



# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION OF 2022

(THIRD SESSION OF THE FIFTIETH PARLIAMENT)

## NOTICES OF MOTION AND ORDERS OF THE DAY

No. 26

THURSDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 2022

(At 10.00 o'clock a.m.)

### NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

**8** Ms Lovell to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — In relation to the Tasmanian Health System Dashboard released on 30 September 2022, pertaining to the twelve months to August 2022:—

- (1)
  - (a) What are the specific circumstances or conditions that lead to the removal of patients from the elective surgery waitlist under the reason – *Surgery not required or declined*;
  - (b) what is the disaggregation of patients by Category 1, 2 and 3, and by length of time on the wait list;
  - (c) with regard to the 1539 patients removed from the elective surgery waitlist what proportion were removed because surgery was not required;
  - (d) what proportion of patients were removed from the list because surgery was declined;
  - (e)
    - (i) what proportion of patients who declined surgery continue to receive healthcare in the public system; and
    - (ii) what proportion have their medical needs met in the private health system?
  - (f)
    - (i) how many patients have been removed from the elective surgery wait list because they are no longer alive; and
    - (ii) what is the disaggregation of these patients by Category 1, 2 and 3?
- (2) With regard to the 486 patients *treated elsewhere for awaited procedure*:
  - (a) What are the specific circumstances or conditions that lead to removal from the elective surgery waitlist;
  - (b) what is the disaggregation of patients by Category 1, 2 and 3, and by the length of time on the wait list; and
  - (c) what proportion of these patients were treated interstate, disaggregated by Category and jurisdiction?
- (3) With regard to the 148 patients *Transferred to another hospital's waiting list*:
  - (a) What proportion were treated in Tasmanian private hospitals, disaggregated by Category and length of time on the wait list;
  - (b) what data is collected on the wait list duration and surgical completion rate of patients transferred to other hospitals' wait lists;
  - (c) how are the costs associated with the transfer and subsequent treatment at other hospitals met; and
  - (d)
    - (i) what was the total cost of transfers to other hospitals' wait lists for the period August 2021 – August 2022; and
    - (ii) how does this compare to the previous three years?

(asked 08.11.22)

**9** Mr *Gaffney* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government:—

- (1) With regard to the increasing popularity of electric vehicles, solar energy installations and battery storage systems in domestic and commercial properties:
  - (a) What is the Government’s policy in responding to the growing need from householders and business owners for objective and impartial advice on integrating these systems; and
  - (b) what support mechanisms and services are in place to encourage the transition to electric vehicles and the electrification of transport systems?
- (2) Noting that Bi-directional charging from battery storage is involved in trials around Australia, and that vehicle to home (V2H) and vehicle to grid (V2G) is a proposed storage solution in a renewable electricity network:
  - (a) What are Tasmanian Government Business Enterprises (GBE’s) doing to investigate, prepare and encourage this technology; and
  - (b) is the Government in a position to direct a GBE to explore this technology?
- (3) Noting that Solar energy combined with Bi-directional charging can be considered the best practice model for electrification, encouraging solar energy installation with battery storage systems must be seen as an imperative first step:
  - (a) What are the barriers in Tasmania to this model;
  - (b) would the Government agree that there are more obstacles in Tasmania to domestic solar (through building permit restrictions) than anywhere else in Australia; and
  - (c) if so, what is the scope within the Tasmanian Planning Scheme to address these obstacles?
- (4) Given that Tasmania is generating all its electricity needs from renewable energy sources, and that it is a net carbon absorber with negative emissions for the last seven years, what is the Government’s future policy to ensure an equitable and timely transition to renewable energy powered transportation?

