses to low enrolments or workforce pressures;
- partnerships with universities;
- registered training organisations and industry; and
- strategies used to support student participation, retention, attainment and transition to further education, training or employment.

- (2)(d) Responsibility for program evaluation and review sits with individual agencies and portfolios.

More broadly, Government programs are subject to a range of governance, budget, performance reporting, audit, evaluation and assurance processes, with the nature and frequency of reviews varying according to the and scale of the initiative.

The Department continues to monitor participation, attainment, workforce and learner outcome data as part of routine business activities.

- (2)(e) What the available evidence shows is that many Extension Schools within 30km of a college continue to attract Year 11 and 12 enrolments, with the majority of these students choosing to study at their local school and not a dual enrolment with a college.

These choices reflect the value students and families place on local senior secondary options, including familiar teachers, established support networks, smaller learning environments, connection to their local community and an educational setting that best meets their individual learning and wellbeing needs.

It cannot be assumed that all students would simply transfer to a college if local provision were removed; some may choose different pathways and some may disengage from education altogether.

As a result, it is not possible to reliably estimate enrolment movements, workforce impacts or efficiencies arising from a hypothetical change of this nature.

The Government remains focused on supporting participation, engagement and educational outcomes by maintaining meaningful pathways that keep students connected to learning

- (3)(a) See below table (Question 3B).

- (3)(b) DECYP has advised it does not hold formal numbers of such transfers, but can report students new to its system in these years.

School Type	2024	2025	2026
Colleges	874	868	940
Extension Schools	79	68	68
Total	929	924	984

Notes:

1. Students in Years 11, 12 and 13 are counted, where they did not appear as enrolled in a government school in either Census 1 or Census 2 in the year prior (ie 'new' to the DECYP system).
2. Students are counted where they are doing any part of their enrolment at a school; students in a shared enrolment between an extension school and a College will be counted in both rows.
3. The total shows the total count of unique students who are 'new' to the DECYP system.

3(c)

Region	2024	2025	2026
North	192	195	199
North West	121	122	144
South	617	613	642
Total	929	924	984

Notes:

1. Students in Years 11, 12 and 13 are counted, where they did not appear as enrolled in a government school in either Census 1 or Census 2 in the year prior (ie 'new' to the DECYP system).
2. Students are counted where they are doing any part of their enrolment at a school; students in a shared enrolment that crosses region boundaries will be counted in both rows.
3. The total shows the total count of unique students who are 'new' to the DECYP system

Ordered, That Ms *Palmer*, have leave to Table data related to Year 11 and 12 students.

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

- (1) Tasmanian Health Service: Annual Service Plan 2026-27.
- (2) Commissioner for Children and Young People Tasmania: Annual Report 2025-26.
- (3) *Vehicle and Traffic Act 1999*: Statutory Rules 2026, No. 28, Vehicle and Traffic (Heavy Vehicle Charges) Amendment Regulations 2026.
- (4) *Inland Fisheries Act 1995*: Statutory Rules 2026, No. xx, Inland Fisheries Amendment Regulations 2026.
- (5) *Inland Fisheries Act 1995*: Statutory Rules 2026, No. xx, Inland Fisheries (Seasons and Waters) Amendment Order 2026.
- (6) *Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012*: Rail Safety National Law National Regulations (Fees) Amendment Regulations 2026.
- (7) *Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012*: Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Act 2025, Act No. 26 of 2025.
- (8) *Land Acquisition Act 1993*: Notice of Acquisition of land under Section 18, comprising areas of land containing 91.4 m²; 606.0 m²; 2531.0 m²; 543.0 m²; 408.0 m²; and 2.668 ha situate in Tasman Highway – Great Eastern Drive – Road Widening and Realignment – North of Triabunna. Municipal Area of Glamorgan-Spring Bay.
- (9) *Land Acquisition Act 1993*: Notice of Acquisition of land under Section 18, comprising area of land containing 238.0 m² situate in Tasman Highway – Great Eastern Drive – Road Widening and Realignment – North of Triabunna. Municipal Area of Glamorgan-Spring Bay.

23 DISCLOSURE OF MEMBER'S INTERESTS.— In accordance with Sections 19 and 20 of the *Parliamentary (Disclosure of Interests) Act 1996* the Clerk of the Council laid upon the Table of the Council the Register of Members Interests for the electorate of Huon.

The Primary Return having been lodged with the President and this day Tabled and placed on the public record, is deemed to have been published.

24 LEAVE TO TABLE DOCUMENT.— *Ordered*, That Ms *Ratray* have leave to table an answer to a Question taken on Notice during consideration of Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 2026.

25 BIO METRIC HEALTH DATA.— Ms *Ratray* laid upon the Table of the Council an answer to a question taken on notice during the consideration of Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 2026 regarding bio metric health data.

