



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

REPORT OF DEBATES

Tuesday 24 March 2026

REVISED EDITION

Contents

TUESDAY 24 MARCH 2026	1
RECOGNITION OF VISITORS	1
QUESTIONS.....	1
EDUCATION - TEACHER STRIKES	1
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	3
EDUCATION - TEACHER STRIKES	3
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	4
LAUNCESTON GENERAL HOSPITAL - EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT.....	5
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	6
AMBULANCE RAMPING - ANMF CLAIMS.....	6
DORSET CHILD AND FAMILY LEARNING CENTRE - PROVIDER.....	7
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	8
LIBERTY BELL BAY MANGANESE SMELTER - VOLUNTARY ADMINISTRATION.....	8
RECOGNITION OF VISITORS	10
EDUCATION - WAGE OFFER NEGOTIATIONS	10
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	11
DORSET CHILD AND FAMILY LEARNING CENTRE - MINISTER'S COMMENTS.....	12
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	13
MEMBER SUSPENDED	13
MEMBER FOR BASS - Ms FINLAY	13
HOBART PRIVATE HOSPITAL - SALE TO CALVARY	14
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	15
FUEL PRICES.....	15
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	16
CANCER TREATMENT SERVICES - ACCESS.....	17
TASMANIAN AGRICULTURE - SUPPORT.....	17
PUBLIC SECTOR - WORK FROM HOME FOR FUEL SAVINGS.....	19
FUEL PRICES - INCENTIVES FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT USE	20
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	20
HALLS ISLAND - LEASE	21
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	22
FUEL SUPPLY LEVELS.....	24
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	25
COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS	25
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION	26
CONSTITUENCY QUESTIONS.....	27
VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS.....	27
TASSAL PRESENTATION TO PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS.....	27
SAFETY IN TOWN CENTRES	27
HALLS ISLAND LEASE.....	28
ELECTRIC VEHICLE SPECIFIC TARIFFS.....	28
RIDGELY - ROADSIDE VERGES SLASHING.....	28
WYNYARD - RESPIRABLE CRYSTALLINE SILICA DUST MONITORING	28
BRIDPORT ROAD - UPGRADES	29
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS	29
JINGAI ZHANG - INVESTIGATION BY GERMAN AUTHORITIES.....	29
TASNETWORKS - ZINFRA CONTRACTOR.....	29
RESPONSE TO PETITION.....	30
ICE SPORTS IN SOUTHERN TASMANIA.....	30
PUBLIC HEALTH AMENDMENT (PROHIBITED TOBACCO AND OTHER PRODUCTS)	
BILL 2026 (NO. 8).....	30

FIRST READING	30
MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE	31
PUBLIC SECTOR WORKFORCE NEGOTIATIONS.....	31
MOTION	39
NOTE - PREMIER'S ADDRESS.....	39
RESIDENTIAL PARKS BILL 2026 (NO. 2)	51
IN COMMITTEE	51
RESIDENTIAL PARKS BILL 2026 (NO. 2)	52
IN COMMITTEE	52
SITTING TIMES.....	106
SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS	108
THIRD READING FORTHWITH	108
RESIDENTIAL PARKS BILL 2026 (NO. 2)	108
THIRD READING	108
STATEMENT BY SPEAKER.....	108
COMMENTS REGARDING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY	108
ADJOURNMENT.....	109
FIGHT MOTOR NEURONE DISEASE CAMPAIGN	109
TASMANIAN LEADERS PROGRAM	110
IAN SAUER OAM - TRIBUTE.....	111
HOMELESSNESS AND THE HOUSING CRISIS IN TASMANIA	112
PUBLIC SECTOR WAGE NEGOTIATIONS AND INDUSTRIAL ACTION	113
ENDING NATIVE FOREST LOGGING RALLY	115
SES GROUPS - NEED FOR CORFLUTE SIGNS	116
BASKETBALL IN NORTHERN TASMANIA	117
THE TASMANIAN NATIONAL TRUST	118
DEVONPORT MOTOR SHOW.....	119

Tuesday 24 March 2026

The Speaker, **Mrs Petrusma**, took the Chair at 10.00 a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People, and read Prayers.

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

The SPEAKER - Members, before we move on to questions, I would like to welcome to the Chamber and our parliament today delegates from our twin parliament, the Legislative Assembly of Samoa. To the Speaker, members, and staff of the Legislative Assembly of Samoa, *talofa ma fa'afeiloa'i* - hello and welcome.

This visit by our Samoan colleagues here today is part of our parliaments and our Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of Tasmania branches twinning relationship with Samoa. Our delegates are here this week to observe our practices and procedures, and to strengthen the already strong relationships we have between our two parliaments. I hope our visitors will be able to meet as many of our members as possible during their visit. We welcome you, delegates, and look forward to learning from you and sharing experiences between our parliaments and continue our twinning relationship into the future. Welcome.

Members - Hear, hear.

QUESTIONS

Education - Teacher Strikes

Mr WILLIE question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, Ms PALMER

Thank you, Speaker, and I welcome the delegates from Samoa too.

Minister, your failure to reach agreement with your workforce has now escalated to full-day closures across Tasmania, the first time we've seen this sort of disruption in years. Students are missing entire days of learning and families have been left scrambling. Teachers are fighting for better paying conditions and raising serious concerns about violence in classrooms and burnout, but yesterday your Deputy Premier accused them of running a political plot aimed at your election in May. His comments come after the Treasurer downplayed the challenges teachers face, including violence in classrooms.

Mr Abetz - I did no such thing.

The SPEAKER - Order, honourable Treasurer.

Mr WILLIE - You know workers don't take industrial action lightly; it's always a last resort after being ignored. Will you condemn the Deputy Premier's comments yesterday and assure teachers you're taking their concerns seriously?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the question. I'm going to leave any sort of commentary about that to others.

Mr Willie - Are you on the teachers' side or his?

The SPEAKER - Order, Leader of the Opposition. I ask that the minister be heard in silence, please.

Ms PALMER - My focus cannot and will not be distracted from working to negotiate a fair and affordable deal for our teachers.

Ms Finlay - So you agree with what the Deputy Premier says?

The SPEAKER - Order, Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALMER - That is absolutely my priority. A comprehensive second offer for teachers has certainly reflected the dedication and collaboration we have with the discussions between our government and the Australian Education Union (AEU). It reflects the shared priorities of teacher workload, of the safety of our staff, professional -

Ms Finlay interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Deputy Leader of the Opposition, this is the second time you have interrupted. If the members of the opposition are not interested in hearing what the minister has to say, we'll move on to the next question. I ask that the minister be heard in silence, please.

Ms PALMER - Thank you very much, honourable Speaker. As I said, my focus will not be distracted from working to negotiate a fair and reasonable deal for our hardworking teachers. That is absolutely my priority.

We put a second offer on the table to the Australian Education Union that addressed all the topics and priorities that teachers have been sharing with me as I've gone to over 150 schools and Child and Family Learning Centres (CFLC) right across Tasmania. It was a fair and reasonable offer and was worked through with the unions. We have worked hand in hand with the unions over the past months. It's really disappointing that the Australian Education Union rejected the offer without taking it to our teachers. So disappointing.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Order. Honourable members of the opposition, this is my last warning to you all. The warnings will come quick and fast today. I ask that the honourable minister be heard with respect, otherwise we will move on to the next question very quickly.

Ms PALMER - Thank you very much. Of course we are terribly disappointed about the disruption we're going to see for families, small businesses and our workforce, but in particular for our students who are going to lose out on a day.

Ms Dow - Because you haven't listened to teachers.

The SPEAKER - Member for Braddon, this is your first warning.

Ms PALMER - I remain completely committed to working with the unions. We remain in discussions and, as I say, we are working through the log of claims. Some of the things that have been put on the table as part of the deal are reducing teacher workloads, keeping our staff and our students safe, increasing senior staffing levels and of course it included a base salary boost for most teachers in year one. We have already seen successful negotiations with our police, firefighters, doctors and education facility attendants and I want to make time to working with the union.

The SPEAKER - The honourable minister's time has expired.

Supplementary Question

Mr WILLIE - If the Education minister won't condemn the Deputy Premier's comments yesterday, why should teachers believe that this government respects the work they do?

Ms PALMER - As I've already answered previously, I am not going to engage in any of that commentary. My focus remains on our teachers, working with them to ensure we have a fair and affordable deal, and I won't be distracted by that.

Education - Teacher Strikes

Mr WILLIE question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, Ms PALMER

[10.08 a.m.]

Schools across Tasmania are now closing for a full day because you have failed to reach agreement with your workers.

Mr Abetz - No.

Mr WILLIE - It's a full day in the north-west.

The SPEAKER - Honourable Treasurer, I ask that your interjections cease. The only one who has the call at the moment is the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr WILLIE - It's an extraordinary escalation that is hitting students and families hard. Teachers aren't playing political games, and you failed to call that out. They are asking you to address real concerns about violence, burnout and unsustainable workloads. How did you let this situation deteriorate to the point where full-day closures are now occurring? Why did you fail to act?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the question. I think it's important to remember that this is the normal part of negotiations. I don't want to see schools close, I don't want to see disruption to student learning, I don't want to see disruption to families, small businesses and, indeed, our workforce. I will continue to work through this process, negotiating with the unions in good faith. As I have said -

Ms Dow interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Member for Braddon, this is your second warning.

Ms PALMER - the second offer that we have put to the unions is addressing all the issues that we know are so important. Around the offer we have the Violence in Schools Action Plan where we are supporting professional learning of our teacher assistants who we know deal with some of our most complex children. We are making sure we are increasing allowances for teachers, things like new overnight student activity allowances -

Ms Brown interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Member for Franklin, this is your first warning.

Ms PALMER - for when they attend school camp. There's a reduction in the school meeting hours cap, there are more schools that have been added to the hard-to-staff school teacher incentive program, and more professional support for our early career teachers. We have gone through the log of claims, we have worked with the union hand in hand, we have listened to our teachers and I remain committed to finding a fair and affordable deal for our teachers.

Supplementary Question

Mr WILLIE - We haven't seen full-day closures like this for some time. Do you accept responsibility for the disruption that students and families are now facing?

Ms PALMER - I did not want to see any industrial action in this space. I'm very disappointed that the unions have outright rejected the second offer that we have put to them and that they didn't take that offer.

Members interjecting.

Mr Willie - They're teachers.

The SPEAKER - Leader of the Opposition, this is your first warning.

Ms PALMER - I know that there will be disruption to families, disruption to workplaces and, above all, disruption to our students. We have a campaign talking about how every school day matters - for those young ones up there. Every day that you're at school is another opportunity for you to learn. I don't want to see students not able to go to schools, but I have to keep students safe. That is why we had to make the decision that because of this industrial action we had to close schools because we had to keep children safe. That has to be my priority, surely, as education minister.

Launceston General Hospital - Emergency Department

Ms ROSOL question to MINISTER for HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH and WELLBEING, Mrs ARCHER

[10.11 a.m.]

Yesterday the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation (ANMF) reported two patients have died after long waits for a bed in inappropriate spaces in Launceston General Hospital's (LGH) emergency department. It's a devastating result of your government's inaction on the health crisis, but unfortunately it's not surprising. The ANMF has been sounding the alarm for months about unsafe conditions in the LGH. They've said systemic changes are needed to improve access and flow. Banning ambulance ramping hasn't fixed the problems in our stretched health system. It's moved it inside hospitals. The ambulance ramping inquiry handed down its report more than a year ago, but there's still no response from your government. Will you take up the 41 recommendations of the ambulance ramping inquiry and ANMF to improve access and flow before more people die waiting for healthcare in the state's emergency departments (ED)?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question. You asked a number of questions in there, but I will start by the claims made by the ANMF, which are very serious and I have sought advice from the Department of Health about them. I am advised that the department is not aware of any adverse patient outcomes or patient safety incidents consistent with those claims. Further, based on the further details released by the ANMF through the media yesterday and noting that they have not raised this directly with either myself or through the department, I can advise that all deaths in the recent past at the LGH ED have been reviewed. While the department cannot identify any situations that match fully with the ANMF's descriptions, I'm advised that, based on that review, all patients received clinically appropriate care and treatment matched to their needs.

Speaking generally, the LGH has well-established patient safety and quality protocols to monitor the quality of patient care and review individual cases. All patients who present to the ED are triaged on arrival and those with the most urgent clinical needs are always prioritised and seen first.

That leads me also to the comments that you made about ambulances and transfer of care. There was some somewhat confusing messaging in those media reports yesterday about getting a transfer of care. We understand, and I have repeatedly said in here, that it is important for people to be able to get to the hospital as quickly as possible. That is why we have continued to be committed to our transfer-of-protocols.

In relation to access and flow issues at the emergency department, there is a whole range of initiatives that have been put in place to keep people out of hospital and in their own homes, reducing unnecessary emergency department presentations, and we're also committed to delivering new and innovative virtual care options to meet the healthcare needs of Tasmania. We have Care@home, a 24/7 statewide interdisciplinary service that provides virtual clinical assessment, remote monitoring, chronic disease management and after-hours palliative support statewide. Hospital@home: we've implemented secondary triage and a whole range of other

initiatives and we have seen urgent care clinics as well developed in this state and we continue to encourage people to know their care needs as well.

Supplementary Question

Ms ROSOL - My question was quite specific about 41 recommendations of the ambulance ramping inquiry and I repeat my question and ask whether the government will take up those 41 recommendations and implement them.

Mrs ARCHER - With respect, your question wasn't very specific, and I went into a number of the issues that you raised. Importantly, what I have said is that we remain committed to our transfer-of-care protocols.

Dr Woodruff - What about the ambulance ramping inquiry findings?

The SPEAKER - Leader of the Greens.

Mrs ARCHER - We remain committed to getting people the help that they need from an ambulance as quickly as possible so that they can be in the care of an ambulance as quickly as possible.

Ambulance Ramping - ANMF Claims

Mr O'BYRNE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.16 a.m.]

The Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation represent our health workers on the frontline. They're in regular communication with the professionals who confront the challenges of our health system every day and have a strong understanding of what's happening on the ground. What this means is that when the ANMF draws attention to an issue, we should listen closely. The government's approach to ambulance ramping seems to have increased the danger to some patients as they are left in alcoves and corridors. When the ANMF make extremely serious claims, we should all take notice. Given these pleas to your health minister, what are you doing to support her in responding to these claims?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I welcome the delegates from the Samoan parliament. It's wonderful to have you visiting Tasmania. I welcome our students as well who are observing Question Time today and democracy in action.

I thank the honourable member for the question. I refer to minister Archer's previous answer when it comes to these very serious matters, and there is no doubt that our transfer-of-care policy, ramping, as it is well known, has worked in terms of ensuring more hours on the road for our paramedics and ambulances. The last figure I heard was some 17,000 hours, and I'm sure it's more than that, which is designed to ensure that our paramedics are doing exactly what they should be doing and responding to those 000 emergency calls and being on the road, attending people in need of healthcare. When it comes to every facet of our health system, from the 000 call, right through the access and flow throughout the hospital, including discharge,

that's where we need a greater emphasis of effort from the federal government, in terms of ensuring there are aged care places and places for people within the NDIS care system. It is every facet of the healthcare delivery that we need to look at, which is termed 'access and flow'.

Of course, listening to very key contributors of healthcare within our system, including doctors, nurses and paramedics, of course we need to listen to their ideas and ways for improving the access-and-flow system, so we don't get overcrowded emergency departments, for example. We are working through that regarding more staff and increasing the size of emergency departments across the state, most notably in the Royal Hobart Hospital, and the LGH, which is a matter of concern that has been highlighted by the honourable member for Bass as well.

We need to ensure that we are investing in our primary healthcare. My understanding is that 40 per cent of people who present at emergency departments can be supported with their healthcare delivery elsewhere within the community -

The SPEAKER - The honourable Premier's time has expired.

Dorset Child and Family Learning Centre - Provider

Ms FINLAY question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, Ms PALMER

[10.20 a.m.]

In your answer to my question last week, you said that the existing local provider, Thrive, is the reason childcare has been cut at the Dorset Child and Family Learning Centre, but Thrive actually wants to deliver early childhood education and care at the centre. Minister, how does it feel to have used Thrive to justify your decision to cut childcare you promised when they actually want to be part of the solution?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the question. It's so exciting to have the opportunity to be able to be delivering a new Child and Family Learning Centre (CFLO) for the community at Scottsdale. To have these wraparound services for parents and children from zero through to five is really quite exceptional, and it's been wonderful to visit CFLCs right across Tasmania. I'll never forget one conversation with a young dad who said that the Child and Family Learning Centre in his area had actually saved his life with the wraparound supports for him and his children.

The new Dorset Child and Family Learning Centre concept design was actually based on advice from the Department for Education, Children and Young People (DECYP) that the Local Enabling Group found the early childhood education and care space was not needed in the near future. That advice came to me after seven weeks of thorough public consultation and also after engagement with the Local Enabling Group.

My office has since had a number of constructive conversations with community members. I've also spoken personally with the Dorset Mayor, Rhys Beattie, and my office has had conversations with the state CEO of Thrive. Based on those conversations, there does seem

to be a disconnect between the advice that's been received by me from the department based on that community consultation and on the engagement with the Local Enabling Group.

What I've done is asked the department to go back and review the information and the advice that they've given to me. I've asked them to meet with the community to engage again with the Local Enabling Group, which they do on a very regular basis, and come back to me with further advice.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Order. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Supplementary Question

Ms FINLAY - Minister, before you made the cuts, did you actually, or your department, ever ask Thrive if they wanted to deliver childcare at the new CFLC?

Members interjecting.

Ms Finlay - Yes or no? Did you speak to Thrive?

The SPEAKER - Order. You've already asked the question.

Ms PALMER - There have certainly been absolutely no cuts at all. The budget is the budget. As I say, there were seven weeks of consultation. There was extensive consultation with the Local Enabling Group. Based on that information, that's where that decision was made that the space was not needed in the near future. We certainly had already been engaging locally with those who'd been working at the current childcare provider there.

As I say, we've escalated those conversations to the CEO of Thrive across the state. I've asked the department to please go back and engage again with the community based on the new information.

Liberty Bell Bay Manganese Smelter - Voluntary Administration

Prof RAZAY question to MINISTER for BUSINESS, INDUSTRY and RESOURCES, Mr ELLIS

[10.24 a.m.]

It's known that the owners of the Liberty Bell Bay manganese smelter have several companies that are struggling, including the Whyalla Steelworks in South Australia and Tahmoor Colliery in New South Wales. Now, northern Tasmania's Bell Bay manganese smelter has entered voluntary administration, with 216 jobs up in the air, despite the state government's loan of \$20 million. This is terrible news for workers, their families, local small businesses and the community, who have endured many months of uncertainty. The company has failed to lodge financial statements in the last five years.

My question is: did we know about the background of the owners? What steps are the government taking to secure the loan against the assets - against hard assets? What step is the government taking to make sure that the state is not the last in the line of creditors?

The SPEAKER - The honourable member's time has expired.

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for Bass for his question, his considerable interest and his continuous engagement that we've had over many months as the uncertainty of the situation at Liberty Bell Bay continues. First, our hearts go out to everyone affected by this administration process - the workers, the supply chain, the broader community, and many people who feed into this major industrial infrastructure that we have in northern Tasmania.