(asked 15.11.22)

**10** Mr *Gaffney* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to the junction upgrade options due to be implemented on the Bass Highway at Leith:—

- (1) In the closing sentence of a media release dated 13 January 2022, in reference to the upgrade options to be implemented on the Bass Highway at Leith, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport stated: “*Feedback will be sought on the final designs of the intersection upgrades this quarter*”:
  - (a) What has been included in the final design for the upgrade as the result of the requested feedback process; and
  - (b) to facilitate public awareness of the actual safety measures being provided and/or implemented -
    - (i) is a detailed plan of the design to be constructed available for the public to view; and
    - (ii) if so, where can the detailed plan be viewed?
- (2) Of the suggestions forwarded in the requested feedback process and not included in the final design of the junction upgrade on what grounds/reasons have they been rejected for inclusion?
- (3) With regard to the construction and evaluation phases of the upgrade:
  - (a) As tenders closed on 21 September 2022, has this tender been awarded;
  - (b) if so, who was the successful tenderer;
  - (c) when is it planned that work will commence;
  - (d) what is the planned completion date for the work;
  - (e) what is the intended process to review the effectiveness of the completed upgrade; and

- (f) what will be the process to evaluate and implement any recommendations that may arise from a review?

(asked 15.11.22)

**11** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to the recent sale of Basslink, and the government and Hydro Tasmania stating that they are committed to assist with Basslink becoming a regulated asset and noting Basslink’s operating costs being well known and the weighted average cost of capital (WACC) figure can be reliably estimated:—

- (1) What does the Minister envisage the range of recoverable revenues from consumers to be?
- (2)
  - (a) With regard to the performance of Marinus Link as a regulated asset, what does the Marinus modelling assume about Basslink’s role;
  - (b) will it perform the same role as Marinus; or
  - (c) are there other assumptions?
- (3) Where does AEMO receive the money from to pay the owner of the regulated asset Basslink?
- (4) Once the AER has determined the maximum allowable revenue recoverable from consumers, how, from whom and to whom will the money flow occur including consumers, transmissions owners, AEMO and the owner of the regulated asset?
- (5)
  - (a) Is it likely 50 per cent of the costs will be recoverable from Tasmanian consumers; and
  - (b) if apportioned on a per capita basis will Tasmanian consumers pay more than Victorian consumers, and
  - (c) how is the cost recovery is likely to work?
- (6) What is the best estimate at this stage of the effects on Tasmanian consumers:
  - (a) In total; and
  - (b) on a per capita basis?
- (7)
  - (a) Is Basslink likely to become an asset that is predominantly used to send power northwards; and
  - (b) will Tasmanian consumers be contributing more to the costs even though there is no direct benefit?
- (8) A figure of 6 per cent of Marinus’ benefits will be ‘received’ by Tasmanians:
  - (a) What is the comparable figure for Basslink as a regulated asset;
  - (b) will this change over time; and
  - (c) is this dependent on how Basslink is used, that is whether it is exporting or importing?
- (9) Is it the case that regardless of the level of use of the regulated asset, the owner retains the regulated fee?
- (10) What is the current estimate of the time it will take to make Basslink a regulated asset?

(asked 17.11.22)

**12** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard proposed reform in the energy sector and matters related to energy prices, in an answer to a Question on Notice from Minister Barnett on 10 November 2022, the Minister stated:—

*“Based on modelling undertaken by Marinus Link Pty Ltd, Tasmanian residential electricity bills will be lower than they otherwise would be following the construction of Project Marinus. This is because of downward pressure on wholesale energy prices arising from the national rollout of lower cost new renewables.”*

- (1) What effect will lower wholesale prices have on Hydro’s profits?

- (2) For a given percentage change in wholesale prices does the model provide the percentage change in Hydro's revenue?
- (3) For a given percentage change in wholesale prices does the model provide the percentage change in Hydro's profits?
- (4)
  - (a) If the Marinus Link model doesn't provide this information has Hydro Tasmania modelled the sensitivity of future profits to changes in wholesale electricity prices;
  - (b) if so, what does the modelling show; and
  - (c) if not, when will this modelling be done?
- (5) Does OTTER use Victorian wholesale prices when determining Tasmanian retail prices?
- (6) Is this likely to change as Tasmania increases the production of renewable energy?
- (7) With an expanded NEM what does the Marinus modelling assume will happen to the differences between Tasmanian and Victorian wholesale prices?
- (8) Roughly 40 per cent of current retail electricity prices set by OTTER comprises networking costs:
  - (a) What is the current breakup between transmission and distribution costs;
  - (b) what is the estimated breakup when the 200 per cent renewable energy goal is achieved; and
  - (c)
    - (i) do or will non-regulated transmission costs impact retail prices;
    - (ii) if so how; and
    - (iii) if not, are non-regulated transmission costs simply borne by generators and/or other users of transmission services such as major industrials?

