



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2025 - 2026

(FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT)

NOTICES OF MOTION AND ORDERS OF THE DAY

No. 44

Thursday 20 August 2026

The Council meets at 11.00 am

Notices of Motion

1 Office of the Custodial Inspector Annual Report 2023-24

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 19 August 2025

To be moved:

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

2 Tasmania's Forest Carbon 2025 Update Report

Given by: Ms O'Connor

Date: 12 September 2025

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

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

3 Tasmanian Liquor and Gaming Commission Ministerial Direction

Given by: Ms *Webb*

Date: 23 September 2025

To be moved:

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

4 Tasmanian Planning Commission Final Integrated Assessment Report

Given by: Ms *O'Connor*

Date: 24 September 2025

To be moved:

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

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

Given by: Ms Armitage

Date: 4 November 2025

To be moved:

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

6 Independent Review into the actions taken in response to the information and concerns raised by the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 11 November 2025

To be moved:

That this House notes:

- (1) The independent review established in November 2023 and undertaken by former Australian Public Service Commissioner Peter Woolcott AO, known as the *Independent Review into the actions taken in response to the information and concerns raised by the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings*; and
- (2) The Independent Review's findings and recommendations.

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

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 3 December 2025

To be moved:

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

8 Commission of Inquiry – Susan Neill-Fraser Conviction

Given by: Mr Gaffney

Date: 3 December 2025

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

- (1) Notes there is no Criminal Cases Review Commission in Australia to enable the independent review of convictions post appeal, as is the case in other countries including the United Kingdom, Canada and New Zealand;
- (2) Notes the cases of Lindy Chamberlain, Kathleen Folbigg, Andrew Mallard and Henry Keogh, all of whom had their convictions for murder quashed following significant concerns being raised by supporters regarding miscarriages of justice having occurred in their respective cases;
- (3) Notes the body of evidence and material that has emerged since the conviction of Sue Neill-Fraser for the murder of Bob Chappell in 2010 that may raise doubt on the soundness

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

9 Honouring the Willow Court Historic Site

Given by: Mr *Gaffney*

Date: 10 December 2025

To be moved:

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

10 Tasmanian Human Rights Act

Given by: Ms *Webb*

Date: 10 December 2025

To be moved:

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

11 Banning the Use of Character References During Sentencing

Given by: Mr *Edmunds*

Date: 6 March 2026

To be moved:

That the Legislative Council:

- (1) Notes:

- (a) Announcements and reforms in other states and territories to ban the use of character references during the sentencing of convicted criminals;
- (b) The calls by advocates to follow the lead of other Australian jurisdictions such as Victoria, ACT and NSW; and
- (c) The 'Your Reference Aint Relevant' campaign which has driven these changes; and
- (2) Calls on the Tasmanian Government to introduce legislation in Tasmania to ban the use of character references in sentencing in this state.

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

Given by: Ms Lovell

Date: 20 May 2026

To be moved:

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

13 Encyclical Letter Magnifica Humanitas of His Holiness Pope Leo XIV

Given by: Ms O'Connor

Date: 28 May 2026

To be moved:

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

14 Overdue Government Response to UTAS Committee Report

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

(1) That the Legislative Council notes:

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

(2) That the Legislative Council further notes that:

- (a) The Expert Council on University Governance, formerly referred to as the Expert Governance Council, presented its *Final Report and Principles* to Education Ministers in mid-2025, with the report formally considered by the Ministers at their meeting on 17 October 2025;
 - (b) The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency released its updated *Statement of Regulatory Expectations: Compliance with workplace obligations* in May 2025; and
 - (c) Despite both pieces of work completed and released since last year, the government has still not provided a formal response to the Select Committee Inquiry's Final Report;
- (3) That the Legislative Council also notes the Senate Education and Employment Legislation Committee tabled its Final Report on the *Quality of governance at Australian higher education providers*, on 11 December 2025, which is highly relevant to the University of Tasmania and its Act;
- (4) And that the Legislative Council calls on the Tasmanian government to:
- (a) Provide a formal and comprehensive response in the Parliament to the Select Committee Inquiry into the Provisions of the *University of Tasmania Act 1992* Final Report, which specifically addresses all findings and recommendations made; and
 - (b) Deliver that response before the Parliament rises at the end of this calendar year.