A few things to clear up. The GFG Alliance is no longer the owner of Liberty Bell Bay. White Oak has exercised a receivership and appointed a new board and has now appointed an administrator in Ernst and Young. The administrator is working through the process and, hopefully, there will be a sale in the future to an owner who wants to invest in the business and the future of that workforce.

One of the most disappointing things about the previous ownership in GFG was that they were either unwilling or unable to invest in the future of that business, despite the government stepping forward proactively and providing a loan for shipment of ore.

In terms of your questions specifically on that loan, rather than being last on the list, we're actually first. We provided this loan on the basis of having a very high degree of security, first ranking security, and that is about ensuring that we can protect the taxpayers of Tasmania while also giving a chance for the smelter to restart.

We were very disappointed that the GFG Alliance made the decision to not restart the smelter, and we've been disappointed that they have been unable to invest in the future. We're hopeful that a new owner will be able to do so, and by entering the receivership process for the ore that we provided, that's given the state options. We can either, of course, sell the ore for roughly about the value for which it was purchased, being a tradeable commodity on the open market. We also retain the option of being able to sell it to new owners who might be interested in a quick restart.

If the receivership wasn't undertaken previously, the GFG Alliance could have, of course, sold that parcel of ore and it could be anywhere around the world. The potential restart of the smelter would be reliant on shipping in manganese ore from the other side of the country or potentially the other side of the world.

We're very confident in the security that we have over the ore. Of course it's secured against the physical asset, so that primarily protects the principle. We also have high-ranking security over the site and the lands as well. We ensure that in taking the risk of stepping forward and providing this option for the future of the smelter that we're protecting the Tasmanian taxpayers, because ultimately the mums and dads who earn the hard-earned taxes -

The SPEAKER - The honourable minister's time has expired.

Recognition of Visitors

The SPEAKER - I'd like us all to please welcome to the Gallery the year 6 students from The Friends School. Welcome to parliament.

We've also been joined by our further guests from Samoa today, so *tālofa lava* and *Afio mai* to our other Samoan guests who have joined us this morning. Welcome to parliament. It's lovely to have you all here.

Members - Hear, hear.

Education - Wage Offer Negotiations

Mr GEORGE question to ATTORNEY-GENERAL, Mr BARNETT

[10.29 a.m.]

Will you confirm that you told reporters the teachers' pay dispute is 'part of a political strategy, a political stunt' and 'designed to bring down the minister for Education at this year's election for the Legislative Council'? If so, this is an unacceptable attack on teachers, who have every reason to seek wage increases that reflect not only the growing cost of living, but the effort and energy they put into their profession and their students. Will you withdraw that implication, because it demeans teachers and their representatives?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I commend the Minister for Education for her work, her diligence, her efforts to work with the Premier and the government to put forward a very fair and fulsome offer, and that's what occurred last Friday - a very fair and fulsome offer. It was offered in good faith.

The Australian Education Union (AEU), in their response, did not send that to their members -

Ms Haddad - They were given an hour; not enough time to consult members.

The SPEAKER - Order, honourable member for Clark.

Mr BARNETT - to the various teachers all around Tasmania, but acted in what they considered the right way and indicated that it was outrageous. I just ask the question. I think it's a very understandable conclusion that there isn't a link. It's an understandable conclusion if you look at the facts and the good faith offer that was made by our government -

Ms Haddad - It's outrageous, and your minister didn't want to back it in - she's embarrassed, no doubt, by what you said.

The SPEAKER - Order, honourable leader of opposition business. This is your first warning.

Mr BARNETT - It was a very generous offer that was put on the table and negotiations were continuing in good faith, with great seriousness - but what happened?

Mrs Greene - What were you expecting in return?

The SPEAKER - Honourable member for Bass, Mrs Greene, this is your first warning.

Mr BARNETT - A strike closing the schools, so it's a very understandable response. In addition, why are we seeing fliers criticising and condemning the Minister for Education in the Rosevears electorate? Why aren't they in other parts of Tasmania? Why are they targeting Rosevears? You have to ask the question and that question was asked and that's a matter for the Australian Education Union.

Dr Woodruff - Just shows what you think about all the time.

The SPEAKER - Honourable Leader of the Greens.

Mr BARNETT - Let's be very clear. As a government we want this matter resolved. We don't want the strikes, we don't want school closures. There is an impact on students, on families, on businesses and on our community as a whole. We thank the teachers for what they do in supporting our children and giving the best education possible but we want this matter resolved. The teachers want it resolved and the parents want it resolved and that's what we are aiming to do.

Supplementary Question

Mr GEORGE - Attorney-General, you know as well as anyone in this Chamber knows, teachers do not go on strike easily or without deep consideration. Will you withdraw the slur of accusing them of political attacks on a minister, when all they are trying to do is protect their work, protect the way that they work and protect their incomes?

Mr BARNETT - I make very clear our sincere thanks to our teachers for the work that they do in teaching our kids and giving them the best education possible. I am talking and making reference to the Australian Education Union. A full and fulsome offer was put on the table and the question has to be asked: in the middle of good-faith negotiations, why is it that suddenly schools should be closed and strikes are pulled on? The question was asked and we want this matter settled in the best interests of our students, of our families, of the whole community and we are determined to do that. The minister has made that clear this morning and we are right behind the minister 100 per cent.

Dorset Child and Family Learning Centre - Minister's Comments

Ms FINLAY question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, Ms PALMER

[10.33 a.m.]

Last week you told this House that the community said it didn't need child care at the Dorset Child and Family Learning Centre. Now, it feels like you're throwing the department under the bus. The local enabling group, the group you are meant to rely on for your advice, established a working group, conducted consultation and confirmed there is a need for early childhood education and care and that the centre should be built. The evidence is clear in the meeting minutes of 18 April and 13 May 2025. How does it feel knowing you intentionally misrepresented the views of the community to justify your cuts?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the question. Please do not verbal me. You are making some absolutely ridiculous statements on that side of the House. Let me be very clear about how it works: we go out, we make a credible announcement that we are going to support this community with a Child and Family Learning Centre (CFLC). There has been no cut to the budget at all; I don't know how many times I can say that.

Let's just step through this carefully for you. In April 2024, as part of our commitment to build additional CFLCs across the state, we committed to providing additional space for early childhood education and care where there is unmet demand for these services.

The Dorset CFLC project commenced in March 2025 and it started with a 'get involved' campaign and a community meeting about the project. Then we had our local enabling group established and from under that was a subgroup which subsequently set up to explore Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) in the area as part of the project with all local enabling group (LEG) meetings and consultation processes that were facilitated by the department. I was advised that the Dorset CFLC LEG assessed the need to provide long day care and recommended that while there was not a need in the near term, the new CFLC should -

Ms Finlay - You're blaming the department?

The SPEAKER - Order, Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALMER - include additional space to enable partnering with an ECEC service provider in the future, if required. This is how it works. The department consults -

Ms Finlay - Doubling down.

The SPEAKER - This is your third warning, Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALMER - my office consults, I talk to people. This is actually how this works. You talk to the community. I have taken advice from the department based on seven weeks of public consultation, based on engagement with the LEG, with the subgroup under the LEG which is involving the ECEC, of which Thrive is actually a member. I have already said that -

Ms Finlay - Still blaming the LEG. You didn't ever speak to Thrive before you made cuts.

The SPEAKER - Order. Stop the clock, please. A number of members of the opposition are on third warnings and a few are on second warnings. There are two people who, if they make another interjection today, I will suspend from the House. The member has asked a question. I ask that the minister be heard. If you're not interested in her response, we will move on to another question. This is my last warning to a number of you today. The honourable Minister for Education has the call.

Ms PALMER - Thank you very much, honourable Speaker. As I was saying, when you're in negotiations and putting together such a wonderful capital investment as we are with our child and family learning centres, there are a lot of discussions and consultations that are had, and we work through that. My office held recent conversations with stakeholders and community members, which raised further feedback. Certainly one of those issues was around workforce capacity, which we know is an issue confronting childcare providers right across Australia and Tasmania's not immune to that. We've also been having discussions about how we uplift the workforce capacity in the Dorset area. In light of those conversations, I have instructed the department to review information and to provide updated advice on this matter and I've been advised that the department is already acting upon my request.

Supplementary Question

Ms FINLAY - There are members of the community currently doing the training to be able to deliver child care in the community. Minister, are you doubling down on your answer from last week and blaming the LEG for your decision to make cuts?

Ms PALMER - With the deepest of respect, I think today you've told me that I blame myself, I blame the department, I blame the LEG and I blame Thrive. I think you need to work out who you're saying I'm actually blaming.

Ms Finlay - It's a long list, minister. It's because you won't take accountability for what you've said.

Member Suspended

Member for Bass - Ms Finlay

The SPEAKER - Order. Under Standing Order 149, I suspend the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition until after the MPI.

Ms Finlay withdrew.

Ms PALMER - This is a good process where the department has engaged with the LEG and the community and where I have also engaged with the community. Based on those conversations and the information coming back to me and my office, I have asked the department to go back out again to review the advice they are giving to me, and they've already committed to doing that. In fact, I'm advised that it's already underway.

Hobart Private Hospital - Sale to Calvary

Ms JOHNSTON question to MINISTER for HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH and WELLBEING, Mrs ARCHER

[10.40 a.m.]

The sale of Hobart Private Hospital to the Catholic-run Calvary Healthcare means that Calvary becomes the only private hospital provider in the state's south. There's deep concern this will mean certain services will no longer be delivered in the private sector - services such as gender affirming surgeries, vasectomies, tubal ligation and IVF. If Calvary says no to providing those services, Tasmanians will have to rely on the public system or go to the mainland.

Tasmanians need affordable, appropriate and dignified pathways to access this care, and these pathways need to be designed now before any sale is finalised. Will you commit to engaging with experts now, such as Women's Health Tasmania and Equality Tasmania to develop alternative service pathways before these services become unavailable in the private sector in the south?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the question. It's a very important issue, and I know one that you have followed closely and engaged with me on, as have other members. Calvary Health Care announced in December 2025 that it had entered into an agreement to acquire the Hobart Private Hospital from Healthscope. It is important that the public and private health systems work effectively to meet the health needs of all Tasmanians, and the private health sector plays an important role for the healthcare system in Tasmania. This agreement is subject to regulatory approvals, including by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, and the sale and transfer of operations for the hospital is not expected to be completed until mid-2026.

The Department of Health is working with all partners to ensure continuity of care, patient choice and sustainability of health services for the Tasmanian community, both in the public and the private system, and the Tasmanian health system has a strong history of collaboration with Calvary Health Care and the Hobart Private Hospital, which we intend to continue.

To your wider point, though, ensuring that healthcare services continue without disruption remains a priority as continuity of care is essential for patients and for the wider Tasmanian community. We welcome that a bidder has been identified and we welcome that collaboration between public and private providers, as I've mentioned. We are closely monitoring developments throughout the sale process to support the safe, effective and sustainable delivery of services at the Hobart Private.

Those regulatory approvals are yet to occur and, so, we do not yet know the full range of clinical services to be provided. However, as you have identified, we do continue to work with a range of stakeholders. I have personally met with Women's Health Tasmania as well as interested members in this place and I reaffirm the commitment that both myself and the Premier have previously made in relation to this issue that we will ensure that Tasmanians continue to be able to access the essential healthcare services that they need.

Supplementary Question

Ms JOHNSTON - To be really clear, I want to make sure the minister has committed to engaging with these important services, Women's Health Tasmania and Equality Tasmania, now rather than waiting till the sale is finalised in mid-June or mid this year?

Mrs ARCHER - Yes, that's correct. Those consultations are already underway; a number of discussions already underway. It is very difficult without knowing what the details are in relation to the finalisation of the sale to know what that will look like, but, yes, we are already doing that and committed to ensuring that.

Fuel Prices

Mr WILLIE question to DEPUTY PREMIER, Mr BARNETT

[10.44 a.m.]

At a time when cost-of-living pressures are biting, Tasmanians are paying more every week and fuel is one of the biggest hits to the household budget. Two weeks into a fuel price surge, you admitted that there have been no compliance checks. You can't confirm whether fuel check prices are accurate and Tasmanians are being told to report gouging to a hotline that's not even operating on the weekend. Victoria has moved to lock in daily price caps while other states are strengthening compliance and enforcement. You've written a letter, convened a round-table and you're outsourcing the responsibility to consumers. Tasmanians want to know what specific state-based measures are you implementing right now to bring fuel prices down for Tasmanians?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question. This is an important matter and we're taking it seriously. As a government, we've been proactive. We've been on the front foot. The Premier has been in National Cabinet with the Prime Minister just last week, on Thursday, held in Hobart, and you can see that the federal government has a very important role to play, in fact the primary role to play in terms of fuel security. I want to make it very clear that fuel supply is currently secure. I want to make it very clear that Tasmanians should buy fuel as and when they need it.

To make it very clear that, as Deputy Premier and Attorney-General, I wrote to the chief commissioner of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, a federal entity that's responsible for anti-competitive behaviour, for price gouging, for false and misleading advertising and the like. It's very important.

I've written to Mr Bowen. We had an energy ministers' meeting on Friday. He provided an update in terms of the federal government in terms of petrol at 38 days; in terms of diesel, 30 days; in terms of jet fuel, 30 days, but we take it very seriously, and in Tasmania the Premier and I have been hosting industry roundtables on a regular basis, the most recent on a weekly basis, the most recent one yesterday.

We are very concerned in terms of cost of living and cost of doing business. The codes of practice in terms of our anti-competitive behaviour in Tasmania are being monitored and

they're being audited by the director of the Consumer, Building and Occupational Services (CBOS), and I thank Ms Pearce for her work and for looking into those complaints, undertaking various audits and ensuring that our codes of practice are in place. The government is very serious about doing everything possible to ensure that we're addressing cost of living, cost of doing business and will continue to do so.

Supplementary Question

Mr Willie - When these costs are escalating every week, Deputy Premier, how many compliance checks have been conducted?

Mr Barnett - Say again?

Mr Willie - How many compliance checks have been conducted?

The SPEAKER - Compliance checks wasn't part of your original -

Mr Willie - Yes, it was. 'No compliance checks'.

The SPEAKER - Okay. Deputy Premier.

Mr BARNETT - As I've indicated, the director of CBOS is acting in accordance with our codes of practice that are in place in Tasmania in terms of complaints made, following up on that and in terms of the fuel check app, obviously that's updated every 30 minutes. I encourage Tasmanians to shop around, check that out, and avail themselves of that information.

Let's be very clear, the federal government have a number of levers to pull in this regard -

Mr Willie - So do you.

Mr BARNETT - Supply is very important, but fuel excise -

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Honourable Member for Clark, your next warning.

Mr BARNETT - is a responsibility of the federal government. It's currently sitting at 52 cents of every single litre and then, of course, GST on top of that. That's a matter for the federal government.

At the industry meeting yesterday, and over recent weeks, a number of those key stakeholders have expressed their concerns and asked the federal government to intervene at least in part to take away some of the pain, and I agree with their concerns.

Cancer Treatment Services - Access

Ms ROSOL question to MINISTER for HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH and WELLBEING, Mrs ARCHER

[10.48 a.m.]

According to the Australian Medical Association (AMA), underfunding of cancer treatment services in southern Tasmania has left no capacity to cope with surges in demand at a time when cancer rates are going up. It's resulting in mounting pressure within the oncology unit, with delays, equipment breakdowns, inadequate infrastructure and staffing pressures. *The Mercury* reported that one oncology patient, Reuben Topski, was given an infusion in the ED waiting room because there weren't enough beds in the cancer unit. Another day, he waited hours for radiation therapy because the machine had failed. All this while your government is threatening to cut staff within the Royal Hobart Hospital clinical trials unit, which could impact patients' ability to access new cancer treatments. Do you accept that the health system is in crisis when Tasmanians are struggling to access life-saving cancer treatment? What are you going to do to fix this unacceptable situation?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for the question. Again, there's quite a number of questions in there. I am committed to regular ongoing engagement with the AMA to ensure that we're working closely together to deal with any specific concerns raised, but also so that we can identify and collaborate on any opportunities to continue to build a better health system.

I don't agree with some of the comments that have been made in the media and some of which you have gone to in your question. I obviously can't comment specifically on the circumstances of individual patients and their treatments, although I do empathise with patients where care does not meet their expectations.

As minister, I'm committed to ensuring the highest possible standards, and we are working hard to implement change and improvement right across the health system. I would encourage anyone with specific concerns about their care to raise them directly with the Royal Hobart Hospital or through my office so that we can investigate those cases directly.

In relation to the issue that you raised about the cancer trial services, for example, there has been a lot of coverage around that issue. Not all of the claims that have been made are correct. I would be happy to follow up with a more detailed response to you or to provide a briefing about that. The cancer trials continue to be conducted in Tasmania at the Royal, and will continue into the future.

Tasmanian Agriculture - Support

Mr Di FALCO question to MINISTER for PRIMARY INDUSTRIES and WATER, Mr PEARCE

[10.51 a.m.]

The cost of doing business for our farmers is going through the roof. I wouldn't like to be filling up a tractor at the moment. As we know, when their costs go up, so do ours.

I understand a lot of the issues with supply chains, freight import and export challenges are issues beyond the state's control. However, what levers are your departments pulling to give much-needed relief to Tasmanian farmers?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I want to thank the member for Lyons for his question and for his sincere and genuine interest in the agricultural sector. It's important, and the questions that you raise are important. The questions that you raise are on the lips of all farmers as we speak. In fact, my phone rings red hot since the conflict in the Middle East.

I'll deal with the fuel first. In terms of the agricultural sector, what we're looking for is fuel surety. We're looking for that next delivery of fuel. We have made, as a government - in fact, I checked only last night to ensure that next shipment of fuel, that 63 million litres which will fill our five depots around the state - that will give Tasmanian agriculture, in fact, all Tasmanians, about 57 days of operation - slightly less for diesel.

It's at this particular time for the agricultural sector, where we're trying to get potatoes and root crops out of the ground, we're also trying to get winter wheat into the ground. As well as the burden on, and increased cost of fuel, it's also the fact that we have a very narrow window in terms of seasonal windows. I'll give you an example: in my particular case, we're trying to get potatoes out of the ground. If we don't get those out of the ground by a certain point in time, they remain in the ground for the rest of the year, so time is of the essence. The other thing is, earth-moving, those heavier types of machinery on agricultural properties, can't happen over the winter period. That is the first issue.

The second issue is around fertiliser. Although 20 per cent of the world's crude oil comes out of the Persian Gulf, 34-35 per cent of the world's fertiliser does also. We've seen a huge increase in forward buying from the agricultural sector, particularly in Tasmania. In fact, it was reported to me by a major supplier that they have sold 12 months' worth, a year's worth, of fertiliser in 10 days, with farmers ensuring that they've got that.

I want to encourage farmers to, rather than buy that, store it in the shed and have a hard, white block of urea, buy it as you need it. There is plenty of fertiliser in the state at the moment, because I have triple-checked.