*(asked 17.11.22)*

**13** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to the recent sale of Basslink, the government and Hydro Tasmania have stated they are committed to assist with Basslink becoming a regulated asset:—

- (1) What is the process in Basslink becoming a regulated asset?
- (2) What roles will the government and Hydro Tasmania play in this process?
- (3) What commitment and/or undertakings have they made at this stage?
- (4) Which other parties need to be consulted before the AER will consider making a draft determination for Basslink to become a regulated interconnector?
- (5) What factors will comprise the AER's assessment of the maximum allowable revenue recoverable by the owner of a regulated interconnector? and
- (6) Is it likely that Basslink's Regulated Asset Base (RAB) will be much different to the \$770m+ that APA has already outlaid to gain control of Basslink?

*(asked 17.11.22)*

**14** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to the new network service agreement between Hydro Tasmania and Basslink and noting the specific details of the agreement are not being sought in these questions:—

- (1) How does the new network service agreement between Basslink and Hydro Tasmania differ from the abandoned agreement?
- (2) Under the previous agreement any interregional revenue was paid to Hydro Tasmania in exchange for a monthly fee, is the new arrangement similar?
- (3) Regarding the commercial risk sharing payment under the previous agreement, does a similar arrangement apply? and
- (4) Regarding the availability adjustment factor which allowed Hydro Tasmania to discount the fee for periods when the cable wasn't working, does this or a similar arrangement apply under the new agreement?

*(asked 17.11.22)*

**15** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard proposed reform in the energy sector and matters related to TasNetworks, in an answer to a Question on Notice from Minister Barnett on 10 November 2022, the Minister stated that “*without Marinus the business will have lower growth in regulated and unregulated developments*”. I note unregulated connections by new generators to the grid are stated to be the key drivers for future growth:—

- (a) With regard the three existing wind farms, who owns the grid connections?
  - (b) TasNetworks 2022 Annual Report includes (on page 81) revenue of \$27m from non-regulated services:
    - (i) How much of the \$27m relates to wind farm connections to the grid;
    - (ii) what is the value of TasNetwork’s assets which connects existing wind farms to TasNetwork’s grid; and
    - (iii) are these included with regulated transmission assets under the label ‘transmission network’ (on page 95)?
  - (c) (i) If Marinus Link unlocks 3GW of additional wind power generation, what is the estimated cost of both the extra regulated and non-regulated transmission needed; and
    - (ii) who will fund the non-regulated transmission?
  - (d) (i) If TasNetworks contracts with a generator to provide non-regulated transmission services and TasNetworks builds the agreed asset, will TasNetworks seek additional security from the generator; or
    - (ii) will TasNetworks bear the risk if the generator is unable to pay as agreed?
  - (e) Is the mooted expansion path for TasNetworks to build more non-regulated transmission assets considered a greater risk than the current model where most revenue is derived from its regulated asset base?
  - (f) (i) Does or will TasNetworks have a higher rate of return on non-regulated assets compared to the rates of return built into regulated prices; and
    - (ii) if so, what additional return will TasNetworks require for non-regulated assets?
- (asked 17.11.22)

**16** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to proposed reform in the energy sector and Marinus Link Minister Barnett on 10 November 2022 in answer to a Question stated:—

*“Project Marinus is expected to attract significant new generation in Tasmania which will provide greater competition and contractual opportunities for existing and new entrant major industrials.”*