15 Analysis of Economics of Marinus Link 2026 Update Report

Given by: Ms O'Connor

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

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

16 Fragrance Sensitivity Recognition Accommodation and Public Awareness

Given by: Ms Forrest

Date: 23 June 2026

To be moved:

(1) The Legislative Council notes:

- (a) fragrance sensitivity, also referred to as multiple chemical sensitivity in its broader form, is a documented and often debilitating health condition affecting a significant proportion of the Australian and Tasmanian population, characterised by adverse physiological responses to fragranced consumer products including perfumes, colognes, air fresheners, cleaning products, and scented personal care items;
- (b) peer-reviewed research published in *Air Quality, Atmosphere & Health* (Steinemann, 2019), drawing on nationally representative surveys across four countries including Australia, found that:
 - (i) approximately one in three adults in Australia (33 per cent), report adverse health effects from fragranced consumer products;
 - (ii) commonly reported health problems include respiratory difficulties, mucosal symptoms, migraine headaches, skin rashes, and asthma attacks;

- (iii) 7.7 per cent of Australians had lost workdays or a job in the past year due to illness from fragranced product exposure in the workplace;
 - (iv) A single application of perfume can release over 100 different chemical compounds into the air, many of which are not listed on product labels due to trade secret protections;
 - (v) fragrance-free policies have been implemented in workplaces, schools, health care facilities, public buildings, and other indoor environments around the world, and national surveys indicate that more people prefer fragrance-free rather than fragranced environments;
 - (vi) among the general population, 47.8 per cent would support a fragrance-free policy in the workplace, compared to only 20.4 per cent who would not.
- (2) The Legislative Council acknowledges:
- (a) fragrance sensitivity is an invisible condition and this invisibility contributes to a pattern of scepticism, dismissal, and minimisation that compounds the burden on those living with the condition, creates barriers to disclosure, and discourages people from seeking workplace accommodations or participating fully in public life;
 - (b) fragrance sensitivity can have a profound impact on people's professional and personal lives, including their ability to maintain employment, attend events, access public spaces, and perform their work, and many Tasmanians living with this condition do so largely in silence for fear of disbelief or ridicule;
 - (c) fragrance sensitivity is a legitimate and debilitating health issue deserving of the same seriousness afforded to other airborne health triggers, including cigarette smoke and known allergens;
 - (d) workplaces, government and public institutions should develop and implement fragrance-awareness or fragrance-reduction policies as a reasonable and practical measure to support access and inclusion;
 - (e) the culture surrounding invisible illness needs to change, and institutions have a role to play in modelling respectful, evidence-informed responses to accommodation requests; and
 - (f) those who raise health and accessibility concerns in institutional settings are entitled to have those concerns treated with confidentiality, dignity, and professionalism.
- (3) That the Legislative Council calls on the Government to:
- (a) consider what steps can be taken within government services and public institutions to reduce fragrance exposure and support those with fragrance-related health conditions;
 - (b) consider whether public health guidance on fragrance sensitivity could be developed or promoted to assist employers, event organisers, schools, and health care facilities; and
 - (c) reflect on the importance of maintaining confidentiality and trust when individuals raise health and accessibility concerns in professional or institutional contexts.

17 Environment Tasmania's Map the Crap Campaign

Given by: Ms Glade-Wright

Date: 12 August 2026

To be moved:

- (1) Notes the concerns raised by Environment Tasmania's *Map the Crap* campaign (www.mapthecrap.com.au) about under-treated sewage released into Tasmania's waterways during bypass events, including the claim that more than 635 million litres of under-treated sewage were released during 2024–25.
- (2) Notes that the majority of bypass events involve skipping secondary treatment before discharge, and that Environment Tasmania states under-treated sewage can contain pathogens, nutrients and other contaminants that pose risks to human health and waterways.
- (3) Acknowledges that Tasmanians use waterways for swimming, paddling, rowing, boating and fishing, and that Department of Health advice states recreational waters may be a public health risk if contaminated and that not all beaches and rivers are regularly monitored.
- (4) Further notes that TasWater owns and operates 110 sewage treatment plants, and that TasWater's 2024–25 Annual Performance Report states only 10 of those plants currently meet all environmental licence conditions.
- (5) Recognises that existing EPA Tasmania sewage spill notification guidelines require notifiable spills to be reported to EPA Tasmania within 24 hours and critically notifiable spills within 2 hours, but that Environment Tasmania is calling for public-facing real-time monitoring and alert systems so communities can make informed decisions as events occur.
- (6) Affirms that Tasmanians have a right to timely, accessible and reliable information about sewage pollution risks in the waterways they use.
- (7) Calls on the Tasmanian Government to work with TasWater, EPA Tasmania, the Department of Health and local councils to:
 - (a) Consider funding real-time or near-real-time monitoring at all TasWater sewage treatment plants and key bypass/outfall points;
 - (b) Consider creating a public live map, website and alert system for bypass events, and publishing quarterly reports on bypass events, compliance, public alerts and progress in reducing bypass reliance; and
 - (c) Report to Parliament within six months on implementation, costs, timeframes and to achieve the above.