We also have the Impact plant down here, which is producing, instead of high-analysis fertiliser - nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and sulphur - they're producing Single Super, the old-fashioned sulphur-based fertiliser, which will suffice. When they've got a problem in front of them, farmers will often farm around it. Instead of using that high-analysis, they'll use a Single Super, they'll put potash in it, they'll put some sulphate of ammonia in it to get the end component up, and they will farm around it.

The SPEAKER - The honourable minister's time has expired.

Public Sector - Work From Home for Fuel Savings

Mr WILLIE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.55 a.m.]

While the federal government is encouraging Australians to work from home to help ease fuel demand, your Deputy Premier refused to answer questions about it yesterday. Thousands of public servants are in roles that can be done from a desk anywhere, yet they are still being required to commute and add to fuel demand. This is within your control, and it is also a direct cost-of-living relief measure for those workers who are currently paying more just to get to work. Public sector unions are calling for greater flexibility. Will you temporarily enable greater work-from-home flexibility across the public service to free up fuel for those who need it most, and take pressure off workers' household budgets?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member for his question. It highlights a very serious issue when it comes to uncertain times globally, uncertain times nationally and uncertain times in this state. I would not like to be a family at the bowser right now. I feel for the people and the families affected by Liberty Bell Bay, as an example. This is where our focus should be in terms of supporting families through what is a very worrying time in terms of cost of living and uncertain times, and no clear end to when things might get back to so-called normal.

When it comes to being flexible with work-at-home arrangements, my understanding is that is already the case.

When it comes to fuel supply - and the honourable member Mr Pearce knows very well the effects on farmers - thank you for the question, Mr Di Falco, regarding great uncertainty amongst rural constituencies - price is a factor. Talking to farmers, guarantee of supply is a factor as well - the decision to sow the winter crop or the crops in the coming spring, et cetera. We all need farmers to enable us to eat and to live. This touches all areas when it comes to the concerns around fuel, Mr Willie. Thank you for your question. Those within the community services - the people who are working on that valuable service Meals on Wheels, delivering to communities. This extends right throughout our community, and we need a very considered response both at a state level and a national level.

The federal government has more levers to pull at the federal level. One of those clear levers, as was reflected in the round table forum yesterday, as I understand it, was the fuel levy excise. If that was reduced, it would reduce a pain point for many in our community and many families. That must be one of the levers that the federal government considers to ease the cost of living on Tasmanian communities. The FuelCheck app is important in terms of shopping around to ensure the lowest price. I noticed Dr Broad's Facebook post this morning highlighting and endorsing the FuelCheck app, which is a great endorsement. Thank you, Dr Broad.

The SPEAKER - The honourable Premier's time has expired.

Supplementary Question

Mr WILLIE - You say it's already in place, but has there been a directive from the Head of the State Service to encourage people who work from home to reduce demand for fuel?

Mr ROCKLIFF - I am not aware of a directive as such, but employees within the public service can speak to their managers to arrange flexible working arrangements for them, themselves and their family, but also the stated intent behind your question about saving fuel.

Fuel Prices - Incentives for Public Transport Use

Ms BURNET question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.00 a.m.]

The pain people are experiencing with the cost of fuel is worsening by the day, and your government is appearing very flat-footed on addressing this. Since your general announcement last week about fuel security, the International Energy Agency has done the policy work for you, setting out 10 clear steps to reduce fuel demand, and the Leader of the Opposition touched on one of those. Number 3 is to encourage people to use public transport, which is something your government hasn't been successful at doing up to this point. This energy crisis offers your government the perfect opportunity to act. What new initiatives is your government considering to increase the uptake of public transport in the midst of this fuel crisis?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the honourable member for her question. We fully appreciate the value of public transport in Tasmania. We've continued our half-price fares on public transport through until 30 June this year, which is a key cost-of-living measure for Tasmanians, but also an opportunity for Tasmanians to have a modal shift - if that's the right terminology - from car to public transport, in this case buses or indeed ferries across the Derwent. It applies to every fare type - non-urban adult, urban adult, adult concession and child student fares - and is an example of a government that is applying resources effectively by having half-price bus fares to support Tasmanian families and making public transport more affordable.

For students travelling on public buses, fare-paying school buses and ferries, the single ticket cash student fare has been reduced from \$2 to \$1, and for adult concession fare travel across urban areas or up to three-month non-urban zones, the single ticket cash fare has been reduced from \$2.40 to \$1.20, again trying to not only support Tasmanians with the cost of living, but also that modal shift to public transport as well, which reduces congestion on our roads and reduces car use and fuel consumption as well.

I thank you for the question. We are doing our bit when it comes to half-price fares, which I know has been welcomed by many Tasmanians.

Supplementary Question

Ms BURNET - You talked about a modal shift; the question was about what initiatives you are putting in place now in direct response to the fuel crisis and also to increase that modal shift. We only have 4 per cent of people catching public transport to commute. What are you doing about that now as a response to the fuel crisis?

Mr ROCKLIFF - I think the honourable member for the supplementary question. I take it still in the context of public transport and I believe I've answered that. When it comes to the

very high prices people are experiencing at the bowser at the moment, if it's possible to access public transport to alleviate that pressure on the family budget, I don't need to encourage Tasmanian families to do that because it would be self-evident to them as they're watching every single dollar, as they would need to do, because as Mr Pearce has highlighted, when it comes to not just fuel but the cost of fertiliser and urea, it's gone up some 35 per cent to 40 per cent, as I understand it. That's a significant input cost and -

Ms Burnet - It doesn't help people catching public transport.

The SPEAKER - Order.

Mr ROCKLIFF - The flow-on effects of that affect the family budget in terms of food -

The SPEAKER - The honourable Premier's time has expired.

Halls Island - Lease

Ms BADGER question to ACTING MINISTER for PARKS, Ms OGILVIE

[11.05 a.m.]

This question is on behalf of Liz McQuilkin, who asks:

My father, Reg Hall, was a Tasmanian wilderness identity known as the Father of the Walls of Jerusalem, having mapped and named this special area and constructed the heritage-listed hut on Halls Island.

Before my father died, he passed the Halls Island lease to me. Years later, in good faith, I transferred this lease to Mr Daniel Hackett on the strict provision that he looks after the hut and honour my father's wishes that Halls Island be kept away from developers and open to all. Mr Hackett betrayed our understanding by proposing a helicopter tourism development for the island and the hut is rapidly deteriorating.

By 31 March, Mr Hackett must have all project approvals in place to satisfy the lease requirements. It's impossible Mr Hackett meets this deadline.

Minister, on behalf of the Hall family and the Tasmanian bushwalking and fly-fishing communities, will you use your power to cancel the lease?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, I thank the member very much for the question which, obviously, is a serious one. I have some information that I can provide to you. The Halls Island Lake Malbena proposal remains subject to all relevant local, state and Australian government planning and approval processes. At this time, it is a matter with the Australian Government to progress and Senator Murray Watt, the Minister for the Environment and Water, has carriage of this matter. As for an extension, I'll take advice in relation to the lease and licence arrangements for Halls Island.

The deed of variation is clear. The Minister for Parks should not unreasonably withhold consent to an extension if the operator is responding to requests from the Commonwealth within a reasonable timeframe. I am aware, following a review of that advice and in consideration of the time and resources the proponent has expended to date on the EPBC referral, that the Minister for Parks granted an extension to 31 March this year. As previously stated, the lease and deed of variation are publicly available -

Ms Badger - Actually, they're not.

The SPEAKER - Order.

Ms OGILVIE - on the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania's website as an active disclosure for some years. The extension instrument is also available on the website.

As I've said, I'll take advice in relation to the lease and licence arrangements for Halls Island. The Australian government's assessment is underway. The deed of variation is clear that the Minister for Parks should not unreasonably withhold consent to an extension if the operator is responding to requests from the Commonwealth within a reasonable time.

In relation to the condition of the hut, I am aware recent images of the hut have been supplied by those with an interest in its future. As a result, I understand Heritage Tasmania is seeking a condition update from the leaseholder and will determine further actions based on the response. I have asked the Parks and Wildlife Service to keep me updated on this matter and provide further advice to me. However, I understand Heritage Tasmania reviewed the condition of the hut in 2024 following correspondence from a number of parties and reported that an examination of images in 2024 showed little decline from those at the time of Heritage listing in 2021.

Dr Woodruff - They should go and have a look in person.

The SPEAKER - Order.

Ms OGILVIE - Heritage Tasmania has not raised any concerns regarding the hut condition since its listing in 2021. As I've said, I am awaiting further advice from PWS in relation to the most recent images.

Supplementary Question

Ms BADGER - You said the minister would not 'unreasonably' be able to withdraw that lease. I'm sure we can all agree in this place that someone who is not paying for that lease and is thousands of dollars in arrears to the department is quite unreasonable. The fact that they are in a court-ordered liquidation and haven't overturned that is quite unreasonable. The fact that they are withholding cultural heritage landscape assessments from the Aboriginal community is quite unreasonable.

The SPEAKER - Ms Badger, it's not time -

Ms BADGER - Therefore, minister, this is in your hands. This is not for the federal department. This is your lease with your signature that will go on it as acting Parks minister. Will you exercise your powers -

The SPEAKER - The member's time has expired. I remind members that a supplementary is not time for a speech or a debate, it is to ask a question.

Ms OGILVIE - May I seek some clarification? I don't think she actually got the question in in time.

The SPEAKER - There was an element of a question. Does the minister have anything further to add?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you, yes, I do. I was actually listening and waiting for the question. You have to watch your clock.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER - Order.

Ms OGILVIE - I can give you a little additional information. I understand that when the federal minister makes a final decision, this will be published by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water on the EPBC Public Portal.

Dr Woodruff - About the lease.

The SPEAKER - Order.

Ms OGILVIE - In relation to the current process which is being undertaken by the proponent and at the direction of the Australian government, I can't be making further comment while the process is under assessment. A decision on whether the proposal will proceed has not been made by the Parks and Wildlife Service at this time.

Ms BADGER - Point of order, Speaker, Standing Order 44, relevance. I didn't ask about the federal process, I'm asking about the lease.

The SPEAKER - Standing Order 44 is about you, the questioner, which actually states you shouldn't be -

Ms Badger - Didn't I say 45?

The SPEAKER - The Standing Order is 45.

Fuel Supply Levels

Mr WILLIE question to PREMIER, Mr ROCKLIFF

[11.10 a.m.]

Tasmanians want you to answer questions in state control. You're abolishing State Growth, which is responsible for managing Tasmania's fuel supply and supply chain emergencies at a time of international fuel insecurity. At the same time, we are now seeing reports of localised fuel shortages in parts of the state, including areas like Nubeena, while other states are actively advising the Commonwealth on supply risks. What advice have you received about fuel supply levels across Tasmania and can you confirm whether any regions are currently experiencing or at risk of shortages? How can Tasmanians have any confidence in your ability to manage this crisis when you're axing the department responsible for dealing with it?

ANSWER

I utterly reject your assertion there. We have regular briefings from Renewables, Climate and Future Industries Tasmania (ReCFIT), the director of fuel and energy within that. Let's be sensible and measured about this. This is about Tasmanian families who are hurting at the bowser. We have been on the front foot when it comes to these matters. I've made very clear statements. The prime minister was in Tasmania conducting a national cabinet just last week. The Deputy Premier has led three round tables across industry sectors and fuel suppliers, which have been very important. Mr Fairs has also been very good in terms of ensuring, within his local electorate at the very least, informs me and others around fuel supply.

As of 17 March, we had 38 days of petrol, 30 days of jet and 30 days of diesel stocks held nationally and exceeded the minimum stock holding obligation. What does concern me, along the lines that minister Pearce was talking about, is we must have a continuity of supply, of course. That's been reinforced to the federal government. Also, our reliance on diesel as a state is higher than other states. When we're talking about our farmers, our foresters and our miners and others, then we've got to be very mindful of those key industry sectors and their reliance on diesel and indeed Tasmania's vulnerability when it comes to that.

When I say vulnerability, and I made the point at National Cabinet, we are an island off an island, so quite naturally, Tasmanians are concerned about supply more broadly, but also right now they're concerned about the price. That's why the federal government, when it comes to price, needs to pull all the levers it possibly can, and one of those is a reduction in fuel excise, which would alleviate the pressure at the bowser.

We have made these matters clear to the federal government, we have a representative from Tasmania within the forum that the Prime Minister established last week through National Cabinet and look forward to our voice being on that table, but most importantly the voices of all Tasmanians.

The SPEAKER - The Premier's time has expired.

Supplementary Question

Mr WILLIE - Does the Premier have an understanding of the fuel supply risks across regional Tasmania and, if he doesn't, how can Tasmanians have confidence in him to manage us through this crisis?

Mr ROCKLIFF - It's why we have had three forums in under 14 days, to National Cabinet to get a good understanding from the industry sector. I was concerned to hear from the tourism industry, which has been a consistent theme I'd have to say in the last couple of forums, around cancellations of bookings for our tourism sector, which was hit very hard throughout COVID and indeed is experiencing real challenges now.

We need to get the message out there that Tasmania does have the supply of fuel and, indeed, to ensure that the federal government can do all they can in terms of reducing excise. What would help me and our team, in term of advocacy, would be your support for a cut in fuel excise. I ask you -

The SPEAKER - The honourable Premier's time has expired.

Community Support for Renewable Energy Projects

Mr GARLAND question to ACTING MINISTER for ENERGY and RENEWABLES, Mr BARNETT

[11.15 a.m.]

During the public hearing for the Energy Matters Committee on 10 March, Hydro Tasmania's CEO, Rachel Watson, detailed how they're picking the renewable energy projects that they are going to support, stating:

... they have to be very good at stakeholder relations: they have to be right on top of their environmental obligations; they have to have done really good; First Nations engagement ... and we do want to support projects that are welcomed by the community. We want to be helping Tasmania develop renewable energy in a way that also has community acceptance.

Can you provide evidence of which proposed renewable energy projects in Tasmania are supported by the community? Will your government also withdraw support for renewable energy projects at Hydro Tasmania that the community do not support? What will you do to improve your energy policy so that communities are heard, respected and protected in line with the federal Liberal plan for affordable energy and lower emissions?

ANSWER

Honourable Speaker, as Acting Minister for Energy and Renewables, and welcome again to the Samoan colleagues and that relationship which we look forward to continuing to grow.

In terms of the question, I want to make it very clear that the top priority issue for all Tasmanians right now is fuel security and the cost of fuel, cost of living, cost of doing business, and that's why, as the Premier said, it's a priority for our government, and I know you would

be concerned, together with members of your electorate on the north-west coast, to the member for Braddon.

In terms of our government's plans and our government's agenda and, obviously, in terms of public consultation and feedback and connection with the government, with the public, it's very important that they understand - as we've been consistent all the way through in terms of the opportunities to grow our economy, create more jobs, deliver a cleaner environment - we have the renewable energy credentials in Tasmania that we're so pleased and proud of, with our 100 years of investment in hydro.

It is very important that we're able to understand that. I know that Hydro Tasmania share that message consistently. The various renewable energy proponents who you referred to in your question are obviously aware of that.

Mr GARLAND - Point of order 45, Speaker, Standing Order 45, relevance. Thank you. Quite clear, I would like to know: will you withdraw your support for energy projects that Hydro Tasmania and the community don't support, and which ones does the government support?

Mr BARNETT - All the projects for renewable energy projects in Tasmania need to go through an appropriate development approval process and much of that requires public consultation and feedback on that development proposal, on that opportunity to grow our renewable energy plan.

If it's an individual proponent, they have to go through that process if it's a major developer. The same applies to TasNetworks and the same applies to Hydro Tasmania and, as I was saying, we are so pleased and proud of our renewable energy credentials. But we've got big plans for Tasmania, and with Marinus Link, Battery of the Nation, we want to deliver thousands of new jobs, billions of investment and this will be delivered over the years ahead.

We want to be a state with the lowest possible prices for electricity and we have the lowest possible regulated prices for customers and for small businesses in Tasmania.

The SPEAKER - The honourable Deputy Premier's time has expired.

Supplementary Question

Mr GARLAND - Can the minister name one project, one energy project, they do not support in this state at this time?

Mr BARNETT - As I was saying, all of those projects need to go through a public consultation process. It's a democracy. It's a free world. The proponents have every right to put forward their proposal to go through that process, get public feedback on that proposal. They have to go through the development approval processes at the federal level, the state level, the local level and progress accordingly. They get public feedback and that's a matter for each and every proponent.

We support growth and development of jobs. We support growing our renewable energy opportunities in Tasmania. This parliament has already locked in its support for doubling our renewable energy opportunities in Tasmania through to 2040 to 200 per cent. This is something

we're excited about as a state government. We'd like all to come on board with this agenda to deliver low-cost, reliable, clean electricity.

Time expired.

CONSTITUENCY QUESTIONS

Violence in Schools

Dr BROAD question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, Ms PALMER

[11.21 a.m.]

My constituent question is from a Devonport primary school teacher. In what other job would you get verbally abused, bitten, spat on, hit, punched and kicked, all whilst you are trying to keep yourself as safe as well as 27 or so others also teaching these students the curriculum? This is the reality many teachers face every single day. Behind classroom doors educators are not only developing lessons, but they're also managing escalating behaviours, de-escalating conflict and protecting students from themselves and from harm. What should be a safe environment for learning can quickly become unpredictable and, at times, dangerous. Teachers are expected to remain calm under pressure and respond with empathy while they are being physically hurt and continue teaching as though nothing happened, but they also carry the emotional weight of these incidents long after the bell rings, often without time resources or the support they truly need. When is the minister going to get serious about violence in schools?

Tassal Presentation to Primary School Students

Mr GEORGE question to MINISTER for EDUCATION, Ms PALMER

The question comes from Dr Ian Sale, a constituent. Why are you allowing Tassal, a multinational company, to make presentations to primary school students in and around the Channel? The Department of Education's guidelines are clear: schools must not allow marketing, advertising or brand promotion to students, including activities that could be perceived as public relations. Would you allow a multinational company like McDonalds, which also employs many Tasmanians, to make similar educational presentations to young children? If not, can you please explain how Tassal is any different?

Safety in Town Centres

Mr VERMEY question to MINISTER for POLICE, FIRE and EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, Mr ELLIS

We've seen quite an increase of unrest, violence and unruliness, not only in Hobart but in other cities around the state. What is the minister and the government doing to strengthen community safety, including visible police and practical support, to reduce antisocial behaviour and improve feelings of safety in town centres?

Halls Island Lease

Ms BADGER question to ACTING MINISTER for PARKS, Ms OGILVIE

My question is from my constituent, Greg, of Molesworth. You said in recent correspondence to Lyons MP Tabatha Badger in relation to the Halls Island lease validity and compliance with lease conditions, that if the proponent seeks in writing to request a further extension as described in the deed of variation, this will be considered. Can you confirm whether the proponent has yet written to you for an extension? If the proponent does not write requesting an extension by 31 March, what will happen to the lease, which will be breached? Is there a grace period for the proponent to write after the deadline? Will the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania automatically update the deed of variation timeframe. or will you finally relinquish the lease from the failing, unreasonable proponent?