- (1) What does greater competition and contractual opportunities for existing and new entrant major industrials imply;
  - (2) (a) Does Hydro Tasmania envisage that new renewable generators will be able to offer a better deal than it currently provides to major industrials; and
    - (b) if so, will this free up more power for Hydro to seek to gain higher prices through baseload firming generation?
  - (3) Does the Marinus modelling show that new wind generators will be built if prices are at or below prices currently paid by major industrials? and
  - (4) Does Hydro expect new entrant major industrials to be offered the same prices as the current major industrials, noting the question does not seek details of actual prices offered to major industrials?
- (asked 17.11.2022)

**17** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to proposed reform in the energy sector and Marinus Link and Battery of the Nation (BotN) in an answer to a Question on Notice from Minister Barnett on 10 November 2022, stated:—

*“The increased commercial opportunities from BotN will assist the business in maintaining the Capital Expenditure Program for existing and ageing assets and provide a stable, commercially viable future for the business.”*

- (a) Does this imply Hydro’s current operating model (revenue/expenses/debt/ returns to government) will not provide sufficient funds to cover Capital for Expenditure for its ageing assets?

The Minister’s response further noted, *“Without Project Marinus, the BotN projects cannot proceed.”*

- (b) does this imply that upgrading (or ‘reimagining’ as Hydro describes it) an ageing asset like Tarraleah is not feasible without Marinus; and
- (c) is the current Tarraleah asset nearing the end of its useful life?

As noted by the Minister, BotN relies on high priced events occurring in mainland markets:

- (d) will the development of the NEM over time reduce the number of high-priced events; and
- (e) what does the Marinus modelling assume about the prevalence of high price events in the future?

Note 1.2 (i) of Hydro’s 2022 Annual Report notes on page 31 that the remaining useful life of assets and the residual value at the end of the useful life are reviewed annually:

- (f) What was the useful life of the Tarraleah power station; and
- (g) what is the residual value at the end of its useful life immediately before the June 2018 announcement by Hydro to transform the asset?

*(asked 17.11.22)*

**18** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to the 29 hydro power stations currently operated by Hydro Tasmania:—

- (1) What is the remaining useful life of each power station?
- (2) What is the residual values at the end of life as per the latest annual review?
- (3) (i) Do the residual values include any demolition and rehabilitation outlays?  
(ii) If not why not; and  
(iii) if so, is the residual value for any asset a negative figure?

With regard to the useful life, residual values and rehabilitation costs for each of Hydro Tasmania’s dams:

- (4) What is the remaining useful life for each dam?
- (5) What are the residual values at the end of those dams lives as per the latest annual review; and
- (6) (i) do the residual values include any demolition and rehabilitation outlays;  
(ii) if not why not; and  
(iii) if so, is the residual value for any asset a negative figure?

*(asked 17.11.22)*

**19** Ms *Lovell* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — In relation to the sale of smoking products to minors, can the Government advise:—

- (1) The number of retailers issued with infringement notices for the sale of smoking products to minors since 2017, disaggregated by year and region?
- (2) The type of retailers issued with infringement notices for the sale of smoking products to minors since 2017, e.g. newsagents, supermarkets, service stations?
- (3) The number of retailers issued with infringement notices for the sale of smoking products to minors that have been subject to prosecution since 2017?
- (4) The number of relevant prosecutions that have been considered and subsequently abandoned since 2017?

- (5) (a) The number of relevant prosecutions recommended by the Department of Health to Crown Law since 2017; and
  - (b) the outcome and penalty of these prosecutions?
  - (6) The rationale for removing the ability of the Director of Public Health to issue infringement notices to retailers selling smoking products to minors?
  - (7) The number of personnel (FTE and headcount) who undertake an investigative and/or enforcement role in relation to breaches of tobacco control provisions, including the sale of smoking products to minors, disaggregated by year since 2017? and
  - (8) The Government's approach to managing the distribution and use of e-cigarettes by young Tasmanians.
- (asked 22.11.22)