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

Given by: Ms O'Connor

Date: 12 August 2026

To be moved:

- (1) Notes:
 - (a) The Australian Medical Association (AMA) Tasmania Briefing Paper, 'Antibiotic use in Tasmania Salmon Farming, Antimicrobial Resistance and Human Health';

- (b) The Briefing Paper background statement that, *“Antibiotic use in open marine aquaculture is well documented to carry risks of environmental persistence, development of resistant bacteria, and eventual spread of resistance genes into human, animal, and environmental microbiomes”*;
 - (c) Its call for the precautionary principle to guide antibiotic use in aquaculture, noting that, *“Deploying Florfenicol in Tasmanian waters under emergency powers, without comprehensive assessment or monitoring, carries demonstrable public health and environmental risks”*; and
- (2) Recognises AMA Tasmania has recommended:
- (a) Cessation of emergency antibiotic approvals pending full Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA) registration, including complete environmental risk assessment and public consultation;
 - (b) Comprehensive baseline and ongoing monitoring of antibiotic residues, resistant bacteria, and resistance genes in water, sediments, and wild fish around aquaculture sites;
 - (c) Mandatory timely transparency on all antibiotic use in aquaculture including in hatcheries with publicly accessible reporting of quantities, timing and site locations;
 - (d) Adoption of a “One Health” framework to ensure aquaculture decisions consider public health impacts and antibiotic microbial resistance risks;
 - (e) Investment in and exploration of alternative control measures such as; vaccines, improved husbandry, reduced stocking densities (to reduce dependence on antibiotics), investment in new technologies that remove effluent and dosed food for safe disposal;
 - (f) Independent scientific oversight of any antibiotic use proposals, including peer review by environmental microbiologists and infectious disease specialists;
- (3) Calls on the Tasmanian Government to apply the precautionary principle to the use of Florfenicol in Tasmanian waters, and to prioritise public and environmental health in line with the AMA Tasmania recommendations

19 Closure of Hobart Hospitality Businesses

Given by: Mr Edmunds

Date: 13 August 2026

To be moved:

That the Council:

- (1) Notes that seven well-known Hobart hospitality venues - Cargo Bar, Jack Greene, Post Street Social, Observatory Bar, Republic Bar, Franklin Wharf Restaurant and Bar and Franklin Wharf Function Centre - closed after the Pub Banc Group entered voluntary administration;
- (2) Further notes that more than 80 Tasmanian workers were stood down as a result;
- (3) Recognises the enormous social, cultural and economic benefits that come from Tasmania’s hospitality sector and acknowledges the significant pressure facing the sector, including rising operational costs and weaker discretionary spending;

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

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

Given by: Ms Webb

Date: 18 August 2026

To be moved:

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

Orders of the Day

General Business

- 1 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 9 of 2026) Follow-up of the Report of the Auditor-General ICT Strategy, Critical Systems and Investment (No. 4 of 2020-21)**
 Mover: Ms Forrest
 Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 26 March 2026
 Status: Report to be considered and noted
- 2 [Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill 2026 \(14 of 2026\)](#)**
 Mover: Ms Lovell
 Date: Reported without amendment by the Committee of the Whole Council on 18 August 2026
 Status: Awaiting Third reading
- 3 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 18 of 2026) Review of the Tasmanian Fiscal Sustainability Report 2026**
 Mover: Ms Forrest
 Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 19 May 2026
 Status: Report to be considered and noted

- 4 Interim Report of the Joint Select Committee on Energy Matters (No. 17 of 2026) Inquiry into Energy Prices and Related Matters in Tasmania**
Mover: Ms *Forrest*
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 21 May 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted
- 5 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 19 of 2026) Establishment of a Parliamentary Budget Office**
Mover: Ms *Thomas*
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 23 June 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted
- 6 Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (No. 27 of 2026) 18th Australasian Council of Public Accounts Committees (ACPAC) Conference**
Mover: Ms *Thomas*
Date: Report tabled and made an Order of the Day on 23 June 2026
Status: Report to be considered and noted
- 7 [Statutory Holidays Amendment \(Central Coast Municipality\) Bill 2026 \(24 of 2026\)](#)**
Mover: Mr *Hiscutt*
Date: Read a First time on 11 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