Electric Vehicle Specific Tariffs

Ms BURNET question to ACTING MINISTER for ENERGY and RENEWABLES, Mr BARNETT

My question is from John, who says that other states in Australia offer favourable electricity tariffs for electric vehicle charging. In order to increase the uptake of electric vehicles in Tasmania, will you encourage TasNetworks and the economic regulator to introduce favourable EV-specific tariffs in Tasmania? If not, why not? What work has TasNetworks been doing to introduce the virtual power plant model to enable EV owners in Tasmania to sell their stored electricity back into the grid?

Ridgely - Roadside Verges Slashing

Ms DOW question to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE and TRANSPORT, Mr VINCENT

My question is from Gordon in Burnie, who contacted me recently about the state of the roadside verges in Ridgely. Gordon would like to know when those roadside verges will be slashed in Ridgely, but more generally when the program will occur across the north-west coast.

Wynyard - Respirable Crystalline Silica Dust Monitoring

Mr GARLAND question to MINISTER for SMALL BUSINESS, TRADE and CONSUMER AFFAIRS, Mr BARNETT

My constituent question again comes from community members in Wynyard. What investigations or monitoring does the government have in place to monitor and measure respirable crystalline silica dust in the greater Wynyard area? How many measuring devices are there and are these devices temporary or permanent?

Bridport Road - Upgrades

Mr FAIRS question to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE and TRANSPORT, Mr VINCENT

Bridport Road is a key link to the north-east of the state, including for the road freight and heavy vehicle sector. Can you please update the House on what is planned in terms of upgrades for Bridport Road and when the works will begin?

Time expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Jingai Zhang - Investigation by German Authorities

[11.26 a.m.]

Mr ELLIS (Braddon - Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management) - On indulgence, Speaker, I missed the call before. I rise to add to an answer to a question from Ms Badger, the member for Lyons, on Wednesday 18 March in relation to the killing of Jingai Zhang. To date, Tasmania Police has not received any request from German authorities in relation to Mr Tobias Pick. Should a request be received, it will be appropriately considered.

TasNetworks - Zinfra Contractor

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Deputy Premier) - Honourable Speaker, I'd like to provide an answer to a question I took on notice last week from the member for Franklin, Mr O'Byrne, with regard to TasNetworks engaging one of their contractors, Zinfra.

All Tasmanians deserve to be fairly paid for the work that they do. Both the Tasmanian government and TasNetworks respect the right of employees to take protected industrial action as allowed for under federal law. I'm also advised that Zinfra is one of the four members of TasNetworks' distribution contracted services panel. Members of this panel currently operate on annually renewed contracts, not contracts for specific pieces of work. All annual contracts have been in place with members for several years and currently about 20 per cent of TasNetworks' regulated program of workers are allocated to contractors on the panel. This work is often referred to as planned work. As part of normal operations, TasNetworks reschedules any upcoming work, including planned work that cannot be completed safely within standard timeframes. That is a safety measure.

As essential work and services that Tasmanians rely on day in, day out, it would be inappropriate and unsafe for TasNetworks to proceed with an electricity outage that they cannot reasonably guarantee completion of within the standard timeframes. I'm also advised that this often is due to adverse weather forecasts, but TasNetworks also postpones, reschedules or reallocates work due to staffing uncertainties. This was the situation that occurred during Zinfra's recent enterprise agreement negotiation.

TasNetworks' foremost priority must be the safety of the Tasmanian community. Proceeding with planned outages that carry the risk of not being completed within acceptable

timeframes due to protected industrial action was deemed by TasNetworks to be too great of a safety risk for customers and the broader community. This is not something the Tasmanian government intervenes in. Therefore, during periods when Zinfra employees were engaging in protected industrial action, TasNetworks took the decision to prioritise safety and cancel planned work that had been allocated, as Zinfra is selecting to undertake the work in-house rather than cancel it completely.

This is consistent with the approach TasNetworks used during previous instances of protected industrial action taken by TasNetworks employees. It's important to note that reallocating or cancelling planned work for safety reasons is not the same as withdrawing a major works contract.

These matters operate under federal law and the Tasmanian government expects government entities to adhere to these laws. Under these federal laws, secondary boycotts are a matter for Fair Work Australia and the Australian Competition Consumer Commission. I'm advised that Zinfra continues to be an active member on TasNetworks' distribution contracted services panel, with planned work continuing to be allocated to them. I thank the member for his question.

The SPEAKER - Honourable Deputy Premier, are you able to table that response? I'm just conscious of Hansard because it was read so fast.

Mr BARNETT - I'd be happy to.

Paper tabled.

RESPONSE TO PETITION

Ice Sports in Southern Tasmania

[11.30 a.m.]

Mr PEARCE (Braddon - Minister for Primary Industries and Water) - Honourable Speaker, I submit the response to Petition No.18 of 2025.

Paper tabled.

PUBLIC HEALTH AMENDMENT (PROHIBITED TOBACCO AND OTHER PRODUCTS) BILL 2026 (No. 8)

First Reading

Bill presented by Mrs Archer and read the first time.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Public Sector Workforce Negotiations

[11.31 a.m.]

Mr WILLIE (Clark - Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I move -

That the House take note of the following matter: Public Sector Workforce Negotiations.

It is my pleasure to rise to speak about this very important matter that many Tasmanian families are now facing across the state. For other members' context, I'll read out what the Deputy Premier said about this matter yesterday. He said this in regard to the teachers and the strike action being taken that is closing schools in the north-west today, the north tomorrow and the south on Thursday. No doubt we will have many teachers and support staff out here on the lawns on Thursday, and I think they'll probably tell the Deputy Premier what they really think. He said yesterday:

That's a strong suspicion that I have that it's part of a political strategy by the Australian Education Union to upset the Education Minister at the May election, and I would call upon the Australian Education Union to cease those political stunts and actually communicate with all teachers the fulsome and fair offer that was provided to the Australian Education Union last week.

That is an extraordinary accusation against hard-working teachers and support staff in our school system who are dealing with very real challenges at the moment: violence in school, workload, burnout. To make out like it's some sort of political plot is a terrible thing to say. It actually disrespects and devalues what they're trying to fight for, which is student outcomes. Their working conditions are student learning conditions, and I don't think the Deputy Premier gets that, because he was given an opportunity today to retract those comments and apologise. Did he do that? No, he doubled down on it.

Where was our Education minister? She was asked about this matter. Did she stand with the teachers and say that's not acceptable, or did she stand with the Deputy Premier and basically endorse his comments by not calling them out? She did exactly that. She said to the teachers, I don't care what some of my colleagues are saying about you - I won't stand up for you. I would expect an Education minister to be fighting for her workforce and trying to resolve this, and these sorts of things make it very difficult to do that.

It's true to form from this government. We had the Treasurer in recent weeks saying that police had a more difficult role than other public servants. I know how upset other public servants were with that. Of course, police deserve fair pay and conditions, they're very hard-working keeping our community safe, and we absolutely value them but to try and set public sector workers off against each other is a disgrace. This is true to form from this government that they devalue the workforce, and it's exactly why they're in the mess they are.

We haven't seen full school closures for many, many years. That's how disruptive this is. It's not something that teachers take lightly. I know that from having been one myself. It's very hard to motivate teachers and support staff to take industrial action, because they're very conscious of the disruption it causes. They're doing it as a last resort. They're doing it because

they're not being listened to. They're doing it because we're in a national labour market, and unless this government values what they're doing, we're going to lose good people.

You only have to see what's happening in other states - Victoria, New South Wales - valuing their teachers. Victoria was offered 18.5 per cent pay rise. That makes our teachers' offer look very insignificant, and they're just across the ditch. We're in a national labour market. We're going to lose good people out of our workforce at a time when we cannot afford to do that. Not only that, but our teachers here arguably have a harder job than some teachers on the mainland. They're teaching a national curriculum which is consistent across the country, but in Tasmania we have particular challenges: socioeconomic challenges and high rates of disability in our student population. Our teachers, arguably, are dealing with more diversity, and they're struggling in their classrooms with violence which is escalating. They're doing the same job but being paid the lowest in the country, and this offer that has been put on the table is not the same as the police. They'll make out like it is, but they're clawing things back and they haven't been upfront about that.

I look forward to Thursday, when we have teachers and support staff on the lawns here at Parliament House. I'm sure they will tell the Deputy Premier what they think of his language and his description of what's going on. We cannot afford to disrespect our teachers and support staff. We cannot afford to have further disruptions in our schools. It's an indictment on this government, but it is because of the way they treat workers. This government is no friend of Tasmanian workers, whether they're in the education sector, our health sector or a range of sectors, where they just try to run people down and blame everybody else.

[11.36 a.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Deputy Premier) - Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to stand today to address the ongoing wage negotiations, the industrial action that's now impacting our schools, impacting our families, impacting our businesses and the broader Tasmanian economy. Right at the outset I will say, to make it very, very clear: this government, and I, value the work of our teachers. We value the work of all our State Service employees, and we recognise their vital role in this great state of Tasmania. That role continues and we want it to continue in a mutually agreeable way, because they are shaping the future of our children and the future of the state.

We remain very firmly committed to delivering a fair and reasonable wage outcome as soon as possible. That's why that offer, which was fulsome, was made and delivered last Friday. It's a very comprehensive offer. It's a very balanced offer. It shows that we're very serious, as a government. It's a considered package and it's been developed through genuine engagement and feedback and, indeed, extensive discussion. I commend and congratulate, again, the minister for Education for her strong leadership in delivering better educational services and outcomes for the people of Tasmania, specifically the children of Tasmania and their families, the high regard that the minister has for our teachers and our education services and how important they are in this state of Tasmania.

The offer is not just about wages. The package also addresses a key number of issues that the teachers and the union have consistently told the government that matter, including workload pressures, classroom safety, staffing support, access to professional development opportunities and the like. That's why it is so disappointing that the AEU has called on this strike and industrial action, and particularly the closure of the schools.

The Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (TCCI) have expressed their views, and their very clear position, and that is calling on the Australian Education Union to abandon this disruptive strike action and instead put the government's offer to a vote. That's the view of the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The acting CEO of the TCCI also has stated that, in Tasmania's current fiscal environment, the offer on the table is fair and reasonable, reflecting a balanced approach to wage growth and sustainability. That's the view of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

We know the consequences of the actions by the Australian Education Union are real and they are being felt right across the community. The minister for Education and the government has expressed how disappointed we are that students will miss out on valuable learning time. That cannot be easily recovered - every day matters for our students. Parents are being forced to make last-minute arrangements, often having to take time away from work or juggle competing responsibilities. Of course, businesses across Tasmania are feeling the impact through lost productivity, workforce disruption and increased uncertainty. They have also highlighted that what many Tasmanians are experiencing in practical terms, including rolling school closures that force parents to stay home, workplaces left short staffed, small businesses losing productivity, and families dealing with additional stress at an already challenging time. When schools close, the effects do not just stop at the school gate but instead flow right across our economy, impacting small business operators, employees, families and every single region of Tasmania.

That's why we're calling for a return to good faith negotiations. That is our call on behalf of our government. It requires genuine engagement, a willingness to listen and a commitment to working constructively towards a practical and achievable outcome. We have demonstrated that commitment through this process.

Let's be clear. Teachers want to teach. They do an excellent job and we value and support them. We're also working in good faith to secure them a pay rise as soon as possible and that's why the union's call for a strike and its impact on families is so disappointing. The closure of schools in particular will have a flow-on effect.

Time expired

[11.41 a.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin - Leader of the Greens) - Deputy Speaker, what we just heard this morning from the Deputy Premier is, on the one hand, he's saying we value the work of our teachers, but everything about his language and his comments yesterday and his responses in parliament today show that he does the opposite. The comments that the Deputy Premier made yesterday were insulting. They were described as such by the education union and they were offensive.

They were offensive to educators, who work hard every day and who have made a difficult decision to take legal industrial action, to stand up for their rights and especially to stand up for the learning opportunities that are just dissolving in Tasmania under the Liberals and their mismanagement of schooling in Tasmania. It is really outrageous that the Deputy Premier doubled down on his insulting comments that he made yesterday where he accused educators who were striking of political stunts and said that it's a part of a political strategy.

He's accusing teachers of playing politics. It reveals everything about how the deputy premier and this government approaches these situations. That says everything about their internal thinking about what's going on. It's all about politics to them. It's all about how they are messaging it, whereas they're not at all concerned with the reality of the wages and conditions that Tasmanian educators are living under, suffering under.

The failure of this government to recognise that, if they don't come and provide a fair and reasonable increase in wages, then we will, as teachers and other educators have warned, see a continual loss of our teaching staff, of early learning centre staff, of the administrative staff, of everybody in the education system. That's what we're facing in Tasmania, when you have a Victorian government that has increased educators' wages by 11.5 per cent, and you've got this government penny pinching, it just shows you where they're prepared to take Tasmania.

We have skyrocketing petrol prices and increasing cost of living for teachers and other educators who are already on the lowest wages in the country. Tasmania once used to be a cheaper place to live; it certainly isn't now. Our housing prices are some of the highest in the country. We have the same fuel shortages, prices maybe more than other states in areas, and we've got teachers on the lowest wages. This is on the backdrop of what the Liberals are planning to bring in - 2500 public sector job cuts. This is the Liberals' austerity measures, and we're seeing it rolling out, and it is a result of their continual focus on spending on concrete instead of people. They're still going ahead with what will be a multibillion-dollar stadium that we cannot afford, when we can't pay to keep teachers in the classroom, we can't keep nurses in hospitals and we can't keep community service workers. Where's the money going for the Meals on Wheels that the Premier talked about caring about this morning? These are the real priorities that the Liberals are making: they are putting the money into building concrete stadiums that we can't afford, because we've got to deal with the basics. You know, Tasmanians can see that.

When you go to the petrol pump and the price means you cannot fill up your car, that's when they want the government to back them, and we have to be funding the essential jobs that are the backbone of Tasmania. This is what vulnerable Tasmanians need. We have nearly a quarter of Tasmanians who were already skipping meals before, what we've just heard for the International Energy Agency, is the greatest fuel crisis that this planet has ever faced, more than the 1970s and COVID combined.

It hasn't started yet. That's the point. We haven't seen the lag effect, but it's coming and what we have to do is batten down the hatches, focus on people, focus on the essential jobs, focus on the people who are there every single day and not playing the political games that this Deputy Premier is paying. It's a shame on him and we call on him to stand up for the public sector workers and give them a fair pay rise.

[11.46 a.m.]

Ms HADDAD (Clark) - Deputy Speaker, the Deputy Premier's comments yesterday were outstandingly tone deaf, and his comments in here today, speaking about the fact that the industrial action that the AEU has been pushed into a corner to have to take because this government has failed to listen to them, really says it all. It says what we know about this government.

They forget that the public sector workforce is their workforce. To hear the government say that they recognise that the school strikes will have an impact on families, on businesses,

on community shows us that they fail to recognise that they are the very community that they are talking about and that they employ. They have failed to listen to their own workforce - teachers, health workers, public sector workers across the board - to the point where they have had no choice but to take industrial action and no union and no worker takes industrial action as their first choice. It is a last resort.

No worker goes to work hoping industrial action is what's going to happen on their day, least of all teachers, any worker actually, and no union goes in planning to take industrial action until they are pushed to the brink by their employer, the state government, their own employer. So, the comments yesterday from the Deputy Premier, I just have to really reiterate what the secretary of the AEU said.

For the Deputy Premier to say that thousands of teachers would be taking industrial action in some kind of political plot to unseat the Education minister just shows how out of touch he is with Tasmanian workers and with Tasmanian teachers. To think that thousands of educators would be walking off the job and taking action in some convoluted conspiracy-theory-style plan and political plot is so tone deaf and it shows what a bubble he lives in and what a bubble this government lives in to think that it would matter that much to thousands of educators to be a part of some kind of political plot.

Let's not forget the case that it's not just teachers who have been pushed into this position, it is public sector workers across the board who have been forced into this situation by this tone deaf government who doesn't value their own workforce: Child safety workers, ARL staff workers, parks and wildlife service workers, forensic scientists, mental health services and biosecurity workers, who have been asked to take a real wage cut in the offers that have been made to them and not just about wages.

Let's not forget that this is actually about working conditions. They've also been asked to give up conditions, they've been asked to endorse job cuts across the public service, they have been asked to drop public holidays and drop their hourly rates. They have been forced into industrial action by the fact that this government fails to remember that these people they are talking about are their own workforce. Similarly, health workers have had to take industrial action as a result of the failure of this government to bargain in good faith with them.

We have seen recent rolling stop-work actions across the health service from pharmacy workers, pathology workers, podiatry workers, allied health professionals, genetic counselling professionals, radiation therapists, radiation oncology medical physicians - rolling stopwork actions from these vital health workers, who we run the risk of losing if this government continues to treat them with contempt and fails to come to the table with a good faith attitude to bargaining.

This has got to the point where we are looking like we may lose staff. Thirza White, the secretary of the CPSU, said that when experienced staff start walking away, the cost is paid by the community through weaker services, higher turnover and irreplaceable expertise. That is the risk we run. This is their workforce that they are failing to listen to. This is every Tasmanian family who has a public sector worker in their household being affected by this government failing to negotiate in good faith. We run the risk of losing these highly skilled professionals across every public sector workforce.

It has also led to really serious claims by the ANMF, which the Health minister didn't pay much attention to in question time today and said it was not necessarily the case. That is really concerning because the concerns the ANMF raise is that preventable deaths have occurred at the Launceston General Hospital as a result of the failure of this government to deliver on their promise around ambulance ramping. We heard the Premier talk about that in a way that was very unconvincing - I've run out of time.

Time expired.

[11.51am]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass) - Deputy Speaker, I welcome the introduction of the matter of public importance today from the opposition but reject the typically negative political rhetoric they engage in. It is a bit rich for the Labor Party to be taking any offence or umbrage at the comments from the Deputy Premier over the weekend, when they themselves last week brought an MPI in here on education and they made it all about Rosevears, speaker after speaker. I believe there were three Labor speakers and it was Rosevears bingo. We called it out because that is the broader political strategy that the Labor Party is engaged in -

Mr Willie - We're politicians. He was talking about teachers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Mr FERGUSON - where they're acting in this House as if the voters of Rosevears are all tuned in and listening to them. It's okay for them to think that, but they made their speeches all about the upcoming election in Rosevears. We saw you coming, Mr Willie; we see you.

I've been a teacher in public education in Tasmania. I've also been an AEU member in the past in Tasmania. What we are seeing in this place is the Labor opposition doing something which is highly questionable where they're inserting themselves into a negotiation process for an EBA between the Tasmanian government and a registered union.

The registered union has teachers as its membership. I don't know currently what proportion of Tasmanian teachers are fully paid members of the AEU, but it's not 100 per cent. Whatever the number is, the fact of the matter is an offer has been made by the government, by our ministers and the appropriate chief negotiator, the head of the State Service, Kathrine Morgan-Wicks as secretary of DPAC. That first offer was rejected out of hand by the Australian Education Union. I understand that a second offer was made last week by the head of the State Service to the Australian Education Union. Did the teachers get a say? No. Did the teachers get a look at it? Was it sent to the teachers for them to consider and have a look at and express a view, member or not? My understanding is that it wasn't. It was rejected out of hand.