26 LEAVE TO TABLE DOCUMENT.— *Ordered*, That Mr *Vincent* have leave to table an a document.

27 TT LINE CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING FUEL SURCHARGE.—

Mr *Vincent* laid upon the Table of the most recent correspondence from the TT Lines regarding the fuel surcharge.

28 ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.— The President read a Message from Her Excellency the Governor as follows:

MESSAGE

Caroline Wells, Governor

A Bill for An Act for the appropriation of \$9 104 688 000 out of the Public Account for the services of the Government for the financial year ending on 30 June 2027

Appropriation Act (No. 1) 2026
(Bill No. 18 of 2026; *Act No. 7 of 2026*)

A Bill for An Act for the appropriation of \$62 913 000 out of the Public Account for the services of the Government in respect of Parliament and Statutory Offices for the financial year ending on 30 June 2027

Appropriation Act (No. 2) 2026
(Bill No. 19 of 2026; *Act No. 8 of 2026*)

having been presented to the Governor for the Royal Assent, she has in the name of His Majesty the King, assented to the said Bills.

Government House, Hobart, 10 July 2026

29 ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.— The President read a Message from Her Excellency the Governor as follows:

MESSAGE

Caroline Wells, Governor

A Bill for An Act to amend the *First Home Owner Grant Act 2000*

First Home Owner Grant Amendment Act 2026
(Bill No. 20 of 2026; *Act No. 9 of 2026*)

A Bill for An Act to amend the *Public Health Act 1997*

Public Health Amendment (Prohibited Tobacco and Other Products) Act 2026
(Bill No. 8 of 2026; *Act No. 10 of 2026*)

having been presented to the Governor for the Royal Assent, she has in the name of His Majesty the King, assented to the said Bills.

Government House, Hobart, 10 July 2026

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

- (1) Ms *Webb* – Kingston Men’s Shed’s Cancer Council Morning Tea;
- (2) Ms *Forrest* – Burnie Musical Society – The Wizard of Oz;
- (3) Ms *Palmer* – Christina Holmdahl;
- (4) Mr *Duigan* – Hillwood Football Club Centenary;
- (5) Ms *Armitage* – Bloom Coffee in Launceston.

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

31 TIME LIMITS SESSIONAL ORDER.— A Motion was made (Ms *Armitage*) and the Question was proposed, That the Legislative Council agree that, for the duration of the 52nd Parliament (or until further order), the following Sessional Order apply to proceedings in the Legislative Council:

- (1) Application – this Sessional Order applies to:
 - (a) Second reading speeches on bills;
 - (b) Contributions during Committee stage consideration of a bill or matter (including multiple speaks);
 - (c) Third reading speeches on bills;
 - (d) Government or Private members’ motions;
 - (e) Contributions in response to Government or Private members’ motions;
- (2) Second Reading Speeches – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (3) Government or Private members’ motions – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the motion may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (4) Committee Stage – Time Limits
 - (a) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same question, in accordance with the Council’s procedures.
 - (b) Each contribution (“speak”) by a Member is limited to 15 minutes.
- (5) Committee Stage - Amendments
 - (a) The Member moving an amendment may speak up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same amendment in accordance with the Council’s Standing Orders.
 - (c) Each contribution (“speak”) by a Member is limited to 10 minutes.
- (6) Third Reading – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 10 minutes.
- (7) Inaugural Speech Time Limits
 - (a) A Member shall be entitled to speak for an unlimited period of time.
- (8) Extensions and Flexibility
 - (a) The time limits in clauses 2-4 may be extended:
 - (i) By leave of the Council; or
 - (ii) On motion, without notice, moved at any time by any Member and determined without debate.
 - (b) A Motion under 5(a)(ii) must specify:
 - (i) The Member(s) to whom the extension applies;
 - (ii) The additional time proposed; and
 - (iii) The reason why an extension is requested.
 - (c) Where a Member is addressing the question and is near the expiry of time, the Chair may allow the Member to conclude their remarks, consistent with orderly conduct of business.
- (9) Effect

This Sessional Order operates as a temporary Order of the Council for the purposes set out in Clause 1.

A Debate arose thereupon.