Orders of the Day

Government Business

- 1 [Occupational Licensing Amendment Bill 2026 \(6 of 2026\)](#)**
Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Reported without amendment by the Committee of the Whole Council on 19 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Third reading
- 2 [Residential Tenancy Amendment \(Safety Modifications\) Bill 2025 \(59 of 2025\)](#)**
Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Reported without amendment by the Committee of the Whole Council on 19 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Third reading
- 3 [Justice and Related Legislation \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill \(No. 2\) \(39 of 2025\)](#)**
Mover: Ms *Ratray*
Date: Read a First time on 19 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading

- 4** [Justice and Related Legislation \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill 2026 \(12 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 28 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 5** [Taxation and Related Legislation \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill 2026 \(21 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 11 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 6** [Charities and Associations Law \(Miscellaneous\) Amendment Bill 2025 \(65 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 26 March 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 7** [Land Use Planning and Approvals \(Miscellaneous Amendments\) Bill 2026 \(22 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 11 August 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 8** [Short Stay Levy Bill 2026 \(13 of 2026\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 9** [Integrity Commission Amendment \(Mandatory Notifications\) Bill 2025 \(69 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 15 May 2026
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 10** [Public Accounts Committee Amendment Bill 2025 \(49 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Ms Rattray*
Date: Read a First time on 23 September 2025
Status: Awaiting Second reading
- 11** [Greyhound Racing Legislation Amendments \(Phasing Out Reform\) Bill 2025 \(66 of 2025\)](#)
Mover: *Mr Vincent*
Status: Second reading debate adjourned on 15 April 2026 (*Mr Edmunds*)
Spoken: *Mr Vincent, Ms Rattray, Mr Hiscutt, Ms Forrest, Mr Edmunds*

Tuesday 25 August 2026

Orders of the Day

Government Business

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

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

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

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

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

14 Partition Amendment Bill 2025 (Bill No. 35)

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

Awaiting Government Response

Questions on Notice

41 Ministerial Code of Conduct

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

Question:

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

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

- (a) Section 9.5;
- (b) Section 9.6; and
- (c) Section 9.7

43 MyState Bank Arena Lease

Asked by: Ms Thomas

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

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

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

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

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

- (12) What assurance can the Government provide that the lease arrangements for the Stadium at Macquarie Point is being negotiated in the best interests of Tasmanians, rather than the best interests of the AFL or Cricket Australia as the proposed head tenants?

45 Competitive Neutrality Entura

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Minister for Energy and Renewables

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

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

- (1) Hydro Tasmania has stated that Entura directs around 60 per cent of its effort to Hydro Tasmania.
 - (a) What share of Entura's revenue, in both percentage and dollar terms, came from Hydro Tasmania and related State entities in each of the last three financial years;
 - (b) Over the same period, what proportion of Hydro Tasmania's contestable engineering, testing and commissioning work was awarded to Entura without an open competitive tender; and
 - (c) What is the policy basis for directing that work to Entura rather than openly tendering it to the Tasmanian market, and absent competitive tension, how is value for money demonstrated?
- (2) When Entura tenders against private firms, how is full cost attribution applied so that no advantage arises from Hydro Tasmania ownership, including cost of capital, tax equivalent payments, guarantees and shared overhead?
- (3)
 - (a) Does Entura's external pricing include a competitive neutrality adjustment as contemplated by the national competition policy principles; and
 - (b) if so, how is it calculated, and who verifies it?
- (4) What is Entura's published operating model, and how does it define the niche it was established to serve versus services already supplied by Tasmanian private firms?
- (5) Given that Entura's results are consolidated into Hydro Tasmania's accounts, will the Minister request Hydro Tasmania publish Entura's revenue split between internal and external work, and the competitive neutrality measures it applies?
- (6) Has the Tasmanian Economic Regulator ever assessed Entura for competitive neutrality compliance, and if not, would the shareholder Ministers refer the matter?
- (7) Given Marinus Link and the broader transmission pipeline, what steps is Hydro Tasmania taking to maximise contestable participation by Tasmanian private firms rather than directing work to Entura?
- (8) Will the shareholder Ministers commit to a competitive neutrality review of Entura's operating model and report the outcome to Parliament?
- (9) What share of Entura's revenue comes from clients other than Hydro Tasmania, and what share from interstate and overseas work?

- (10) (a) Is Entura's national and international commercial expansion within the charter Hydro Tasmania was established under, and have the shareholder Ministers and the Board sanctioned it; and
 - b) if so, please provide an explanation?
- (11) What public capital and commercial risk are committed to that interstate and overseas activity, and is Entura's performance reported to Parliament separately from Hydro Tasmania's core results?