While some members might be okay with that, I find it very questionable that that's happening while the Labor Party in this House are bringing the negotiations onto the Floor of the House, at the same time as the Labor Party is criticising the government for the state Budget, which we used through the pandemic to shield all public servants and our private sector through those very difficult times. We've used that budget to shield vulnerable people and to have genuine responses to the commission of inquiry. The Labor Party is saying they want to see budget improvement and on the other hand, on the Floor of this House, they're bringing in debates and injecting themselves into the negotiations, which is quite properly between the union and the government's bargaining agents and the Head of the State Service.

Other sectors of our public service have been able to make agreements with the government. Medical practitioners have struck an agreement. It's only one year, but there is an agreement. That took effect recently and the pay increase was recognised back to 1 January of this year. Education facility attendants received a 3 per cent increase from last December and firefighters, a 3 per cent increase from one December last year. As we know, police have also found an agreement. I believe whether you're Liberal or Labor, Greens or Independent or SFF, we have a role, which is to say there are recognised negotiators at the table, but we're not one of them. We encourage the agreement-making to take place without bringing our politics into it. I believe teachers should have been able to have a say before any industrial action was taking place. It's amazing how quickly an offer from last Friday has deteriorated into schools being closed this week.

I support the minister and her actions. I'm aware of her advocacy. She is a strong advocate for her workforce and it's very disappointing to see this debate on the Floor of our House.

[11.56 a.m.]

Ms BURNET (Clark) - Deputy Speaker, I thank the honourable Leader of the Opposition for bringing this MPI to the Chamber. It's about public sector negotiations and there is no harm for anybody in this place to talk about how good or bad the public sector negotiations have been.

I'd like to make a few comments in response to the Deputy Premier. Deputy Premier, your government needs to take some responsibility in relation to how poorly many of the public sector negotiations are going. We are seeing them stalling and industrial action taken in a number of professions and it is an indictment because there is so much at stake in relation to getting a good outcome for these public sector negotiations.

I will keep my examples to the health sector. Some might describe it as naivety of the government but others might describe it as bloody-mindedness. The government is taking an intractable position to negotiations at a time arguably when health workers are at their lowest ebb, certainly the lowest that I've seen for health workers in Tasmania. When staff recruitment and retention is extremely challenging and the cost of locums is out of control, the government is adding insult to injury with these protracted negotiations. For staff at our hospitals and community health centres across this state in various sectors, it's simply untenable for them. It truly is driving staff out of the sector and it is the patients who suffer. The long-term cost of this will mount as the exodus will need to be filled with locums. We've heard that the nursing locum bill is going up and up. It's so expensive and that's partly because there is not the industrial security that public service nurses require.

Industrial action is not taken lightly. Most state governments have tried to suppress the wages of their employees, but nowhere have we seen these effects as savage as they are in Tasmania and not, I would say, any worse than they are now. We need a strong public sector, we need a government who will negotiate in good faith, and it is questionable whether that is occurring in good faith for many of the protracted negotiations that are occurring right now.

The government pretends to look at the bottom line but, as it was when I worked at the Royal Hobart Hospital some years ago now, wage negotiations that are not done in good faith have huge ramifications for the workplace. Nobody wants to take industrial action. Nobody wants to be leaving their roles to stand on the streets and make their voice heard because the government isn't hearing them. Tasmanians value our nurses, doctors and allied health workers,

our teachers and other public sector workers but the government, according to how they're negotiating, would seem does not. We need negotiations done in good faith for a strong public service to work for all Tasmanians.

[12.01 p.m.]

Mr GEORGE (Franklin) - Honourable Speaker, I want to take advantage of this MPI to speak about one particular sector of the public service negotiations, and that's unsurprisingly about teachers, the people who are at the very core of what Tasmanians need to compete and thrive in the 21st century. That, of course, is education.

From the start, it's incredibly unhelpful when the Deputy Premier and Attorney-General attacks teachers and the union that represents them on the entirely unconvincing claim that rolling strikes in this state after months of negotiations are politically motivated just to bring down the education minister. If indeed the education minister is defeated at the forthcoming Upper House election, it'll be the government's fault for its failure to manage wage and condition negotiations. That may well be stimulated in part by the Deputy Premier's unnecessary intervention.

Teachers are perfectly capable of making decisions on wage claims and understanding the motivations of their representatives. Let's be clear. Teachers are amongst the most dedicated, if not the most dedicated, public servant professionals in the state and nationally. As graduate teachers enter the workforce, they do so on almost equal terms to their mainland colleagues, if slightly less than most but, by the time they're at their most experienced and most productive, they lag well behind the mainland states and territories. However, in many ways their work is actually more difficult because of systemic issues, including widespread functional illiteracy, declining standards of facilities and poor and aggressive behaviour of both students and parents.

A top-of-the-line experienced Tasmanian teacher earns around \$120,000 a year, compared to an average mainland colleague in one of the states of \$132,000 a year, or \$139,000 if you include the Northern Territory. This is before the current wage rises implemented or under negotiation in other states and territories. Ranking teachers stand last in the pack when it comes to salaries in Tasmania.

Teachers are burning out young in Tasmania young and they're burning out quickly. Meanwhile, senior teachers are leaving the profession because they're exhausted. Early exits from the profession have doubled in a little more than five years. We can reach a reasonable conclusion that some, if not many, of them are amongst the 15,000 Tasmanians leaving the state each year for better wages and better living conditions.

The Premier reckons the government values the teachers. Well, I beg to differ. It's clear that this government does not value teachers. While he might claim a salary package on offer is reasonable, the teachers clearly beg to differ and I beg to differ with them.

Meanwhile, Treasurer Abetz refuses - actually refuses - to even consider raising taxes on extractive industries; taxes that could very well go towards improving the wages of teachers who are essential to our future productivity and aspirations. The Treasurer ignores Treasury advice on exerting every lever available to government to bring the budget under control.

I stand with the teachers - and I will stand with them as they gather outside Parliament House later this week - forced to abandon their students and their professional responsibilities because of government intransigence. I call on the Deputy Premier to withdraw his inflammatory comments that demean teachers and their representatives and do nothing but undermine negotiations. This government mouths respect for teachers but treats them with contempt.

May I finally say that I do not understand the arguments put forward by the honourable member for Bass. He accuses the Opposition of politicking over wage negotiations, but doesn't apparently recognise his own Deputy Premier is actually adding even more fuel to the fire, and the idea that teachers are being led by the nose into a strike after months and months of negotiations is simply ludicrous.

Mrs GREENE (Bass) - What we're witnessing right now is widespread industrial unrest in the public service because the Rockliff government has fundamentally lost the trust of its workforce. We've seen multiple school strikes already in the last couple of months, NAPLAN testing disrupted and this week 24-hour rolling strikes are disrupting classrooms across the state. Hospital workers have been taking visible action consistently now for months, which is impacting on patient care and other workers across the State Service.

Time expired.

Matter noted.

MOTION

Note - Premier's Address

Resumed from 17 March 2026, page 102.

[12.06 p.m.]

Ms BROWN (Franklin) - Honourable Speaker, I'm pleased to be back on my feet to finish my contribution on this debate and, for the sake of the *Hansard*, I will go back to my previous comment if I'm allowed to, and I'll say that the minister often speaks about construction numbers and building targets but we rarely hear him speak about people, and that's the real problem here. Housing is not about construction targets or press releases; it's about people. It requires empathy, it requires heart and that's what this government is missing. Dishonesty, delay and inaction have become hallmarks of this government's housing policies.

We have seen this government desperately try and dodge, not committing to releasing the KPMG interim and full report into Homes Tasmania, but Tasmanians deserve to know. They need to know the answers because in this report it has the pathway forward to fixing the problems. They need to know the failings and they need to be able to see a way forward. Quite frankly, I don't trust this government to find the answers.

This report has very serious questions. Questions like: was the interim report the reason why the inaugural CEO suddenly departed? Was it the reason why the government finally reversed its position and opted into the federal Help to Buy scheme after months of embarrassment as being the only state or territory refusing to participate? For months,

Tasmania stood alone, leaving hundreds of potential placements on the table. It took pressure from state and federal Labor before this government finally did the right thing and put Tasmanians first.

I'll finish by saying this. A rebrand will not fix this housing crisis. A policy announcement without detail will not fix this housing crisis and, after 12 years of this government, the Liberals have shown that they cannot fix a rusty gate, let alone the mould, leaks and rot that Tasmanians are forced to live with.

[12.09 p.m.]

Mr FAIRS (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, I rise to respond to the Premier's state of the state address to place on record my strong belief that Tasmania is in a period of genuine opportunity provided we keep our focus where it belongs: on practical outcomes for our communities. In recent weeks, I've had the chance to see first-hand what that looks like.

I visited the Northern Suburbs Community Hub in Launceston recently, ahead of its official opening this weekend, and I have to say, standing inside that facility, you get a very clear sense of scale.

This is not a token upgrade, it's a serious investment in the northern suburbs of Launceston, in my seat of Bass. For years local clubs have told us about the shortage of indoor courts, training sessions running late into the night, young players turned away because there was simply not enough space and volunteers doing their very best with ageing infrastructure. This hub changes that equation, with multiple indoor courts, flexible recreation areas, and spaces for community programs. It will allow more kids to participate in sport, more competitions to be hosted locally and more families together in a safe and modern environment. When we talk about the benefits flowing back into the community, this is exactly what we mean. More participation means healthier young people engaged with their community. Healthier young people means stronger families. Stronger families mean stronger neighbourhoods. It's a virtuous cycle and it starts with having the right facilities in place.

I recently visited Exeter High School to see the completed redevelopment there. I have to say, the difference was striking. The new and refurbished learning spaces are modern, light-filled and flexible. They reflect how education is being delivered in 2026, not how it was delivered decades ago when I was a wee lad. Yes, I do remember. Teachers have tools they need. Students have spaces that encourage collaboration, focus and pride in their school. When you speak to the principal and staff, they do not talk about aesthetics. They talk about engagement. They talk about attendance. They talk about creating an environment where young people feel valued. Facilities alone do not deliver outcomes, but they absolutely support them.

I spent about 45 minutes with Exeter High School students in part of the new facility specifically designed to prepare and cook food. They were interested and engaged and enthusiastic about what they were cooking, and with good cause. Their apple and cinnamon pie smelled absolutely superb. I didn't get to sample any, but the pride and the passion on what they made was just absolutely inspiring.

Still in my seat of Bass and just down the road, Legana Primary School stands as a symbol of a growing community being backed by its government. Legana is expanding rapidly, with young families choosing to build and settle there. Having a local primary school with modern classrooms and world-class facilities is not just convenient, it is foundational. Parents can enrol

their children close to home, kids can walk or have a short commute. Community identity begins to take shape around the school gate. When I was walking through the classrooms and met with the staff and students, there was a clear sense of optimism. This is a school designed for the future, not retrofitted for the past.

These major infrastructure investments matter. They are visible, they are transformative, and they send a message of confidence. I also want to make this point very clearly: it is not only the \$100 million projects that change lives. Sometimes it is a grant of just a few thousand dollars. In the current cost-of-living environment, we know many Tasmanians are doing it tough. Grocery bills, fuel and energy costs have risen. Rent and mortgage pressures are real. Community organisations are often the first line of support. Over the past couple of years since I've been in this place, I've been actively engaged with the work of GroWaverley in Launceston. This is a grassroots organisation run out of a rented home, helping to provide fresh food to members of the community who are struggling. With a relatively small community infrastructure grant - just a few thousand dollars - they are now able to upgrade equipment and improve their storage capacity. The result? Their ability to provide food support effectively doubling. Let me repeat that: a modest grant, measured in the thousands, doubling their capacity to help people in need. That is the power of targeted community investment. It doesn't always make headlines, it doesn't come with ribbon-cutting and a crane in the background, and I'm happy for that. For the Tasmanian families who receive that vital support, however, it means everything. It means a pantry that is not empty. It means dignity. It means relief in a difficult week.

When we talk about building a caring community alongside a strong economy, this is what it looks like on the ground. This is why I support an approach that combines large-scale, state-shaping infrastructure with practical, localised programs. The recently announced Launceston conference centre at Kings Wharf is exactly the kind of investment that will help the north realise its potential as a visitor destination and a business events hub. Transforming underutilised waterfront land into a modern, purpose-built facility has multiple benefits. It means we can attract conferences and conventions that previously bypassed regional Tasmania. It means delegates coming to Launceston will stay in local accommodation, eat in local restaurants, visit local attractions, and extend their trip to see what our region has to offer, and as we all know, it has plenty.

That additional demand flows straight into the local economy. It means more jobs in hospitality, tourism, transport and retail. It means increased occupancy at local hotels, especially during shoulder seasons, where demand has traditionally been softer. It also means existing venues around the state can work in tandem with the new centre. A well programmed calendar of business events can ensure Launceston remains busy year round, helping to stabilise the visitor economy and create certainty for local operators.

Business events, as we know, are high yield. They tend to attract visitors who spend more per night than the average leisure traveller. They bring professionals who return home with positive words to say about Tasmania. They enhance Tasmania's reputation as a destination that can host important gatherings. It is no accident that so many cities around the world invest in convention centres as catalysts for economic activity, because when you have the facility to host larger conferences, you unlock opportunities that were previously out of reach.

For Launceston and the north, this is a chance to greatly amplify the benefits of recent visitation growth. When more than 1.4 million visitors injected \$4.5 billion - more than - into the Tasmanian economy last year, we saw what tourism can do.

When Errol Stewart completes his vision, we will have the infrastructure to take it even further. The new Bridgewater Bridge improves freight efficiency and commuter safety across the south. That drives economic productivity. Marinus Link strengthens our renewable energy advantage and attracts investment into the North West. That creates jobs and positions Tasmania at the forefront of national energy transition.

The decision to commence the Macquarie Point stadium is a defining moment. It's not just about a venue; it's about confidence. It's about saying that Tasmania belongs on the national stage. It's about jobs: thousands of jobs during construction, apprenticeships for young Tasmanians and ongoing work in events, hospitality and tourism, once it's complete. It's about giving our state a permanent place in the elite national sport, and unlocking the multimillion-dollar economic activity that comes with it.

At the same time, a community hub in Mowbray, a primary school in Legana, an upgraded high school in Exeter and a small grant to a food relief organisation in Launceston all play their part, because economic policy is not an abstract exercise. It must connect to lived experience. When a parent can enrol their child in a local school with confidence, that is economic security. When a teenager can join a sports team because there is finally court space available, that is social investment. When a volunteer organisation can expand food distribution because of a small infrastructure grant, that is compassion translated into action.

We must keep that balance. We must continue to back big projects that unlock opportunity for decades to come, and we must continue to recognise that sometimes the most immediate impact comes from modest, well-targeted funding that empowers communities to help themselves.

Tasmania's strength has always been its sense of connection - we all know that. We are a small state with scattered population centres, but we look out for each other like no other. As we move through 2026, a year rightly described as a year of delivery, let us remember that delivery is measured not just in concrete poured or steel erected. It's measured in opportunities created. It's measured in classrooms filled with engaged students at Exeter High and Legana Primary. It's measured in young athletes training at the Northern Suburbs community hub. It's measured in families supported by organisations like GroWaverley because of a small grant that's made a big difference.

If we keep our focus on those outcomes, if we ensure that the benefits of growth flow back into our communities, then we will not only build a stronger economy, we will also build a more resilient, more connected, and more compassionate Tasmania. That is something, Speaker, that every member of this House can stand behind.

[12.20 p.m.]

Mr GARLAND (Braddon) - Honourable Speaker, it's a bit of an understatement, but we have to do things better. We have a lot of areas to improve upon. I think I will start with the salmon industry. To understand how we got to this point in time, you have to go back a bit in time. At the outset, the salmon industry was a great industry. It was boutique, it was small, it was specialised and it was focused on quality. We, in the north-west, had to put up with

thousands of seals relocated onto our fishery. We complained about it for 20 years and it took a mental health episode to stop it. Absolutely disgraceful; an example of the community put last and business put first.

The recreational fishers' handbook at the time stated, 'Do not take fish off or fish products from one waterway to another to stop and prevent the spread of disease'. Then our departments issued licences and permits to cart thousands of these seals up and down the highway for eight hours and dump them on our fishing grounds. That was the start of the industry. We were only small in number and we didn't matter and now you look where the salmon industry is at: it is absolutely disgraceful.

I watched *Four Corners* the other night on what is unfolding in South Australia. They're being told, 'Don't go down and walk near the ocean. Don't breathe the ocean air'. I was sitting on Clifton headland the other night, on the muttonbird rookery there, looking over Storm Bay and all those communities in that area there. How devastated would we be, a shore-based aquatic state, to have that happen here? The thing is we have all those conditions that are in South Australia to have what occurred there.

We have all those conditions here right now and what are we doing instead of destocking and transitioning out of our waterways because of the warming waters? No, we're just dumping tonnes of antibiotics in there. Absolutely disgraceful. The one thing that is self-evident in here since I've been here is community and the best interests of this state are put last. Salmon industry a point.

Another one, the energy, look what's happening there. There's not been one project that's been knocked on the head. They've been advocating to put them everywhere and, if you look at Robbins Island, you talk about the federal Liberal policy on avoiding critical areas and looking after communities and respecting their wishes. Aboriginal community: 12 tribes of the north-west, Robbins was their meeting place. It was the only place they met together, man, woman and child, in October every year and what do we want to do? We want to industrialise it, build a quarry, blast it, put this monstrosity there which will impact all and sundry.

The migrant shore birds there, 10 000 of them, some of them critically endangered, threatened, hanging on by the skin of their teeth and what are we doing? We want to put a big wind farm there. That system there, by the way, swells to 20,000-30,000 birds. You factor in the 10,000 migratory birds, then you factor in all those local ones and those that come from Victoria in times of drought that have to come there to feed - and what are we doing? They don't matter.

Then, if you look at the economics of Marinus, we're being told that it stacks up and it's going to make power prices cheaper. Well, all the evidence coming to me is the exact opposite. Under Mariners stage one, the major industrials transmission prices rise by 29 per cent and it states, in the whole-of-state business case, one or two of them may go. Now, where is the relevance for jobs that I'm hearing from both sides of the parliament with salmon and how important those jobs are? What about the major industrials?

Then Deloitte report shows a 59 per cent power price rise under Marinus. That's for your mum and dad power price payers. Absolutely disgraceful. We're already in the cost-of-living crisis right now. People are struggling and we're advocating this. The North West Transmission

development, we pay \$2600 per person for that, Victoria pays \$180 per person. Tasmania received 6 per cent of the benefits, Victoria receives 28 per cent.

Now, I'll be honest with you, I'm in this parliament today because of my close connection with the environment. That's what brought me here; salmon farms, wind farms, impacting those areas that my community holds dear. You look at the Devils right, there's been 318 Tasmanian Devils killed in the Montagu area in the last five years. If they go ahead with Robbins Island, there will be an extra 82 truck movements every day.

I see the devil emblem on the front of our jumper - and congratulations to the team on the weekend getting a win. Nothing better than that, We're a football state, there's no argument about that. It's just the stadium which has divided us. Hopefully that side can bring us back together and show a bit of success. However, what really irks me is we are wearing that devil on the front of that guernsey, putting that out there to the world, and then ignoring what's happening every day of the week down there. Absolutely disgraceful.