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

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

33 QUESTION TIME.— The President called for Questions without Notice. There were five Questions asked.

34 TIME LIMITS SESSIONAL ORDER.— The Council resumed the Debate on the Question, That the Legislative Council agree that, for the duration of the 52nd Parliament (or until further order), the following Sessional Order apply to proceedings in the Legislative Council:

- (1) Application – this Sessional Order applies to:
 - (a) Second reading speeches on bills;
 - (b) Contributions during Committee stage consideration of a bill or matter (including multiple speaks);
 - (c) Third reading speeches on bills;
 - (d) Government or Private members' motions;
 - (e) Contributions in response to Government or Private members' motions;
- (2) Second Reading Speeches – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (3) Government or Private members' motions – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the motion may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (4) Committee Stage – Time Limits
 - (a) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same question, in accordance with the Council's procedures.
 - (b) Each contribution ("speak") by a Member is limited to 15 minutes.
- (5) Committee Stage – Amendments
 - (a) The Member moving an amendment may speak up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same amendment in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders.
 - (c) Each contribution ("speak") by a Member is limited to 10 minutes.
- (6) Third Reading – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 10 minutes.
- (7) Inaugural Speech Time Limits
 - (a) A Member shall be entitled to speak for an unlimited period of time.
- (8) Extensions and Flexibility

- (a) The time limits in clauses 2-4 may be extended:
 - (i) By leave of the Council; or
 - (ii) On motion, without notice, moved at any time by any Member and determined without debate.
 - (b) A Motion under 5(a)(ii) must specify:
 - (i) The Member(s) to whom the extension applies;
 - (ii) The additional time proposed; and
 - (iii) The reason why an extension is requested.
 - (c) Where a Member is addressing the question and is near the expiry of time, the Chair may allow the Member to conclude their remarks, consistent with orderly conduct of business.
- (9) Effect
- This Sessional Order operates as a temporary Order of the Council for the purposes set out in Clause 1.

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

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

36 TIME LIMITS SESSIONAL ORDER.— The Council resumed the Debate on the Question, That the Legislative Council agree that, for the duration of the 52nd Parliament (or until further order), the following Sessional Order apply to proceedings in the Legislative Council:

- (1) Application – this Sessional Order applies to:
 - (a) Second reading speeches on bills;
 - (b) Contributions during Committee stage consideration of a bill or matter (including multiple speaks);
 - (c) Third reading speeches on bills;
 - (d) Government or Private members' motions;
 - (e) Contributions in response to Government or Private members' motions;
- (2) Second Reading Speeches – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (3) Government or Private members' motions – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the motion may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (4) Committee Stage – Time Limits
 - (a) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same question, in accordance with the Council's procedures.
 - (b) Each contribution ("speak") by a Member is limited to 15 minutes.
- (5) Committee Stage – Amendments
 - (a) The Member moving an amendment may speak up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same amendment in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders.

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

(9) Effect

This Sessional Order operates as a temporary Order of the Council for the purposes set out in Clause 1.

Amendments were proposed to be made to the Motion (Ms O'Connor):—

Leave out,

‘for the duration of the 52nd Parliament (or until further order), the following Sessional Order apply to proceedings in the Legislative Council’

After ‘That the Legislative Council agree that,’ *insert,*

‘the following proposed Sessional Order be referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consultation, consideration and report’

A Debate arose thereupon.

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

The Council divided.

AYES 3

Mr Gaffney
Ms O'Connor
Ms Webb (Teller)

NOES 9

Ms Armitage
Mr Duigan
Mr Edmunds
Ms Glade-Wright
Mr Hiscutt
Ms Lovell
Ms Palmer
Ms Thomas (Teller)
Mr Vincent

It passed in the Negative.

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

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

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

The Sitting was suspended at 7.15 o'clock p.m. and resumed at 8.14 o'clock p.m.

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

39 LEAVE OF ABSENCE.— *Ordered*, That the Honourable Member for Murchison, (Ms Forrest) be granted leave of absence from the service of the Council for the remainder of this day's sitting. (Ms Rattray)

40 TIME LIMITS SESSIONAL ORDER.— The Council resumed the Debate on the Question, That the Legislative Council agree that, for the duration of the 52nd Parliament (or until further order), the following Sessional Order apply to proceedings in the Legislative Council:

- (1) Application – this Sessional Order applies to:
 - (a) Second reading speeches on bills;
 - (b) Contributions during Committee stage consideration of a bill or matter (including multiple speaks);
 - (c) Third reading speeches on bills;
 - (d) Government or Private members' motions;
 - (e) Contributions in response to Government or Private members' motions;
- (2) Second Reading Speeches – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Second Reading may speak for up to 60 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (3) Government or Private members' motions – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the motion may speak for up to 60 minutes.
 - (b) Any other Member may speak for up to 60 minutes.
- (4) Committee Stage – Time Limits
 - (a) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same question, in accordance with the Council's procedures.
 - (b) Each contribution ("speak") by a Member is limited to 15 minutes.
- (5) Committee Stage – Amendments
 - (a) The Member moving an amendment may speak up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) Each Member may speak up to three (3) times to the same amendment in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders.
 - (c) Each contribution ("speak") by a Member is limited to 10 minutes.
- (6) Third Reading – Time Limits
 - (a) The Member moving the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes.
 - (b) The Member who moved the Third Reading may speak for up to 15 minutes in reply.
 - (c) Any other Member may speak for up to 10 minutes.
- (7) Inaugural Speech Time Limits
 - (a) A Member shall be entitled to speak for an unlimited period of time.