46 **Hydro Tasmania Generation Assets**

Asked by: Ms Forrester

To: Minister for Energy and Renewables

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

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

- (1) Please provide a breakdown of electricity generated (in GWh) by each of the 30 power stations in the fleet for:
 - (a) the 2025 drought year;
 - (b) the 2022 above-average year; and
 - (c) the 1994–1996 baseline period used to set the original REC baseline figures?
- (2) Are there any power stations in the fleet where generation output has declined materially relative to historical averages for hydrological reasons that are comparable, and if so, is this attributable to asset condition rather than inflows?
- (3) Following the transformer fire at Reece power station, what full independent review of transformer condition across the Hydro Tasmania generation fleet was undertaken:
 - (a) What were the findings, and
 - (b) what remediation actions have been completed or are planned?
- (4) (a) Has Hydro Tasmania engaged any external engineering assessment of the overall condition of its generation fleet in the past five years; and
 - (b) if so, what were the key findings of that assessment regarding life expectancy of critical components including turbines, stators, transformers and penstocks?
- (5) (a) How many transformers across the Hydro generation fleet have been assessed as requiring replacement or significant refurbishment;
 - (b) what is the estimated capital cost; and
 - (c) what is the estimated timeline for that work?
- (6) Please provide a breakdown by power station of the number of generating units across the fleet that are currently offline for:
 - (a) Maintenance;
 - (b) Refurbishment; and/or
 - (c) unplanned reasons?
- (7) Regarding the Gordon Number 2 major refurbishment:
 - (a) what was the original expected completion date; and
 - (b) if the works continue or continued beyond that date:
 - (i) when was it, or is expected to be completed; and

- (ii) what was the original budget and the total cost to date or completion?
- (8) Regarding the following refurbishments to Poatina 2 machine, Lemonthyme, recently completed in the past 5 years are Poatina 3, Rowallan, Lake Echo, Trevallyn 1 and 2, Wilmot, for each, please advise:
 - (a) what was the original expected completion date; and
 - (i) when were the works completed; and
 - (b) what was the original budget; and
 - (ii) what was the total cost to date or completion?
- (9) Please provide a breakdown by power station of number of generating units across the fleet that are currently offline and indicate the expected return-to-service date for each.
- (10) (a) What is the total capital expenditure budget allocated for asset maintenance, refurbishment and replacement of generation assets in the 2026–27 financial year; and
 - (b) how does this compare to the previous two financial years?

48 Payment in Lieu of Rates Scheme for Renewable Energy Generation

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Minister for Energy and Renewables

Date: 23 June 2026

Question:

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

- (1) Renewable generation plant is currently classified as a chattel rather than a capital improvement to land, and is therefore not rateable in the ordinary way.
 - (a) What is the legal or administrative origin of this classification, and has the Government reviewed whether it remains appropriate given the scale of current and committed wind, solar and battery investment in Tasmania; and
 - (b) does this classification apply equally to Hydro Tasmania's generating assets, and if so, has the Minister sought advice on whether it is consistent with the Commonwealth's competitive neutrality framework?
- (2) Does the Minister support, in principle, a nationally consistent rating treatment for renewable generation assets (i.e. PiLoR), given operators of multi-state portfolios already budget for and accept this model elsewhere?
- (3) Has the Minister or the Department had any direct engagement with any windfarm operators or proponents, on the rates treatment of their Tasmanian current or future assets, including any complaints or concerns raised about administrative complexity under the current multi-landholder valuation approach?

59 Human Resources Transformation Project

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 11 August 2026

Question:

- (1) With regard to the Human Resources Transformation Project (H RTP), that is the re-scoped Human Resources Information System (HRIS) transferred from the Department of Health to the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC):
 - (a) What is the total number of contracts awarded in connection with the H RTP to date?
 - (b) What is the total value of contracts awarded in connection with the H RTP to date?
 - (c) What is the total pricing distribution of contracts awarded in connection with the H RTP to date? and
 - (d) Please provide a full schedule of these contracts including value, award date, contract period, and number of bids received.
- (2) Of the contracts confirmed:
 - (a) how many were priced between \$50,000 and \$99,000 under open-market quoting threshold under the Treasurer's Instructions; and
 - (b) how many were priced between \$99,000 and \$99,999?
- (3) What procurement method (direct sourcing, panel arrangement, labour hire, single-invite quote, or open tender) was used for each of the contracts awarded to date?
- (4) Where multiple sub-threshold contracts have been awarded to the same vendor within a short period, does the Premier accept this could constitute contract splitting in substance even where each individual contract complies with the letter of the threshold?
- (5) Where multiple sub-threshold contracts have been awarded to the same vendor within a short period, does the Treasurer accept this could constitute contract splitting in substance even where each individual contract complies with the letter of the threshold?
- (6) What internal control exists within DPAC to detect and prevent the risk of contract splitting?
- (7) What internal control exists within Treasury to detect and prevent the risk of contract splitting?
- (8) Please confirm:
 - (a) the actual number of bids or quotes received for each of the contracts; and
 - (b) In cases where only one bid or quote was received - in each case, what steps were taken to test market pricing given the absence of competitive tension?
- (9) How many contracts have been awarded above the \$100,000 threshold; and
 - (a) How many of these contracts have been awarded without open-market tender;
 - (b) What was the value of each of these contracts;
 - (c) For each of these contracts, what specific exemption under the Treasurer's Instructions was relied upon; and
 - (d) Was that exemption approved by the appropriate delegate?
- (10) What verification does DPAC undertake of a supplier's claimed Tasmanian presence, including local employment, before applying Buy Local Policy weighting, and was that verification applied to all contracts?
- (11) Were four direct-sourced contracts totalling approximately \$920,000 executed on 24 December 2025; and