Wedge-tailed eagles - they are not replacing what it's taking out right now. Without adding any more wind farms to the equation, we are not replacing what is being taken out right now. They're on a pathway to extinction. Ours is a subspecies of the mainland. It's a separate altogether, another threatened, endangered iconic animal of this state, and it doesn't seem to matter to both sides of the House with renewables that this is not a factor and not a consideration.

Ramsar listing - back in 2000 the Labor Party had on their desk the paperwork for Ramsar listing for Robbins Island. For those who don't understand or don't know, Ramsar listing is a recognised protection body. It's global for these wading birds that fly from one end of the planet to the other. Labor did not want to move on it because they did not want it getting in the way of this wind farm. The Liberals are being the same ever since, and here we are 25 years later.

If Ramsar listing had been afforded back then, there would be millions gone into that area to deal with the rice grass, but no, look what's happened there. We had to rely on volunteers and people scraping with whatever they can get together to deal with that problem because we were too miserable to give those birds the protection they needed, and millions of dollars would have come federally into ridding that area of the rice grass. It would have been cleaning up the waters and all that that enters in there, and they've found in an area where they've cleared the rice grass recently, instead of having 10 mullet there, there was 100. These inshore waterways: I cannot overstate their relevance and importance to the greater fisheries. They are our nursery feeding breeding areas.

Whaleback Ridge - that project, when I was first briefed on that, I thought, this sounds too good to be true and, like in most instances, things that are too good to be true generally are too good to be true. But here is an avenue for us. We need to take a deep breath with this energy space. We need to look at where we can do it with the least impacts, with the best return for this state and, if that's the case, Whaleback is your starting point.

Under stage one there, there's no need for new transmission or whatever. They can hook straight in. Grange Resources is looking to fully electrify. They're just down the road and, if people in this House finally realise and work together and transition salmon out, there is excess power, there is excess water, there is plenty of land, you have all that salmon infrastructure

around Macquarie Harbour there. Absolutely disgraceful, the federal government, when I heard that they were advised to get salmon out of the waterways to protect the Maugean skate, and they did the exact opposite.

A common denominator in this state is community, and our place is put last. When I met with the windfarm commissioner in 2018 he agreed we are taking the wrong approach. It's atop-down and it should be a bottom-up approach. Community and the place we hold dear are the last ones factored in and the last ones to be accommodated with their concerns. My hope in this parliament is that we, from here on, put our community and our place and these special creatures that make this place so special on the planet, put them first and foremost.

Isn't that the role of this parliament? It's been too long to get to this point, where corporations and business interests override community and environment and there's a time for change and, if ever that time is relevant, it is right now.

I can tell you right now we have a lot to deal with in here.

The health system - north-west is the most underfunded. We have to travel the furthest to get services we need, and I'm told by the people in the health system that there's too many chiefs and not enough Indians, and that seems to be a common denominator everywhere, too. The bottom has all the information, and all the skin, the information and the knowledge to take us forward but what are we doing? No, we don't listen to them. We'll get some high-paid expert to come up with something on their own, totally isolated from the community. Let the health professionals fix the health department. I commend the minister, Bridget Archer, that we've had a couple of appointments just recently, which are going to satisfy a much-needed demand there.

AEMO - the government is saying \$470 million will flow into our coffers under Marinus. Marinus will be a regulated asset. AEMO set the price. We get paid a fixed price here and there's another few entities that have a grab on that power. Hydro was put in this state for our benefit, to keep power cheap and affordable to us, and that's where we have to go. Whaleback Ridge is your answer. Forget about this Marinus. Let's start there - we can do it - and Hydro should take a share of that. Why are we letting corporations - and we're paying them power price agreements over and above the award rate - when we can do it ourselves? Work with Hydro, with Whaleback Ridge, and go from there. To spend billions of dollars on Marinus, which is going to destroy the environment, is absolutely absurd. We need to look out for our own interests to keep our power price cheaper, and that's your starting point: first stage, Whaleback. That power can then be put into salmon onshore production and we can start dealing with these problems. We're not dealing with all these problems. We're just kicking the can down the road, and here we are - we're right at the end of it.

There is a lot of responsibility and a big onus on this parliament to start dealing with those things that matter to the community. I'm here today because of that. People threw me in here. I'm just a small-mesh fisherman who was sick to death of the ignorance of the things that make this place so special. Fortunately, I didn't know if anybody else supported me, and I put my hand up for the first one. I got 2000 votes, and I thought, 'People do give a stuff'. Then, I doubled it again, and they were calling me the kingmaker. If the parliament wants to see where the community is at, they threw me in here to represent their interests over and above corporations and everyone else. That's what I've been trying to do ever since I've been here.

Mr George - Hear, hear.

Mr GARLAND - It's very, very simple. Community and place first, and for our best interests. With the power, with the salmon, we have the ability to do it right, put it in the right place, take a deep breath and not rush into things. That's what we must do.

I was briefed on the budget by Treasury. There's nothing more important than money. On the Energy Committee my focus was on environment, then I got pulled up by the expert. He said, 'No, Craig. What most people care about, and their first priority, is their budget'. That is so true, and that is so true right now. We have to look at whatever way we can to reduce any increase in electricity, fuel, food, all the rest of it, and we all know once the power goes up, everything else goes up. I have friends who are middle-income earners. They're doing okay, but they are struggling. They're getting paid quite a bit of money, but they are struggling right now. What concerns me is where we're going in the next year or two, given what's happening in the Middle East right now.

We must take an insular approach about how we manage the affairs of this state. The other thing that was pointed out to me every time I went down to the west coast, before I got elected, they were saying to me, 'We're sick of them coming down here every four years promising this, that and other. Then they disappear and we don't see them again'. Guess what? I became one of them last year, so they were giving it to me down there, because I got elected and here I was, coming down looking for their vote. The thing that concerns me is that we get people from the north-west, Braddon - most of the votes come from Devonport, Ulverstone, Latrobe; the growth areas. West coast never gets a voice. King Island never gets a voice. I'm looking at cost savings and getting proportional representation. Back in the day, when communities had an issue, they met in the town hall. They raised their issues and then they had a show of hands, and they sent someone forth to represent them. We've got a range of communities now that have never had a voice for a long time.

My solution? We have 29 municipalities. Why don't we vote for our representative from our municipality who we know and trust, and communities can't be hoodwinked with a slick advertising campaign over and above who they know and trust. It would give the west coast a voice. It would give King Island a voice. It would give every municipality in this state a voice. It would erode that party domination, which seems to be most interested party first and how we're affected, and then the community. This would override that. It would put them in the local council chambers. You don't have to spend \$300,000-\$400,000 on an office like they probably did on mine, which I thought was overkill. You put them in there, you make them accountable. If they're not doing the job, throw them out, without disrupting the whole state and going into another election cycle - because, to my mind, parliament does not have that luxury. We have 500,000 people. We cannot sit by for two months in caretaker mode, then the department's waiting for another six months to get a direction. In essence, we're losing a year out of four years of our term. That is not good enough. My solution is: vote for your member from your local municipality, put them in the council chambers. All that expense has gone. Make them accessible and accountable, and if they're not doing the job, flick them out and put the next one in without interrupting the whole state. I've given this thing a lot of thought because I'm sitting here and I'm seeing how things do and don't work, and my role in here is to come up with solutions and put forward suggestions. That's what I'm doing today.

We are such a great state. We are. Let's face it. There wouldn't be any argument from anyone in this place here that we are living in probably the most beautiful, well situated, well

placed state in the country, and probably in the world, for that matter. Our nature - when someone's suffering in my community, there's a handout. Look at what Rob Fairs is doing up his way. He should be commended for what he's doing up there, absolutely. That's what Tasmania is all about. It's about working together in a collaborative way, with a common goal, and that's where I see this parliament has to come.

My state of the state is: let's do things better, let's save money, let's look after those things that people are - One-in-six people in Tasmania are employed in tourism, right? Look at what happened with the forestry at Dial Range, and look at the history of forestry. I was on the waterfront back in the 1980s. I was shipping out bolster packs from 30 or 40 different sawmills. They're all gone. All those sawmill owners used to come down onto the *Irene Greenwood*, the ship that used to bring the lupins and barley and aluminite and what have you from Western Australia, and it was like a big club. They were all sitting there trading timber, trading beer, trading secrets, and telling a lot of lies in a lot of cases but that's our culture. That's our culture. We have worked together with - that's it, and that's all I see that people are expecting of this parliament, of us, is to sit down, work together, not play party politics, focus on what's in the best interests, agree to disagree and then form a pathway to take us forward because more than ever, we're going to have to deal with a lot of things - and we are right now, but there will be more coming. If we take that approach: Tassie first, and people first in this state, that just spreads. It spreads. People start working more together in a collaborative arrangement.

Regarding the transmission, I would like to mention the farmers in my area. This is all good quality, arable farmland that we're pushing these transmission lines through. On the mainland, if you're an existing landowner next to a transmission line, you get compensated. I have friends and others have contacted me who are going to see their valuation on their property plummet, not just by a little bit but by a lot. I know these people. They had to work and struggle and save just for a deposit to get the land. Now, through no fault of their own, they're being thrown under a bus. I ask this parliament: let's rethink this energy space. Take a deep breath, go to the most suitable place right now for benefit to us and this state, and forget about Marinus for a while, because it's a huge cost with huge impacts that we simply cannot afford right now.

[12.38 p.m.]

Mr VERMEY (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, it's a great pleasure to be here before the House to give my reply to Premier Jeremy Rockliff's state of the state. I've only been in this House for a short time, I still have much to learn, and I give thanks to all those who've helped me on my journey so far.

From where I come from, I've had over 30 years running a small business, and a family business - a business that my father and my mother had started and surrounded me from birth that's given me a real insight into community and the connection to them. I know firsthand that you have great days in small business as an owner and extremely tough ones as well. Having a small business means that you employ people, and employing people means that you want to give them opportunity: opportunity to live life, to have a family, to earn a wage that provides not only for day-to-day, but an opportunity to buy a home, to go on holidays, to work towards setting themselves up so they can have life after work, with retirements.

It also means that you're at the coalface. You're dealing with people, meeting people from all walks of life, listening to them and understanding their issues.

We all have to work today in Tasmania to build a better future for Tasmanians. We need to stop playing political games and get on with the job to build a strong economy and to build on a strong and caring community. The 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania is a good plan and, with our government, I look forward to delivering a bright future for all of Tasmania. Tasmania, this little island at the bottom of the mainland not many years ago often was the butt of many jokes, where we were referred to as two-headed and married to our cousins, but now, wow has that changed.

Even through COVID, it really put the spotlight on us because we became a safe haven and a place of opportunity, and some of that big opportunity is that we have to have investment to drive things forward. The stadium and entertainment precinct at Macquarie Point is the development, the enabler that gives us the AFL team, the men's and women's Devils team that we deserve and should have had a long time ago, and also gives us investment into all the other businesses, jobs, employment with apprentices, and the future.

Regarding the conference centre, last week I ran to a good friend, an ENT guy, and they had 500 ENT specialists in Tasmania, and they're hoping by coming here and seeing what we have in our state that some of these young surgeons may think, 'This is a place where we can bring up our kids, have a family and an opportunity to stay here', and that they can see that Tasmania is going forward.

The Macquarie Point stadium will deliver jobs and create investment. On the weekend when the Devils played at North Hobart I went up there at 10.00 a.m. and was walking down from my place in West Hobart and ran into some families. You're wearing your jumper and you're all part of a team. I had no idea who these people were, but because you've got a colour on that's the same as the others, you're part of that team, and this one person I ran into who had a young child and a partner said, 'Oh, you're Marcus', and I said, 'Yes, that's correct', and he said, 'You're the first time I've ever voted for a Liberal', and I thought that was pretty good.

This person was a green who came from Victoria where they looked after memorabilia at the MCG, but has now come to Tasmania to work with TMAG and sees opportunity here and they were heading off to the game. We got to the game and we were lined up with people everywhere, but not only at the doors but going through North Hobart and all those businesses. I went back to them yesterday and spoke to the pubs and cafes. They were busy before the game and flat out after the game. It was a perfect day. The heads of AFL were there in the crowd looking around, looking to the right and seeing the mountain, looking down to the left and seeing the river and going, 'Wow, what an amazing thing'. We probably could have fitted a few more in there, but it was a good, comfortable crowd. It was exciting and that's just a little taste of what we've got to come.

There were people from all around the state. I ran into cousins and family members who had flown in from Melbourne and Sydney and they were all thinking they were going to come back here. This is an enabler. I went to the Devil's Den about a week ago looking at some merchandise in there and there was a couple in their late 50s - probably my age, maybe into their 60s - and they were inquiring about membership. This couple were from the Sunshine Coast in Queensland and I said, 'Why are you asking about membership?' and they said, 'Because we want to move here, we want to come to Tasmania'. This is attracting people and this is what we want. It's lifestyle and opportunity.

In recent weeks, I've had the opportunity to attend functions aboard the French and American Antarctic vessels, the MV *L'Astrolabe* and icebreaker *Polar Star*. The Antarctic Gateway has an opportunity in Tasmania to deliver over \$200 million to our economy and can grow further through developments at wharf 6 which provide a safe haven for the Antarctic vessels and precinct, with Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources and all that happening around the area. It also creates investment, with people taking stock from our farmers and other suppliers, generating money back into small businesses. For the crew of the icebreaker *Polar Star* there was a demand to come to Tasmania. They absolutely love it. These are some of the little things just around our area here that we can build on. With the work that's going down at wharf 6, that will create more opportunity.

The expansion of the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Sciences helps with those Antarctic studies. It's such a big thing for the university. It promotes jobs and is a world-leading opportunity. We had one of our great professors who went to school with my brother down there with Queen Mary showing the studies, pulling up kelp and crayfish - or lobster, as the mainlanders like to call them; I still like to call them crays. That's on a world scale as well, having that link to the Danish community. Tasmania's well and truly getting its name out.

Recently I went to the opening of the Forest building in the heart of Hobart. Everyone has been knocking it and saying it's terrible. It is full, with 3000 students and 500 staff in the city, and they don't have a cafeteria. They go outside. Again, I went round the small businesses there to see the injection that they're getting out of it. There doesn't seem to be any trouble with people catching a bus and riding a bike and getting in to the city. It's working well.

Ms Ogilvie - It's working well.

Mr VERMEY - The accommodation there is 95 per cent full. International numbers are up and continuing to climb, proving that Tasmania is a destination for learning.

In our schools, we've seen great investment, over \$12 million to help support our schools with lifting literacy resources. Every single child in years prep to grade 2 now has a phonics tile kit and our teachers have new decodable readers and sets of text with lesson plans, ensuring we're reducing the workload on our teachers. I know firsthand through my boys' dyslexia and the challenges they've had over time that these things help so much. It's so important to pick up these little things earlier so we can get the help to get them through into other learning areas.

Our plan is pointing us in the right direction, we're stimulating our economy and encouraging businesses. I saw a new business open yesterday in my area, a great little coffee shop. They've got three businesses now and they said they'd never get past two. I went down and they said, 'We've just got to work harder and keep it going. We love employing people and when we see the excitement on young staff with their jobs, that's what we want to do'. I think 97 per cent are small businesses.

Mr Barnett - Yes, 97 per cent.

Mr VERMEY - We're building on that and encouraging people to take up that challenge. We're cutting more of the red tape to give opportunity for businesses to open.

Our wine and whiskey industries speak for themselves, multi award-winning, not just here in Tasmania but on all of the mainland and winning countless awards worldwide. This

week, I had the privilege to go to the botanical gardens and see Bird in Hand and their opportunities and their vision. They've invested \$2 million themselves. We've put money into the gardens - \$7 million - to increase access, to get more mobility through there. It's one of the number one tourist sites in Tasmania.

Mr Barnett - 400,000 visitors.

Mr VERMEY - Absolutely, and it is stunning and it's looking great. That investment into the areas on the east coast, at Seymour, they want to increase their sparkling hold. They're from South Australia but they know the best grapes for what they want. They're growing here in Tasmania.

Mr Barnett - They've got investments here, wineries.

Mr VERMEY - Absolutely, employing more people. Other things like golf. Golf. What a future golf has in Tasmania. We have some of the world's leading courses, ranked right up there. We had the Shark fly in to have a bit of a look around. That creates opportunity and the work that's been done at the airport, increasing runways, increasing access, that Asian market that's right on our doorstep and if we can bypass that big island just above us and come straight into Tasmania, it sells our produce, it sells what we have and we cater to that market. That's a huge market that we haven't tapped quite yet, but we have the opportunity to get there.

Going on, the *Spirits*, and they're nearly here. We've nearly got everything set up and we're going well, it's ahead of schedule, but we're going to tick and we're going to go through it and we're going to make sure everything is running perfect but they are floating billboards for Tasmania. You go on board and they're so well decked out on each area, the north, the west, the south, right in the centre - it's a great way of advertising for Tasmania and it'll just increase our visitor experience.

To Marinus Link, the opportunities that brings to us. Having us being the battery of Australia, to store that power and then sell it back to the mainland, it will work for us. I have a brother who's been involved in that area for long period of time. He set up renewable energies in India. And our hydro scheme is brilliant. Now, we can build on that and take it to the next level. It will be a driver, an investment, provide employment to help set up training facilities for advanced education. It will be a STEM enabler.

2026 has been a year of opportunity, a year of delivery and it will be a year going forward to create, want and need. I look forward to working with our Premier and my Liberal team to support all Tasmanians, to be recognised as a place to invest in, to build a strong economy, to have a caring community and to let the world know it is the best place to invest and live. Thank you.

Address noted.

RESIDENTIAL PARKS BILL 2026 (No. 2)

In Committee

Resumed from 19 March 2026 page 72.

[12.57 p.m.]

Quorum formed.

Clause 3

Ms FINLAY - I haven't moved an amendment yet, we're just speaking -

DEPUTY CHAIR - [inaudible].

Ms FINLAY - Minister, could I please ask a question about the bond? I have a sequence of amendments about bond and security deposits and initially I was interested in the definitions and the application of that. Could I ask a question? Was there at any time, a consideration of not including a bond at all? I know they're not required, but was there any consideration by yourself or the department of not including the requirement of a bond for long-term residents in caravan parks?

Mr BARNETT - Thank you, Chair, I thank the honourable member for her observations. I realise people have come in as a result of the quorum call. I respect that. I might make some remarks in advance of our ongoing deliberations with respect to the committee stage if I could. I thank honourable members in this place in terms of the constructive approach that we've had in terms of addressing amendments. The government has offered briefings on this bill to all members of parliament. We've given those briefings and feedback's been provided by various members of this parliament and I wanted to put that on record and say thank you for that.

Frankly, my approach here is to deliver the best possible bill for the people of Tasmania, for the long-term residents, for the park owners and a balanced approach. Let's be very clear. At all times I've tried to achieve an objective of a balanced approach based on feedback. We have had the submissions consultation; we've had the feedback. We have improved the bill with various amendments during and as a result of that.