**20** Ms Webb to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — In relation to Parliament having been advised on 10 November 2022 that the Terms of Reference for the O'Farrell review had been withdrawn as legislation did not allow for the Police to share protected information with Mr O'Farrell SC — Can the Government confirm:—

- (1) Was Mr O'Farrell SC consulted on the original Terms of Reference dated 28 September 2022?
- (2) (a) Was legal advice obtained in reference to the original Terms of Reference; and
- (b) if so, when, and from whom?
- (3) On what date did the potential illegality of what was proposed by the Review regarding "protected information" become apparent?
- (4) Who identified the potential for illegal conduct in the conduct of the Review?
- (5) Were Tasmania Police made aware of my letter to the Premier dated 6 October 2022 querying and seeking reassurances regarding the legality of what was proposed?
- (6) Following the handing down of the Jeff Thompson decision on 25 August 2022 and to date, has there been any provision of "protected information" to Mr O'Farrell SC, including but not limited to:
  - (a) materials related to the Jeff Thompson matter such as the application for warrant, the affidavit of Constable Jago and the warrant;
  - (b) materials related to the Sue Neill-Fraser matter; and
  - (c) materials related to other relevant matters?
- (7) If material has been provided to Mr O'Farrell:
  - (a) when did he receive copies of the specific materials; and
  - (b) has that material now been destroyed or returned to Police?
- (8) Has any potential misconduct or breach of the legislation been notified to:
  - (a) the Police Minister;
  - (b) the Ombudsman, as the Inspection entity under the relevant Act;
  - (c) the Integrity Commission;
  - (d) the Attorney-General; or
  - (e) any other authority?
- (9) Will the Government state unequivocally that no other illegal behaviour regarding protected information obtained by the use of surveillance devices has occurred in Tasmania over the last 5 years?

(asked 23.11.22)

**21** Ms *Forrest* to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government — With regard to Hydro Tasmania’s three Basslink contracts, the Basslink Services Agreement (BSA), the Floating Facility Fee Instrument (FFFI) and the Basslink Facility Fee Swap (BFFS) — Note 21 on page 68 of Hydro Tasmania’s 2022 Financial Statements states the BSA was terminated but neither the BFFS or FFFI were impacted:—

- (1) With regard to the BSA:
  - (a) Does Hydro Tasmania have any rights or obligations from the BSA that have survived despite termination of the BSA; and
  - (b) if so what are they?
- (2) With regard to the FFFI:
  - (a)
    - (i) Is Basslink P/L the other party to this contract; and
    - (ii) if not, who is?
  - (b) What is the term of this contract?
  - (c)
    - (i) Please outline the rights and obligations of the parties to this contract describing how any payments due are calculated; and
    - (ii) who has been paying to whom under this arrangement?
  - (d) Although the FFFI is always noted in Hydro Tasmania’s Financial Statements as a financial instrument why isn’t it given a value and included in Hydro Tasmania’s balance sheet as was the BSA and the BFFS?
  - (e) As the FFFI is now treated as an interest rate swap since the BSA termination,
    - (i) does the future liability for FFFI payments have a value; and
    - (ii) if so, what was that value at 30 June 2022?
  - (f) Now that the FFFI payments are treated as an interest rate swap since the BSA termination,
    - (i) do future FFFI payments and/or receipts have a value that needs to be recorded in Hydro Tasmania’s balance sheet; and
    - (ii) if so, what was that value at 30 June 2022?
- (3) With regard to the BFFS:
  - (a) Who is the other party to the contract?
  - (b) What is the term of the contract?
  - (c) Please outline the rights and obligations of the parties to this contract, describing how any payments due are calculated.
  - (d) What was the BFFS liability as at 30 June 2022 included in the interest rate swaps liability?
  - (e) Now that the BFFS is treated as an interest swap,
    - (i) where do BFFS payments since BSA termination appear in Hydro Tasmania’s financials;
    - (ii) what was this amount for the 2022 year; and
    - (iii) what was the amount paid pre BSA termination?
- (4) What have been the amounts paid by Hydro Tasmania in each year from 2006 to 2022 for each of BSA, FFFI and BFFS?