- (a) if so, what was the operational reason for awarding contracts on that date specifically; and
- (b) were normal approval and delegation processes followed in full?

60 Firmus AI Factory Deployments in Tasmania

Asked by: Mr Gaffney

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 11 August 2026

Question:

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

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

GBEs, such as TasNetworks, and the role of major industrial steering committee of Cabinet.

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

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

61 Civics and Citizenship Education in Tasmania

Asked by: Mr *Edmunds*

To: Minister for Education

Date: 11 August 2026

Question:

Regarding the teaching of Civics and Citizenship in Tasmanian schools:

(1) With respect to Curriculum:

- (a) How is the government ensuring the Australian Curriculum's Civics and Citizenship strand is actively taught in all Tasmanian schools, rather than being treated as an optional or secondary topic?
- (b) What specific initiatives are being introduced to ensure students graduate with a practical understanding of how preferential voting and the Hare-Clark system work in Tasmania?

(2) With respect to Teacher Support & Resources:

- (a) What specialised professional development is available to Tasmanian teachers to help them confidently teach complex political systems and media literacy?
- (b) Can you provide more information on how the Department of Education are collaborating with the Tasmanian Electoral Commission (TEC) to develop and distribute standardised, modern classroom resources?

(3) With respect to Practical Student Engagement:

- (a) Research shows that practical experience boosts lifelong voting habits. Would you support making youth-led mock elections a mandatory, hands-on learning activity in all Tasmanian high schools and colleges?
- (b) What targeted strategies are in place to improve civic literacy in rural and lower-socioeconomic areas of Tasmania, where voter turnout and engagement are historically lower?

62 Palantir Technologies

Asked by: Ms *O'Connor*

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 12 August 2026

Question:

- (1) During Budget Estimates in Government Administration Committee A this year, the Minister for Health was asked whether the Tasmanian Health Service has awarded any tenders, or signed any contracts, with any company or subsidiary of the global corporation, Palantir Technologies Inc. The question was taken on notice and the subsequent answer indicated there are no such tenders awarded or contracts with any Palantir Technologies Inc subsidiary company. Was a thorough search of current providers with THS undertaken to ensure an accurate answer is provided to the Council? Is the Minister certain the question asked by the Member for Hobart was responded to with the necessary due diligence and that the answer provided to GAA is correct?

- (2) Across State Service agencies, have any tenders been awarded or contracts signed with subsidiaries of Palantir Technologies Inc? If so, in which Agency or Agencies and for what services; to what financial value; and duration of the contract.
- (3) Does Palantir Technologies Inc, or any subsidiary of the corporation, have access to the personal data of Tasmanians that is stored or cached by State Service Agencies?

63 Government Response to Questions on Arts Funding

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 18 August 2026

Question:

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

- (1) Given the answer suggests the \$10 million is incorporated into (not additional to as stated previously) the existing Arts Industry Development and Screen Industry Development lines, does the Minister for the Arts accept that the \$10 million cannot properly be described as new or additional funding to the sector or provide a clear explanation as to how it is additional funding?
- (2) Can the Government provide the dollar value attributed to:
 - (a) the conclusion of election commitments; and
 - (b) efficiency measures, for each forward estimate year, so that the net effect on the arts budget line can be reconciled against the stated \$10 million commitment?
- (3) With those two offsetting factors identified, can the Government confirm the net change (increase or decrease) in real terms to the Arts Industry Development line for each of 2026-27 through 2029-30?
- (4) Has any funding request for the Tasmanian Strategic Touring Fund been received or is one anticipated for 2026-27, and if so, what is the expected timing of a decision?
- (5) Is it the Government's intention that the Fund continue in some form beyond 2026-27, or has a decision been made to discontinue it?
- (6) What savings target was assumed in the 2026-27 budget for the Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancy (TNVR) process in constructing the Arts Tasmania administrative expenses line for 2026-27?
- (7) If the TNVR process does not deliver savings at or near that assumed level, what is the contingency and will the shortfall be met from within the existing arts budget, additional government funding, or through a reduction in program funding?
- (8) Can the Government confirm whether "stable" funding in 2026-27 means the same number of organisations will be funded as in 2025-26, or whether the number of organisations funded may fall while the total dollar amount remains similar?
- (9) Will any currently four-year-funded organisation receive a reduced allocation in 2026-27 relative to 2025-26?
- (10) Once the needs identified through the Cultural and Creative Industries Strategy and the Tasmanian Live Performance Exchange sector report are known, will new funding be allocated to address them, or will any resulting initiatives be funded from within existing Arts Tasmania and Screen Tasmania allocations?