I acknowledge all the Beauty Point Long Term Residents' Association who were here last week and their particular concerns, but I wanted to say that we've always approached this in good faith to generally and genuinely in a collaborative way get to a landing point. I wanted to thank the Greens for the amendments, which we've considered, and we've worked through and broadly supportive, subject to working those through, which I've addressed directly with the honourable member for Bass and indicate -

Sitting suspended from 1.00 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

RESIDENTIAL PARKS BILL 2026 (No. 2)

In Committee

Resumed from above (page 51).

Mr BARNETT - Thanks very much, Speaker. Before I resume my remarks, I'd like to acknowledge in the Chamber today in the Speaker's Reserve Sherryl Smith, the President of the Beauty Point Residents Association who we all met last week, Steve, and their dear friends, who have come down to be here today, quite hopefully and positively, to see if we can progress as a parliament this very important bill that will provide clarity for long-term residents, not just at Beauty Point but across more than 70 caravan parks around this great state of Tasmania.

As I was reflecting with colleagues during this committee stage, I've said that we're approaching this legislation in good faith, in collaboration and a cooperative way, to get the best possible outcome for Tasmania for long-term residents and park owners and the like and giving confidence for the years ahead.

I've acknowledged the good work and good-faith discussions I've had through my office and my department, and my department's offered briefings for all members of parliament, but specifically to the member for Bass on behalf of the Greens, Ms Rosol, and we've worked through those amendments and come to a mutually agreeable outcome where we believe we can improve the bill with those relevant amendments, so we're not opposing those. We thank Ms Rosol and the Greens for being so cooperative and collaborative with our office to progress those and I thank the honourable member for her feedback and ability to work through that.

I say that because it contrasts somewhat with the number of Labor amendments that have not been the subject of broad consultation, despite the fact that several would have direct operational consequences for park owners, residents and the tribunal. In particular, a number of those amendments would materially alter the balance of the bill by expanding too far the protected class of resident, compressing existing statutory timeframes to impractical levels, or making the termination and reissue framework much more rigid.

Even so, the government is not taking a closed position. We have said we would consider Labor's amendments on their merits and we have done so. There are some amendments that, in the spirit of cooperation and in recognition of the role of this parliament, we're prepared to support. I wanted to indicate that and it's with that spirit of cooperation, we're absolutely prepared to support those particular amendments, even where we do not consider those amendments strictly necessary to achieve the policy intent, but we want to progress this. I have serious reservations, however, with respect to a number of others which would be extremely difficult to support. I will leave it there.

The deputy leader of the Labor Party asked if there was any consideration of not including a bond in the act: the answer is no. The capacity to have an option to take a bond was always a feature of the bill. Bonds or security deposits are a common feature in both long- and short-term accommodation models. They provide a valuable risk-management tool in relation to rent arrears as well as potential damage caused during a stay, and you can understand the importance of bonds in that regard.

Consumer, Building and Occupational Services (CBOS) consulted widely through the distribution of a discussion paper some time ago, as well as the release of the consultation bill, and the inclusion of the capacity to require a bond was flagged throughout this process. I'll leave it there. I've answered that question and I thank the House.

Ms FINLAY - I add my voice to welcoming the people from Beauty Point here today. It's great to have you here to see this bill pass through the House.

Thank you, minister, for your response to the question about whether there was consideration for not applying a bond because, as we understand, there's no requirement to have a bond in any jurisdiction. It is just an option, and it was felt by members in the community that the reference to a bond was associated closely with personal property, where a reference to a security deposit was more associated with external property, as you have described. As I've outlined, we're of a mind, based on hearing the community, that a bond not be applied. This first amendment is actually in the event that if one of these instruments remains, there is a preference of the community that it would be referred to as a security deposit, so this is the first of a number of amendments to satisfy that outcome. With that, I move -

Page 8, subclause (1), definition of *bond*.

Leave out that definition.

Further in the amendment, there is the inclusion of the definition of 'security deposit', which occurs before we prosecute the idea of not having a security deposit.

Mr BARNETT - Just to respond more specifically to the honourable member, as I've mentioned in this place previously, the government is not wed to the use of 'bond' here rather than 'security deposit'. 'Bond' was retained as a term that is generally understood and is used in other jurisdictions, as the honourable member indicated. It is noted, however, that residential tenancies in Tasmania use the term 'security deposit' and therefore I acknowledge that there is also a sound basis on which to use 'security deposit' here as well.

However, I would like to note that other than changing the terminology, the definition in the Labor amendment is identical to that in the bill and although Labor has indicated that this amendment was included to reflect that the residents own their dwelling and its contents, the definition of the Labor amendment is identical to the one currently in the tabled bill. The government therefore does not oppose the change in terminology from 'bond' to 'security deposit'.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms ROSOL - Thank you, Chair. I have an amendment to move, one of two amendments in this clause. I move -

Page 8, subclause (1), before the definition of *common area*.

Insert the following definition.

'Commissioner' has the same meaning as in the Residential Tenancy Act 1997;

This amendment allows for the Residential Tenancy Commissioner to make determinations with regard to bond or disbursements, a role that, in our previous amendments, was to be formed by the tribunal, but we've received feedback on those amendments that it was preferred that the role of the Residential Tenancy Commissioner be retained so that it's consistent with the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*, which was feedback that we were happy to incorporate into our amendments.

Our subsequent amendments relating to the role of Residential Tenancy Commissioner are consistent with the functions and obligations of the Residential Tenancy Commissioner set out in the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*.

Mr BARNETT - Thanks very much, Chair; I appreciate that. As previously noted, the government is very open to the concept proposed by the Greens through Ms Rosol today in terms of bonds being held by the residential deposit authority. As was made clear in the briefings to members during development of this bill, we were never opposed to that policy direction. However, these changes require the supporting IT systems, administrative processes and implementation arrangements to be properly established before they can commence, and that work would delay the commencement of the bill.

For that reason, the government's position is that if this amendment is to proceed, it should commence on a day to be proclaimed, rather than immediately. Happy to support, but it's a timeframe issue as to when that kicks in so that the administrative work and preparation to help make it effective occurs. That would allow the necessary systems and processes to be put in place without delaying commencement of the remainder of the act.

It's important that the broader reforms in the bill are not held up while administrative arrangements for one discrete measure are being worked through. Given that we have already considered clause (2), the appropriate course will be for the government to move amendments to facilitate the delayed commencement of the Residential Deposit Authority provisions in the Legislative Council.

I'm giving you a heads-up as colleagues in this place and in the other place that as a result, we're happy to support this amendment, but we need to make sure that starts within a period of time where it's administratively possible to implement that. We've shared those thoughts and views with the honourable member, and I appreciate the feedback from the member. In light of that understanding and the feedback that I've had that we can progress that particular minor technical amendment in the Upper House, I'm happy to support this amendment. Thank you, Chair.

Ms FINLAY - That makes sense and we're happy to support this amendment. I wasn't clear though, minister, whether you'd put your mind to a timing. What timing would be taken forward to the Legislative Council in terms of being able to implement that?

Mr BARNETT - As I've said earlier, we'll take some time. I'm advised about three months. It's an IT system, administration system to get that working, so to give colleagues in this place and upstairs an understanding, it's in the order of three months, I'm advised.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - Thank you, Chair. I want to acknowledge that the original draft bill that was distributed for consultation subject to submissions was altered and improvements made. There were still some matters that people who made submissions wanted to have included in the final legislation. One of those matters was including a definition of 'long-term resident', so I move the following amendment -

Page 9, same subclause, after the definition of *forwarding address*.

Insert the following definition.

'long-term resident', in relation to a residential park, means -

- (a) a resident who -
 - (i) is, or is taken to be, a resident of that park under a residential park agreement where the term of the agreement is for a fixed period of 5 years or longer; or
 - (ii) has been a resident of that park for a period of at least 5 consecutive years; or
 - (iii) owns the dwelling that is installed on the site to which the residential park agreement relates; and
- (b) the relevant site, or residential park, is the resident's principal place of residence;

The purpose of this amendment is to give certainty to long-term residents in caravan parks about their status within a park, and for that to be recognised within the definitions. Happy to take any questions on that.

Mr BARNETT - Unfortunately, with respect to this particular amendment and the associated amendments to this clause (3) amendment, it does alter the structure of the bill, so we don't believe it's necessary and may have other consequences that have not been thought through or consulted on. Therefore, unfortunately the government's not in a position to support this particular amendment.

Ms ROSOL - Chair, it was remiss of me before that I didn't acknowledge our visitors here this afternoon. Welcome, and it's great to have you here for this debate.

We understand and support the intent of this definition in this amendment, which is to make it crystal-clear that the legislation is intended to support long-term residents of residential parks. However, we have concerns about how this definition's been drafted and whether or not it unintentionally creates more disadvantage by, essentially, establishing different classes of long-term residents.

As it's written, this definition means that a long-term resident is someone who has a term of agreement for a fixed period of five years or longer, or has been a resident of the park for at least five consecutive years, regardless of the total length of any one agreement, or owns

a dwelling that is installed on the site to which an agreement relates, and the site in particular or the residential park in general is the resident's principal place of residence.

The previous draft of this amendment referred to dwellings 'located' on the site, whereas this version relates to those 'installed' on the site. The bill refers exclusively to dwellings that are either 'located' or 'installed', so there's a shift in language there between amendments. That's a complete shift in which groups are included or excluded. So, the policy intent is murky. Can the member explain why different rights are intended to be applied based on whether a dwelling is installed or located, and why there's been a shift in the language between the drafts?

Ms FINLAY - Thank you for the question. and for the clarification on (3). In the redrafting that we had done with Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC), and received great advice from them, I'm not clear that we intended for the 'located' to be removed. I'm happy to take advice from the Chair, but would it be the position of the Greens to support this definition if 'located' was included in the definition?

Ms ROSOL - I'm seeking to understand what your intent is with it, because it's two different things - whether it's 'installed', whether it's 'located' - they have different meanings, and that has significant implications for who the amendment applies to, or who the definition applies to. I'm really wanting to hear what your intention is with it.

Ms FINLAY - The intention is - and thank you for picking up that error in here - that it is for located and installed properties.

Ms ROSOL - So, for both?

Ms FINLAY - Yes.

Ms ROSOL - That was a drafting issue, because that gets down to whether a dwelling is immediately mobile or not mobile, if it's located or installed there. That definition that you have here is used and needed for a lot of your subsequent amendments, so I'm just concerned about creating two different sets of rules for those own a fixed dwelling or those who own a caravan. That's the concern that we have here about that. I hear, from what you're saying, that that's unintentional, but the amendment as drafted at the moment does create that distinction, and creates different classes.

Ms FINLAY - Can I ask, through you, Chair, to the Clerks, is it possible for me to restate that part of the amendment, or does it need to be amended?

DEPUTY CHAIR - You have to move an amendment for the amendment. You have to ask somebody else to move it.

Ms ROSOL - Chair, before any amendments to the amendment might come forward, I do have some other questions. It's particularly around a situation where a person doesn't necessarily own the dwelling. For example, if it belongs to your mother or if it belongs to a sibling, but you're living in it and it's your principal place of residence, according to this definition, you wouldn't be considered a long-term resident unless you'd been at the park for five years or more. Can you confirm that that is what would happen with this amendment?

Ms FINLAY - The status of the ownership is one of the provisions listed by 'or'. The intention is to define a long-term resident, which is somebody who has it as the principal place of residence and has the status of being there for five years or longer.

Ms ROSOL - A question then about where there are multiple residents and if, in those circumstances, only the owner under the proposed paragraph (c) would be considered a long-term resident. If there are multiple residents, would they be considered long-term residents? Because the bill is relying on the status of a lease rather than the status of an individual, if we change the focus from the lease to the residents, you will be creating circumstances where only the owner and not any other residents in the dwelling would be conferred with the rights you're intending to put in the bill. Is that intentional?

Ms FINLAY - Are you picking that up in the definition or in later amendments?

Ms ROSOL - It's in your definition of who a long-term resident is. In trying to clarify who a long-term resident is, if there are multiple residents within a caravan park but there's one agreement for the site, does that pick up everybody who is resident in there or just one person? Who does it apply to in that situation?

Ms FINLAY - My intention is, and my reading of the drafting is, that parties to the agreement who are long-term residents. There might be multiple residents and, if multiple residents are party to the agreement, they would have the security of the agreement. There may be one person who is party to the agreement but they have someone else collocated with them. If they have been there for that period of five years, they would be a long term resident, but the security of these are for people who hold the agreement.

Ms ROSOL - Has there been a revised version that you've done since. I got this morning's version number seven?

Ms FINLAY - No.

Ms ROSOL - That's version number seven?

Ms FINLAY - Yes.

Ms ROSOL - I guess I'm just curious. There was something that you said there, but it's slipped out of my mind now. Are you suggesting from this, you're saying parties to the agreement, but that's not in this definition anywhere. It's a long term residence, so, every resident in one location or dwelling would have to sign their own agreement to be covered by this.

It doesn't say party anywhere in the definition. You've just referred to parties there. There could be multiple parties, but there's no reference to parties in the definition. I'm just seeking clarity on who the long-term resident is, because if there's more than one person in one dwelling and the agreement is with a long-term resident and not about the dwelling, who's covered, who's not covered. That is not very clear to me.

Ms FINLAY - My expectation is that the resident is the party, so whoever signs the agreement is a party to an agreement. It could be multiple; that would be subject to the

agreement of the people who enter into the agreement. This is identifying the definition of a resident who enters into an agreement.

Ms ROSOL - Another question. Why would a person who doesn't own the dwelling but is otherwise in all the same circumstances as someone who does have fewer rights? That seems to be what comes through from the definition that you've put here for long-term residents. Why should a person who doesn't own the dwelling have fewer rights than someone who does own the dwelling?

Ms FINLAY - With the 'or' and 'or' and 'or', it could be someone who owns the dwelling, it could be someone who is resident to the dwelling. The important part is that for each of the descriptions of a long-term resident that the relevant site or residential park is the resident's principal place of residence. That's the piece that brings them together.

Ms ROSOL - I'm just wondering on top of that if you've had any feedback or consultation with caravan owners specifically, or people who don't own their dwelling, or anyone else who might consider themselves a long-term resident but wouldn't be captured by this definition. The definition doesn't capture everybody. Have you talked to people it wouldn't capture?

Ms FINLAY - The proposal for this amendment was a result of advocacy from a range of people represented by the Beauty Point Resident Association, and with our drafting with OPC, that this covers people proposed to be identified as a long-term resident in the caravan park.

Ms ROSOL - Thank you. Just to restate, we have concerns about the insertion of this amendment, that it will create huge gaps in residency status based on some fairly arbitrary rules that potentially unintentionally will exclude some people from under the rules by inserting this definition.

Amendment negatived

Ms ROSOL - Chair, I move -

Page 10, same subclause, after the definition of *rent*.

Insert the following definition.

"Rental Deposit Authority" means the Rental Deposit Authority established under section 48K of the Residential Tenancy Act 1997;"

This amendment introduces a definition of the 'rental deposit authority' as established by the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*, and these two amendments are our first amendments that will require a bond to be paid to the authority.

Mr BARNETT - I appreciate the Greens putting forward this amendment. As previously noted, the government is open to the concept proposed by the Greens of bonds being held by the residential deposit authority. It was made clear in the briefings to members during development of the bill we were never opposed to that policy. We don't have any issues with the amendment put forward by the Greens.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - Chair, my third amendment to this clause follows on from the previous amendment supported by this place. I move -

Page 12, same subclause, after definition of *Secretary*.

Insert the following definition.

'Security deposit, in relation to a residential park agreement, means an amount that a resident is required to pay, under a provision of the agreement, as security for the performance of obligations under the agreement or this Act;'

Mr BARNETT - I've shared some remarks earlier regarding no problems with this approach and we're happy to support it.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4 -

Application of act to certain agreements

Ms FINLAY - I have sought some clarification on the previous question about 'occupied' or 'installed' and have had some drafting advice about that because this is also referenced in this amendment. I move -

Page 14, subclause (1), after paragraph (a).

Insert the following paragraph.

- () an agreement that confers on a person a right to occupy a site in a residential park if -
 - (i) The resident owns the dwelling installed on the site; and
 - (ii) The dwelling was installed on the site with the consent of the park owner; and

We move these amendments with feedback from residents at the Beauty Point Tourist Park to provide more clarification in these circumstances. I've had some engagement with OPC since the question from the member for Bass that 'occupied' is a broad term and could mean simply parked on a site. The OPC drafting of 'installed' includes 'occupied'. For these purposes, this is taken to be interpreted as including sites that are occupied and where there is a structure that is installed. Therefore we move this amendment to provide further clarification to this clause.

Mr BARNETT - I think we're on version seven - is that right? To clarify, through you, Deputy Chair?

DEPUTY CHAIR - Yes.

Mr BARNETT - I think this has come at a late stage. Nevertheless, we are not in a position to be able to support this and I'd like to outline the reasons, if I can. It appears from the drafting of this provision that the amendment is intended to ensure that the bill covers any person who 'installs' a dwelling on the site with the consent of the park owner. The government does not see this amendment as either clear, necessary or appropriate and therefore does not support it.

The bill already applies to agreements for occupation of a site as a principal place of residence for 90 days or longer. Without this amendment, the act will apply to anyone who has an agreement to stay 90 days or longer or who has, in fact, stayed 90 days or longer. The amendment appears to remove the 90-day threshold where a dwelling has been installed with consent. This introduces an element of ambiguity as to when a dwelling is installed. 'Installed' is not defined and, therefore, using the ordinary meaning, it is assumed that a dwelling is installed to place in position a service or use. This will obviously be clear in some cases. However, there is the potential that some people may consider putting down levelling blocks, corner stabilising legs and wheel chocks, et cetera which will make it sufficient to install a caravan as it enables it to be used.

It also creates an arbitrary distinction based on the specific nature of the dwelling. In contrast, the bill as tabled has been drafted to focus on the nature of the agreement and understanding of the resident and park owner, rather than differentiating between residents based on whether they are in a tent, a cabin or a camper-trailer. Unfortunately, on this occasion, the government is unable to support this amendment.

Ms ROSOL - In relation to this amendment, it expands on the definition of 'residential park agreement'. The provision is intended to ensure that the proposed new definition of 'long-term resident' is not contrary to the application of the act's provisions, but that definition wasn't inserted, so this provision isn't required. We're concerned that if it was included without that previous definition, it might have unintended consequences for residents who currently have short-term leases and don't want a long-term lease.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 13 agreed to.

New clause A to follow clause 13 -

Ms FINLAY - Chair, this is around creating consistency for the agreements for long-term residents and it's to go in after clause 13. I move -

New Clause A to follow Clause 13

'A. Status of certain agreements of long-term residents

If a residential park agreement is in force under this Act in respect of a long-term resident of a residential park, the terms of that agreement must

not be materially inconsistent with the terms of residential park agreements in force in respect of other long-term residents of that park, except where -

- (a) the long-term resident and park owner have agreed to the variation of terms in the residential park agreement; or
- (b) the variation of the terms in the residential park agreement are a result of an order of the Tribunal.'