(8) Extensions and Flexibility

- (a) The time limits in clauses 2-4 may be extended:
 - (i) By leave of the Council; or
 - (ii) On motion, without notice, moved at any time by any Member and determined without debate.
- (b) A Motion under 5(a)(ii) must specify:
 - (i) The Member(s) to whom the extension applies;
 - (ii) The additional time proposed; and
 - (iii) The reason why an extension is requested.
- (c) Where a Member is addressing the question and is near the expiry of time, the Chair may allow the Member to conclude their remarks, consistent with orderly conduct of business.

(9) Effect

This Sessional Order operates as a temporary Order of the Council for the purposes set out in Clause 1.

Amendments were proposed to be made to the Motion (Ms Rattray):—

Paragraph (6)(a)

Leave out,

‘15 minutes’

Insert instead,

‘30 minutes’

Paragraph (6)(b)

Leave out,

‘15 minutes’

Insert instead,

‘30 minutes’

Paragraph (6)(c)

Leave out,

‘10 minutes’

Insert instead,

‘30 minutes’

Paragraph (8)(b)

Leave out,

‘5(a)(ii)’

Insert instead,

‘8(a)(ii)’

A Debate arose thereupon.

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

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

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

And the Question being put,

The Council divided.

AYES 9

Ms *Armitage*
Mr *Duigan*
Mr *Edmunds*
Ms *Glade-Wright*
Mr *Hiscutt*
Ms *Lovell* (Teller)
Ms *Palmer*
Ms *Thomas*
Mr *Vincent*

NOES 3

Mr *Gaffney* (Teller)
Ms *O'Connor*
Ms *Webb*

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

41 STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT: TIME LIMITS.— The President said —

“The previous Motion having passed in the Affirmative I wish to remind Members that the Sessional Order proposed by that Motion is now in effect.

For the purpose of today, that means Members are now limited to one hour in speaking to the remaining Notices of Motion and Order of the Day on today’s Order of Business.

The Clerks with the assistance of Parliamentary ICT are exploring a technical solution that will allow Members to see the time they have remaining to speak. Until that system is in place I would ask Members to take note of the time they start their contributions, though Clerks will be recording when each speech starts and running a timer to enable me to let Members know when their time has expired.”

42 BILL NO. 24.— Mr *Hiscutt* brought up the Statutory Holidays Amendment (Central Coast Municipality) Bill 2026.

And Mr *Hiscutt* having presented the said Bill, the same was read the First time, and ordered to be printed.

Ordered, That the Second reading of this Bill be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next. (Mr *Hiscutt*)

43 REPORT OF THE 2024-25 INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE CLIMATE CHANGE (STATE ACTION) ACT 2008.— A Motion was made (Ms *O'Connor*) and the Question was proposed,

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

A Debate arose thereupon.

And the Question being put,

It was resolved in the Affirmative.

44 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly has appointed:

- (1) Mr *Fairs* to serve on the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts in pursuance of Section 2, subsection (2) of the *Public Accounts Committee Act 1970*;
- (2) Ms *Howlett* to serve on the Joint Sessional Gender and Equality in place of Mr *Jaensch*;
- (3) Ms *Ogilvie* to serve on the Joint Select Committee on Energy Matters in place of Mr *Vermeij*;
- (4) Ms *Howlett* to serve on the Joint Sessional Committee on the Recommendations of the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry in place of Mr *Vermeij*; and

- (5) Ms *Ogilvie* to serve on the Joint Sessional Committee on the Parliamentary Library in the place of Mr *Shelton*.

House of Assembly, 11 August 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

45 BILL NO. 21.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly hath passed a Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to amend the *Duties Act 2001*, the *First Home Owner Grant Act 2000*, the *Land Tax Act 2000* and the *Taxation Administration Act 1997*’,

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

House of Assembly, 11 August 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

The Bill was read the First time.

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

46 BILL NO. 10.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly doth agree to the Amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to amend the *Local Government Act 1993*, the *Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2020*, the *Local Government (General) Regulations 2025* and the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2025*’.

House of Assembly, 11 August 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

47 BILL NO. 22.— A Message from the House of Assembly:—

MR PRESIDENT,

The House of Assembly hath passed a Bill, intituled — ‘A Bill for an Act to amend the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and the *Local Government (Building and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1993*’,

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

House of Assembly, 11 August 2026

JACQUIE PETRUSMA, *Speaker*

The Bill was read the First time.

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

48 ADJOURNMENT.— *Resolved*, That the Council will, at its rising adjourn until 11.00 o’clock a.m. on Wednesday, 12 August 2026. (Ms *Ratray*)

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

The Council adjourned at 10.17 o’clock p.m.

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

Briefing:

- *Police Offences Amendment Bill 2025*