- (11) What is the expected timeframe for receipt of the Tasmanian Live Performance Exchange sector report, and when does the Government expect to respond to its recommendations?
- (12) During Budget Estimates scrutiny, the Director, Creative Tasmania provided the Committee with a specific year-by-year breakdown of the additional \$10 million, including \$0 to Arts in 2026-27 and \$1 million to Arts in 2027-28. The response provided by the Leader stated that no position has been determined for 2027-28, and that a position on 2028-29 to 2029-30 has also not been determined.
 - (a) Can the Government explain why the specific breakdown given by the Director, Creative Tasmania differs from the Leaders response?
 - (b) Was the breakdown given in evidence to Estimates accurate at the time it was given? If so, what has changed since Estimates to make the allocation now "undetermined"?
- (13) The Leader's response stated forward estimates reductions are due to efficiencies, not a decrease in support to the sector, while also stated 2029-30 becomes the new ongoing baseline.
 - (a) Can the Government provide the dollar breakdown of the forward estimates reduction in the Arts Tasmania appropriation between;
 - (i) administrative/efficiency savings; and
 - (ii) any reduction in funding passed through to the sector, for each year 2026-27 to 2029-30?
 - (b) If the reduction is intended to be entirely absorbed through administrative efficiencies with no reduction in sector support, can the Government confirm the dollar value of efficiencies required to achieve this, and identify the specific measures (beyond TNVR) that will deliver savings of that scale?
 - (c) Does the Government accept that if efficiency savings of the scale implied are not achieved, sector funding will necessarily be affected in order to meet the reduced forward estimate?

64 Forest Practices Authority

Asked by: Ms Forrest

To: Leader for the Government

Date: 19 August 2026

Question:

With regard to the funding, operations and practices of the Forest Practices Authority (FPA):

- (1) How are the prescribed fines determined; and
 - (a) If based on environmental harm and culpability, does the FPA have an internal enforcement guideline, decision matrix or policy document that sets out how those factors are assessed; and
 - (b) if so, please provide a copy of these documents?
- (2) What specific sections of the *Forest Practices Act 1985*, or any other legislation, authorise the use of satellite imagery, drones and aerial photography in compliance investigations?
- (3) (a) What statutory provisions authorise Forest Practices Officers to enter private freehold land; and
 - (b) explain what private land holder safeguards exist regarding notice, biosecurity and privacy?

- (4) How are the prescribed fines used by the FPA?
- (5) How much prescribed-fine revenue has the FPA received in each of the last five financial years?
- (6) (a) Has the Minister or the FPA ever commissioned an independent review of its compliance and enforcement practices; and
(b) if not, why not?

Summary of Bills

Read First Time

No. 35 of 2025	Partition Amendment Bill (<i>pro forma</i>)
No. 39 of 2025	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill (No. 2)
No. 49 of 2025	Public Accounts Committee Amendment Bill
No. 55 of 2025	Tasmanian Community Fund Amendment Bill
No. 65 of 2025	Charities and Associations Law (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill
No. 69 of 2025	Integrity Commission Amendment (Mandatory Notifications) Bill
No. 12	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 13	Short Stay Levy Bill
No. 15	Housing Land Supply (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 21	Taxation and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 22	Land Use Planning and Approvals (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill
No. 24	Statutory Holidays Amendment (Central Coast Municipality) Bill

Second Reading Adjourned

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

Second Reading Negatived

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

Returned to the House of Assembly with Amendment

No. 50 of 2025	Police Offences Amendment Bill
----------------	--------------------------------

Awaiting Third Reading

No. 59 of 2025	Residential Tenancy Amendment (Safety Modifications) Bill
No. 6	Occupational Licensing Amendment Bill
No. 14	Statutory Holidays Amendment Bill