*(asked 23.11.22)*

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**1** Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Amendment Bill 2022 (No. 48): Third reading.

**2** Environmental Management and Pollution Control Amendment Bill 2022 (No. 46): Consideration of Bill as amended in Committee of the Whole Council.



- 3 Justice and Related Legislation Miscellaneous Amendments Bill 2022 (No. 43): Second reading.
- 4 Public Interest Disclosures (Members of Parliament) Bill 2021 (No. 22 of 2021): Consideration in Committee of the Whole Council.
- 5 Partition Amendment Bill 2022 (No. 38): Second reading.

## NOTICES OF MOTION

- 1 Ms *Armitage* to move — That the Legislative Council appeals to the Government to give strong consideration to making it compulsory for all elected Members of State and Local Government to obtain and keep a Working with Vulnerable People Card.
- 2 Ms *Webb* to move — That the Legislative Council:
  - (1) Notes that Australia ratified in 2017 the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhumane or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT), which provides for international inspections of places of detention, at both national and subnational levels, by the United Nations Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture (SPT);
  - (2) notes on 29 November 2021 Tasmania passed the *OPCAT Implementation Act 2021* which commenced on 20 January 2022;
  - (3) notes the recent disturbing reports that a delegation from the United Nations Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture (SPT) has taken the extraordinary step of suspending its current visit to Australia due to obstruction encountered in interstate jurisdictions when attempting to carry out its mandate as defined by OPCAT;
  - (4) notes national and international condemnation and concerns raised by human rights and legal entities and individuals responding to news of the reported obstruction, including the Australian Human Rights Commission which has called for urgent action by all Australian and state governments to address the fallout from the suspension of this UN SPT visit;
  - (5) acknowledges and welcomes reports that the SPT delegation did visit six Tasmanian custodial sites, including the Ashley Youth Detention Centre, before the national inspection tour was suspended;
  - (6) notes that Part 3 of the Tasmanian *OPCAT Implementation Act 2021* provides for the Minister to enter into arrangements with the Commonwealth Attorney-General to facilitate the SPT's functions under and in accordance with OPCAT in Tasmania, including access to detention facilities, potential interviewees, and documentation;
  - (7) requests the Tasmanian Government:
    - (a) confirm which detention facilities were visited by the UN Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture delegation during October this year;
    - (b) detail any arrangements made with the Commonwealth under Part 3 of the *OPCAT Implementation Act 2021* to facilitate the UN SPT delegation's inspection visit; and
    - (c) undertake to evaluate the *OPCAT Implementation Act 2021* in context of the recommendations of the Australian Human Rights Commission's *Road Map to OPCAT Compliance* released on 17 October this year, and report back to the Parliament; and
    - (d) formally reiterate its commitment to:
      - (i) co-operating fully with all future visits and unannounced inspections of Tasmanian detention facilities, including the capacity to interview privately any person deprived of their liberty and access documentation, undertaken by the United Nations Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture (SPT) under the auspices of OPCAT; and
      - (ii) the recognised rules-based international legal system underpinning OPCAT.
- 3 Mr *Willie* to move — That the Tasmanian Government School Students: Student Wellbeing and Engagement Survey for 2022 – Wellbeing for Learning, be considered and noted.

**4** Ms *Webb* to move — That the Legislative Council:

- (1) Recognises that the regular publication of the Members of Cabinets' official diaries provides an important accountability mechanism, by improving transparency and strengthening public confidence in government decision-making processes;
- (2) notes that the regular and mandated disclosure of official ministerial diaries, detailing meetings with stakeholders, individuals, third-parties and registered lobbyists, is established practice across a range of parliaments including NSW, ACT, and Queensland;
- (3) requests the Tasmanian government undertakes to introduce mandated requirements for the regular and routine disclosure of all Ministerial and Cabinet Secretary official diaries, detailing scheduled meetings, and their purpose, with stakeholders, organisations and individuals, including third parties and lobbyists; and when developing this disclosure regime to also:
  - (a) ensure the process is informed by best practice examples of mandatory disclosure of ministerial diary requirements established in other jurisdictions, including examples of oversight and compliance requirements;
  - (b) develop and publicly consult on a proposed Tasmanian mandatory disclosure of ministerial diaries scheme; and
  - (c) ensure the mandatory disclosure of ministerial diaries scheme is implemented in 2023.