Agreed to by Both Houses

No. 36 of 2025	Government Business Governance Reforms Bill	Act No. 18 of 2025
No. 37 of 2025	Commissions of Inquiry Amendment (Private Sessions Information) Bill	Act No. 19 of 2025
No. 38 of 2025	Justice and Related Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill	Act No. 17 of 2025
No. 40 of 2025	Residential Tenancy Amendment (Pets) Bill	Act No. 22 of 2025
No. 41 of 2025	Sentencing Amendment (Aggravating Factors) Bill	Act No. 33 of 2025
No. 42 of 2025	Government Business (Sale Reforms) Bill	Act No. 20 of 2025
No. 43 of 2025	Taxation and Related Legislation (First Home Owner and Payroll Relief) Bill	Act No. 31 of 2025
No. 44 of 2025	Custodial Inspector Amendment (Protection from Reprisal) Bill	Act No. 27 of 2025
No. 45 of 2025	Poisons Amendment (Interstate Prescriptions) Bill	Act No. 26 of 2025
No. 46 of 2025	Dangerous Criminals and High Risk Offenders Amendment Bill	Act No. 23 of 2025
No. 47 of 2025	Justice Miscellaneous (Explosives Offences) Bill	Act No. 32 of 2025
No. 51 of 2025	Expungement of Historical Offences Amendment Bill	Act No. 21 of 2025
No. 52 of 2025	Terrorism Legislation (Extension) Bill	Act No. 25 of 2025
No. 53 of 2025	Mt Lyell Acid Drainage Reduction (Repeal) Bill	
No. 54 of 2025	Commission for Children and Young People Bill	Act No. 30 of 2025
No. 58 of 2025	University of Tasmania (Protection of Land) Bill	Act No. 2 of 2026
No. 60 of 2025	Registration to Work with Vulnerable People Amendment Bill	Act No. 24 of 2025
No. 63 of 2025	Appropriation Bill (No. 1)	Act No. 28 of 2025
No. 64 of 2025	Appropriation Bill (No. 2)	Act No. 29 of 2025
No. 1	Building Amendment Bill	Act No. 6 of 2026
No. 2	Residential Parks Bill	
No. 3	Grange Resources (Tasmania) Pty Ltd (Alternative Application Period) Bill	Act No. 3 of 2026
No. 5	Police Offences Amendment (Increased Penalties for Damage to Tasmanian War Memorials) Bill	
No. 7	Education and Care Services National Law (Application) Amendment Bill	Act No. 5 of 2026
No. 8	Public Health Amendment (Prohibited Tobacco and Other Products) Bill	Act No. 10 of 2026
No. 9	Help to Buy (Commonwealth Powers) Bill	Act No. 4 of 2026
No. 10	Local Government Amendment (Targeted Reform) Bill	
No. 11	Petroleum Reporting (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill	Act No. 1 of 2026
No. 18	Appropriation Bill (No. 1)	Act No. 7 of 2026
No. 19	Appropriation Bill (No. 2)	Act No. 8 of 2026
No. 20	First Home Owner Grant Amendment Bill	Act No. 9 of 2026

Current Committees and Membership

Standing Committees

[Committee of Privileges](#): Mr Farrell, Ms Forrest, Ms Armitage, Mr Gaffney and Ms Rattray

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Greyhound Racing Transition \(Joint\)](#): Ms O'Connor, Ms Webb and Ms Rattray

Sessional Committees

[House Committee \(Joint\)](#): Mr Farrell (The President), Ms Forrest and Ms Rattray

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

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

[Workplace Culture Oversight \(Joint\)](#): Mr Farrell, Ms Forrest, Ms Lovell and Ms Rattray

[Gender, Gender-based Violence and Equality \(Joint\)](#): Mr Edmunds, Ms Forrest, Ms Thomas and Ms Glade-Wright

[Government Administration A](#): Ms Forrest, Ms Glade-Wright, Ms Lovell, Ms O'Connor and Ms Thomas

- Recent developments relating to government policy on poker machine harm minimisation: Ms Webb (substitute member with leave from Government Administration B)

[Government Administration B](#): Ms Armitage, Mr Edmunds, Mr Gaffney, Mr Hiscutt and Ms Webb

Select Committees

[Energy Matters \(Joint\)](#): Mr Edmunds, Ms Forrest, Mr Hiscutt and Ms Lovell

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

Dates of Meetings of the Legislative Council

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

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

The sitting schedule is available at:

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

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

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

Quorum Calls of the Legislative Council (Fridays)

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

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

Standing and Sessional Orders of the Legislative Council

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

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