**5** Ms *Forrest* to move —

- (1) That this House notes:
  - (a) Huntington's Disease is an inherited degenerative neurological condition affecting the brain and central nervous system that results in the progressive loss of mental and physical capacities impacting affected individual's ability to walk, talk, eat, think and reason with death ensuing from complications;
  - (b) Huntington's Disease is a neurological condition that has both physical and mental symptoms;
  - (c) that the services to provide care and support to individuals with symptomatic Huntington's Disease are currently delivered through mental health services, specifically Older Person's Mental Health Services;
  - (d) Huntington's Disease does not skip a generation. An individual who does not inherit the expanded HTT gene will not develop the disease and therefore will not pass it on to the next generation;
  - (e) Huntington's disease symptoms typically manifest at the prime of the person's working life, thus creating financial challenges;
  - (f) five to ten per cent of all Huntington's Disease cases are classified as Juvenile HD; which has an age of onset between infancy and 20 years and in most cases, the rate of progression of Juvenile HD tends to be faster than in the adult form;
  - (g) early features of Juvenile HD include strong behavioural changes; learning problems, decline at school and speech problems;
  - (h) according to Tasmanian statistics;
    - (i) Huntington's disease affects 1 in 5,000 individuals, not including those that are considered at risk or pre-symptomatic;
    - (ii) that this number is 3 times the Australian average; and
    - (iii) per capita, Tasmania has the second highest prevalence of Huntington's disease in the world;
  - (i) Huntington's Tasmania continues to work with and support Huntington's Disease families and calls for additional resources and dedicated facilities to support affected Tasmanians; and

- (j) Huntington's Tasmania has recently resolved to join a national body, Huntington's Australia as the peak national body representing families impacted by Huntington's Disease.
- (2) This House calls on the Government to:
- (a) deliver services to those with symptomatic Huntington's Disease through robust Model of Care, developed in consultation with the Huntington's Disease community with greater emphasis on access to neurological services, allied health and the establishment of regular clinics in the three most affected regions of Tasmania, within the health sector to ensure all support, expertise and services necessary are available that actively reduces the stigma associated with Huntington's Disease;
  - (b) consider the inclusion of Specialist Neurologist Nurse Practitioners across the state to support the care of people with Huntington's Disease;
  - (c) consider the alignment of Huntington's Disease Case Managers aligned to Huntington's Disease Tasmania rather than Older Person's Mental Health Services;
  - (d) ensure appropriate purpose built residential care facilities are available to assist members of the community impacted by Huntington's Disease that require full time care;
  - (e) ensure the justice system is adequately resourced to respond appropriately to those interacting with the justice system who have symptomatic Huntington's Disease; and
  - (f) support Tasmanian health services to improve facilities and services to enable Tasmanians with Huntington's Disease to be eligible for and qualify for clinical trial status in Tasmania, particularly in regards to neurological and neurosurgical services.

D.T. PEARCE, *Clerk of the Council*

**PAPERS ISSUED**

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Notice Paper No. 25

**SUMMARY OF BILLS**

*Read First Time*

Bill No. 38 Partition Amendment (*pro forma*).  
 Bill No. 43 Justice and Related Legislation Miscellaneous Amendments.

*Consideration in Committee of Whole Council*

Bill No. 22 of 2021 Public Interest Disclosures (Members of Parliament).

*Consideration of Bill as amended in Committee of Whole Council*

Bill No. 46 Environmental Management and Pollution Control Amendment.

*Awaiting Third Reading*

Bill No. 48 Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Amendment.

*Agreed to by Both Houses*

Bill No. 63 of 2021 Climate Change (State Action) Amendment.  
 Bill No. 5 Traffic Amendment (Electronic Billboards).  
 Bill No. 10 Family Violence Reforms (*Act No. 21 of 2022*).  
 Bill No. 11 Electricity Safety.  
 Bill No. 12 Roads and Jetties Amendment.  
 Bill No. 15 Police Offences Amendment (Workplace Protection) (*Act No. 22 of 2022*).  
 Bill No. 19 Health Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) (*Act No. 23 of 2022*).  
 Bill No. 20 Vehicle and Traffic Amendment (Driver Distraction and Speed Enforcement) (*Act No. 27 of 2022*).  
 Bill No. 27 Occupational Licensing (Automatic Mutual Recognition Consequential Amendments).  
 Bill No. 29 Land Use Planning and Approvals Amendment.  
 Bill No. 30 Retail Leases.  
 Bill No. 35 Homes Tasmania (*Act No. 25 of 2022*).  
 Bill No. 36 Homes Tasmania (Consequential Amendments) (*Act No. 26 of 2022*).  
 Bill No. 39 Stadiums Tasmania Amendment (Transfers).  
 Bill No. 40 Statutory Holidays Amendment (*Act No. 24 of 2022*).  
 Bill No. 41 Justice Miscellaneous (Advance Care Directives) (*Act No. 28 of 2022*).

Bill No. 42	Animal Welfare Amendment.
Bill No. 45	Legal Profession Amendment.
Bill No. 47	Expansion of House of Assembly.
Bill No. 49	Appropriation (Supplementary Appropriation for 2022-23).

#### **STANDING COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS**

Committee of Privileges: Mr *Farrell* (The President), Ms *Forrest* (Chair of Committees), Mr *Gaffney*, Mrs *Hiscutt* and Ms *Ratray*.

Standing Orders Committee: The President (Mr *Farrell*), The Chair of Committees (Ms *Forrest*), Mrs *Hiscutt*, Ms *Ratray* and Mr *Valentine*.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works (Joint): Ms *Ratray* and Mr *Valentine*.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Subordinate Legislation (Joint): Ms *Forrest*, Mrs *Hiscutt* and Ms *Ratray*.

Parliamentary Standing Committee of Public Accounts (Joint): Ms *Forrest*, Ms *Webb* and Mr *Willie*.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Integrity (Joint): Ms *Armitage*, Ms *Palmer* and Mr *Valentine*.

#### **SESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS**

House Committee (Joint): The President (Mr *Farrell*), Ms *Forrest*, and Mrs *Hiscutt*.

Library Committee (Joint): Ms *Armitage*, Mr *Farrell*, Ms *Forrest*, Ms *Howlett*, Ms *Ratray* and Mr *Valentine*.

Gender and Equality Committee (Joint): Mr *Duigan*, Ms *Forrest*, Mr *Harriss* and Mr *Willie*.

Workplace Culture Oversight Committee (Joint): Mr *Farrell* (The President), Ms *Forrest*, Mrs *Hiscutt* and Ms *Lovell*.

Government Administration A: Mr *Duigan*, Mr *Edmunds*, Ms *Forrest*, Mr *Gaffney*, Mr *Harriss* and Ms *Lovell*.

Government Administration B: Ms *Armitage*, Ms *Howlett*, Ms *Ratray*, Mr *Valentine*, Ms *Webb* and Mr *Willie*.

- Matters related to adult imprisonment and youth detention.

#### **SELECT COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS**

*University of Tasmania Act 1992*: Mr *Duigan*, Mr *Gaffney*, Ms *Lovell*, Mr *Valentine* and Ms *Webb*.

Government Businesses Scrutiny Committee A: Mr *Duigan*, Mr *Edmunds*, Ms *Forrest*, Mr *Gaffney*, Mr *Harriss* and Ms *Lovell*.

Government Businesses Scrutiny Committee B: Ms *Armitage*, Ms *Howlett*, Ms *Ratray*, Mr *Valentine*, Ms *Webb* and Mr *Willie*.