My advice from OPC is to use the word 'residents' now instead of 'long-term residents' as circulated because the definition wasn't approved:

If a residential park agreement is in force under this act in respect of a resident of a residential park, the terms of that agreement must not be materially inconsistent with the terms of residential park agreements in force in respect of other residents of that park, except where:

- (a) the residents and park owner have agreed to the variations of terms in the residential park agreement; or
- (b) variations of the terms in the residential park agreement are the result of an order of the tribunal.

The purpose of this is to provide where there is agreement between the park owner and the resident or where there's been a variation made with the tribunal. It goes into the clause which is talking about the sale of property.

Mr BARNETT - I thank the honourable member. In short, the government is very concerned at how this clause would operate in practice. If there are six long-term residents in a park and each have negotiated variations in their own agreements based on their respective circumstances, it then seems unclear as to what the seventh resident's agreement would be consistent with. The government notes that the bill already provides for a range of statutory terms that cannot be negotiated out and sets down processes for seeking to have that term ruled harsh or unconscionable. The government does not support this amendment on the basis that it's unclear what benefit it would provide a resident of a park. That relates to the following clause 13.

I think we're getting a bit of a cavalcade from the first amendment that Labor put forward which wasn't supported and then the supplementary one that again wasn't supported. We've got some unintended consequences that would flow through to long-term residents, park owners and others, if this were to progress. We're getting a cavalcade of concerns that are being raised so the government is not able to support this amendment.

Ms FINLAY - If I can clarify, Chair, the purpose of these clarifications are in regard to direct experiences that have occurred from long-term residents at caravan parks in Tasmania, where there has not been agreement for an amendment to a park agreement and, in fact, there's been imbalance in the relationship between park operators and park residents. The purpose of this clarification is to ensure that, if there is agreement between a park owner and a resident, then that can be satisfied subject to those matters that cannot be negotiated out, but if there is not agreement, then it's going to the tribunal; that the tribunal would establish those.

There's been a lot of cases in Tasmania where the imbalance has been such that people have had to advocate at higher courts, at the Supreme Court and others, and this amendment serves to say, by agreement there can be a change, otherwise by order of the tribunal.

Ms ROSOL - I'm just concerned about this amendment now, because if the definition of 'long-term resident' isn't in there and then we've taken 'long-term' out of this amendment and we're just reading it as 'resident' now, then it's not clear which residents it applies to or doesn't apply to, and does it apply to everybody, because it's so unclear. It doesn't seem to be workable or make sense with that in there, and I suggest that this is reworked and revised and perhaps a revised version brought to the Council, if it's needed.

I think at the moment it's very unclear and we can't support it.

Amendment negatived.

Clauses 14 and 15 agreed to.

Clause 16 -

Other information to be provided to residents

Ms FINLAY - Deputy Chair, I move the following amendment -

Page 27, subclause (1), paragraph (c), subparagraph (i), after 'other than a'.

Leave out 'bond'.

Insert instead 'security deposit'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 16, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 17 and 18 agreed to.

Clause 19 -

Sale of dwelling on site

Ms FINLAY - Deputy Chair, one of the other matters that has been consistently raised through experiences locally has been the barriers to people selling a property that they own. If they want to sell their home, then there have been circumstances where there's been egregious barriers to being able to do that.

The current drafting has a period of 14 days to advise with the intention before the intention to sell. There is no default first right of refusal provision in any jurisdictions around the country and so, requiring that somebody, for their own circumstances, who wants to sell their own asset, that they provide 14 days notice before they can act seems long.

In the feedback of our first consultation, there was a suggestion that 24 hours wasn't long enough, that that was a very short period of time, but given that there's actually no default first right provisions anywhere else, that would be zero hours. What this provides is a courtesy to

provide park operators a heads-up of the intention to sale without delaying the opportunity to sell your personal asset.

I move the amendment -

Page 33, subclause (4), paragraph (c), after 'within the period of'.

Leave out '14 days'.

Insert instead '24 hours'.

If there's any other member of the community who had an asset and you wanted to sell it, and it's your asset, giving people a courtesy amount of notice to say that it's your intention to do so, you should have full capacity to enter into the process of selling your own asset without delay.

Mr BARNETT - In short, this amendment to Clause 19 reduces the option period for an owner to make an offer on a dwelling for sale in their park from 14 days to 24 hours. The inclusion of an option period, both here and at Clause 62, provides a park owner with a window to make an offer on a dwelling for sale. There's no legal obligation on the resident to accept the offer of the park owner, so Labor's amendments reduce this option period from 14 days to 24 hours. The government doesn't support the amendment in its current form and, frankly, reducing that period to 24 hours goes too far. Twenty-four hours is not a genuine commercial opportunity to consider whether to exercise a first option to purchase. It risks turning that statutory right into a mere formality.

I would add that we are now working off version 7 of Labor's amendments. The original versions that I and other colleagues received were on Thursday and then we got an updated version on Friday. It's gone through a range of versions and I received this version 7 at 9.50-something this morning just before Question Time. I draw that to your attention. It's been challenging to get across these amendments and to consider them carefully, but certainly with respect to this particular one in version 7, we're absolutely not able to support that amendment.

Ms FINLAY - I was going to respond to the comments and it will be true of the commentary, I'm sure, that the minister raises across all of our amendments. We provided our best efforts for early distribution of amendments in consultation with the community in terms of those outstanding matters once they had met with you and you made some amendments to the draft bill for the one that we're considering today. However, there was a feeling in the community there continued to be outstanding matters.

I've been in the parliament for nearly five years, and this is only the second legislation that I've brought through the parliament. Using my best efforts, we have the amendments that we believe represent the expectations and hopes of the community, so I don't apologise for that. I am sorry that it has taken that process, but here we are.

What the purpose of this amendment is, although it seems like a brief period of time, being able to provide a courtesy indication to someone that you intend to sell your own asset seems reasonable - 14 days. There have been examples where people have been prevented from selling the asset that they own. For some members of the community, it has been their entire life savings and has been left behind and not being able to execute a sale for that asset, which has financially been burdensome and traumatic for many. We're seeking to provide this clause

to say yes, give a courtesy heads-up. If a park operator wants to make an acquisition, they will have a long-term strategic asset management plan for their site. They can still participate in the sale process, but it doesn't prevent the owner of their own home from entering to the process to sell their asset.

Ms ROSOL - I hear what you're saying with this amendment and wanting to protect rights of the residents, but we do have a few points of clarification that I'd like to just ask here. I believe the intent of this amendment is to give a park owner only 24 hours in which they can exercise their right of refusal when a resident intends to sell a dwelling. Am I correct in that?

Ms FINLAY - In doing so, that doesn't prevent the owner from participating in a public sale process, but it gives them the heads-up and the opportunity for them to indicate whether they would like to enter into the process of acquisition.

Ms ROSOL - Thank you. I'm concerned that the amendment doesn't give either party enough time to properly consider the terms of an agreement to sell a dwelling. We sought some advice from the lawyer who's been representing the residents of the Beauty Point matter, and they felt that 24 hours was unreasonable; on both sides it's really difficult. The wording of (4)(c), to me, suggests that the parties need to reach an agreement as to the sale, so it's not just a question of whether the park owner wishes to exercise their rights to purchase the residence but that they have to reach a position on which the terms of that agreement would be settled on together. Therefore for any of those details of sale that would ordinarily be decided within that 14-day period, both parties now only have 24 hours to go through those negotiations and make that agreement. Is it reasonable and/or practical to do that kind of thing within 24 hours of having a solid agreement in place?

Ms FINLAY - I'm taking on board the question of the member. From the feedback we were provided and what we're intending to execute here is the opportunity for someone to sell their property without delay, but going through the process of providing that courtesy in advance. In the event that the park owner isn't in a position to indicate that outcome, they can still publicly participate in the open sale process.

Ms ROSOL - Thank you. Can I just clarify how the period of 24 hours was reached as a suitable time period? What factors did you consider that might hold up reaching an agreement within 24 hours? For example, if the park owner is interstate or unwell, does that have implications for the resident, who might now have to sell their dwelling on the open market when they wanted to sell it to the park owner? If they didn't have a buyer in mind already, they could end up with a residence that's on the market for quite some time and they've lost that opportunity for the park owner because of that 24-hour period. How did you settle on the 24 hours and what factors did you consider?

Ms FINLAY - Thank you for the clarifying question. In the first case, as our research indicated, there are no other jurisdictions that require a first right of refusal. The second point is that matters in this legislation can be dealt with by agreement, so if there is an existing agreement between a long-term resident at a caravan park who wants to sell their home and the park owner and they know they want to make that transaction, they don't have to use this clause. But if there is, as there has been, challenging relationships between a resident and a park owner and someone wants to sell their property, they shouldn't be prevented from doing so, but they are required to give a courtesy indication to the park owner. As our research has indicated,

there is no default first right provisions in any other jurisdiction, so this provides that opportunity, but never prevents the actions of two parties in agreement to transact together.

Ms ROSOL - There were several versions of amendments that went around and the earlier version entirely removed the right of refusals, so I'm a little unclear where the policy intent has been for this. This amendment seems to want to retain the policy but also places a 24-hour limitation on it that's not practical or functional. Can you explain the difference between drafts and what you were trying to achieve with those changes?

Ms FINLAY - As the minister does, I'm going to ask for some advice for a minute. Consistent with my previous comments, the intention of this amendment comes from resident advocacy, and in the meeting we had at the end of last week there was concern with the drafting around it being 24 hours in advance of the sale of the property. This updated amendment is around 24 hours of the intention to sell the property and we are saying that that requires a property owner to give that advice to a park operator but it doesn't limit their capacity to sell beyond that.

Ms ROSOL - Thank you. I'm not sure looking at what I'm reading that it says what you're saying it's saying. We would be open to amending this to perhaps a seven-day period, but 24 hours we feel is unreasonable and too short. Maybe that's something that could be considered in the Legislative Council when it goes through up there.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 19 agreed to.

New clause B to follow clause 19 -

Ms FINLAY - Deputy Chair, this is in regard to the transaction of a sale where there's an existing agreement and the intention of that agreement to be transferred to a new owner. I move -

New Clause B to follow Clause 19

'B. Sale of dwelling on site where agreement to be transferred

- (1) It is a term of a residential park agreement that, if the resident intends to sell a dwelling located on the site to which the agreement relates and transfer to the agreement to the new owner of the dwelling -
 - (a) the resident must give written notice to the relevant park owner of that intention to sell the dwelling; and
 - (b) if no agreement is reached as to the sale of the dwelling within the period of 24 hours after the park owner is so informed of the intention to sell under paragraph (a), the park owner's option to purchase lapses and the dwelling may be offered for sale to other parties; and

- (c) if the dwelling is sold to a new owner, the park owner must offer the new owner a residential park agreement -
 - (i) on substantially the same terms as the agreement held by the previous resident; and
 - (ii) with a fixed term of at least 5 years; and
 - (d) the park owner must not unreasonably -
 - (i) refuse to transfer the residential park agreement to the new owner of the dwelling; or
 - (ii) refuse to enter into a residential park agreement with the new owner of the dwelling, on terms as agreed with the new owner.
- (2) For the avoidance of doubt, this term of a residential park agreement is in addition to, and does not derogate from, the terms of a residential park agreement specified in sections 18 and 19.'

This amendment doesn't preclude a new owner entering into a new agreement by approval with the park operator, but says that if there is an existing agreement in a park when there is a sale, that existing agreement transfers to the new owner on the same terms. That is to ensure that there's no interruption to the process between the sale of the two parties. There's been some evidence of that happening in the past, so by default, if a new owner enters into an agreement willingly with a park operator, that can happen, but if the new owner wants to have an agreement on the same terms as the existing owner, this amendment provides for that.

Mr BARNETT - In short, this is becoming very problematic. As I say, we received version 7 this morning, and this clearly could have unintended consequences. It's what you'd call a substantial amendment to the bill. We've put a lot of time and effort into the bill and consultation on the bill. We got feedback and amended it accordingly. I just draw to the attention of the honourable member the opportunity of prosecuting further amendments in the Legislative Council. At this stage we certainly can't, and won't be, supporting this amendment.

Ms ROSOL - This amendment has the potential to mean that if a person with a 90-day lease sells a caravan on that site, the park owner must provide the new owner a fixed-term lease of at least five years, and we're struggling to see any justification for that.

Amendment negated.

Clauses 20 to 27 agreed to.

New clause C to follow clause 27 -

Ms FINLAY - Chair, again, and I note the minister's comments around the fact that there was a draft bill, there was consultation, there were amendments from that consultation. However, as the minister is aware, to a subsequent meeting that happened on-site with residents

who had outstanding matters unresolved by the draft bill before us, this new clause is particular to something that happened on site. This new clause follows Clause 27. I move -

New Clause C to follow Clause 27

C. Vacant possession does not apply in certain circumstances

It is a term of a residential park agreement that a resident is not liable for any breach of the agreement, or other legal sanction, in respect of vacant possession of the site to which the agreement relates if -

- (a) the agreement ends, or is terminated, under this Act; and
- (b) the park owner prevents the resident from entering the residential park or site; and
- (c) as a result of the actions of the park owner, the resident is unable to remove a dwelling owned by the resident that is located on the site.

There are a number of caravan parks in Tasmania, and as a member for Bass, I'm acutely aware of concerns that have occurred to long-term residents at the Beauty Point Caravan Park. There have been examples where people have been prevented from returning to their own home, when they've been removed from the caravan park, to deal with or to take action, positive action for themselves, financial action, that results in property being left behind on a site.

It could have been determined that they're leaving a vacant possession, but they're being prevented from doing so. So, advocacy from the community has requested the addition of this amendment that when a long-term resident has been prevented from returning to the residential park or the site and the actions of the owner prevents them from being able to remove their dwelling, that these amendments provide for those circumstances.

Mr BARNETT - In this instance, my department has reviewed it carefully. We don't think it's really necessary, but we don't think it's over-the-top either. We're happy to accept this particular amendment. We're not going to oppose it. We'll have further consideration of it between now and when it gets to the Legislative Council, but we don't intend to oppose this particular amendment.

Ms ROSOL - The Greens are happy to support this amendment.

New Clause C agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 33 agreed to.

Clause 34 -

Certain fixed agreements to be reissued

Ms FINLAY - Deputy Chair, the purpose of this amendment is to provide some rebalancing in the relationships between park owners and long-term residents in regard to variations. I move -

Page 48, subclause (1), after 'given by'.

Leave out 'either party to the agreement in accordance with subsection (2)'.

Insert instead 'the resident in accordance with subsection (2) or section 72'.

The reason for this - and it comes up from advocacy from the community - the drafting advice we had was that it's possible for agreement by a long-term resident and by a park owner to enter into a variation by instruments in this draft bill at any time. If, when it approaches the end of a term, the resident wants to seek amendment, they should be able to bring that up. If there's agreement, then it carries forward. If there's not agreement, then there are instruments in here on how to manage that.

Mr BARNETT - I should note there are two clauses - amendments to clause 34. Just on this specifically, currently clause 34 provides that where either party to a long-term agreement want to vary an agreement prior to reissuing it, they must provide 90 days' notice to the other party. This provides the parties with an opportunity to consider any requested variations. The opposition proposes to amend section 34 (1) so the trigger for reissue on the same terms as displaced, not by notice from either party under subsection (2), but by notice from the resident, in accordance with subsection (2) or section 72. This amendment needs to be read with Labor's replacement of clause 34, subsection (2).

Together the changes substantially remove the joint control over variation and reissue from park owners and vests it solely with residents. The practical effect is that a park owner would lose the express capacity under the current bill to trigger a review before reissue simply by giving notice under clause 34 subsection (2). Instead, resident action would become the only trigger. A park owner is then only able to apply to TASCAT to oppose a variation proposed by a resident. They're not able to make an application on the basis that existing terms of the agreement are no longer appropriate.

The government is not supporting this amendment, as it goes too far in denying a park owner any capacity to negotiate with residents to seek tribunal or seek tribunal intervention about agreements prior to reissue.

It is also noted that the amendments reduce the notice period from 90 days to 30 days. The inclusion of 90 days was in order to ensure that both parties have the opportunity to consider the agreement prior to it being reissued. Thirty days may be too short for meaningful review and negotiation of a long-term arrangement, especially if prescribed review processes, legal advice or tribunal applications become necessary. The proposed amendment does not merely make the process easier; it removes the balanced architecture of the bill and replaces it with a more compressed resident-driven mechanism. The government's position is that the bill already contains the right framework and that this amendment would disturb that balance rather than improve it. We believe that the bill is well balanced and won't be supporting the amendment.

Ms FINLAY - There have been various contributions throughout the development of this draft bill thanking the government for the extreme step that's been taken, from Tasmania being the only jurisdiction in Australia that hasn't had these protections to what we have here, a consulted and amended bill. There is, however, still ongoing concern from the community

about the imbalance in the relationship and that's what's motivated Labor to bring forward this amendment.

Our understanding from the drafting advice is that there remains opportunities throughout the term of an agreement for a park owner and a long-term resident to agree on changes. This provides that when an agreement is coming to an end that a resident can propose amendments, with consideration to the owner. As you have indicated, I haven't read in the second amendment yet, but it seeks to change the timeframe from 90 days to 30 days.

Ms ROSOL - My comments also acknowledge both of the amendments here. This amendment removes the ability of both parties to a residential agreement to not reissue a long-term fixed agreement on the same terms, making it so that a resident is the only party who can issue a notice under subsection (2) to seek a variation of the terms of the agreement.

Is this unintentionally restricting the rights of a park owner in a way that could have consequences for the residents? I understand the intent of this amendment is to bring balance to the parties and put rights with the residents, but I'm questioning whether it might accidentally do the opposite or open up the opposite as a possibility. If, say, a park owner wanted to reissue the agreement but make it a term of 10 years rather than five, which would be potentially of benefit to the resident, but there's no way for the park owner to bring that option to the table with this amendment. Is that reasonable and something that you considered when you prepared this amendment?

Ms FINLAY - We did consider and receive advice on the drafting of this, and the advice provided was that, by agreement, the instruments in this legislation aren't required. If a park owner wants to enter into a 10-year term and a long-term resident wants to enter into a 10-year term, they can do that. What this does is rebalance the opportunity for a resident at the end of a term. It would, by right, roll over to another five-year agreement or another agreement on the same terms as the existing one, but this provides that the resident can bring forward a change if they want to. If there is a long-term strategy and an agreement between a park owner and a long-term resident, prior to the end of the term at any time through the agreement and they both see that as mutually beneficial, that can be entered into. That was the advice we received in the drafting of this.

Ms ROSOL - I guess that places the administrative burden on the resident in that case, if it's something that's an idea from the park owner, but if the park owner can't bring the amendment and the change themselves then the resident has to do that, which could be burdensome. Vulnerable residents might have difficulty with that. It removes that opportunity for the park owner to do something that would be beneficial to the resident.

I want to note also that clause 3 gives both parties the right to appeal to the tribunal if the terms can't be agreed upon together. What was it about that that you determined wasn't a sufficient remedy for situations where an agreement can't be reached and instead the park owner should be prevented from seeking a variation? Why did you choose to do this when there's already clause 3 that allows for other ways of dealing with it?

Ms FINLAY - In bringing forward the voice of the community to seek this amendment and have it drafted with OPC, we specifically asked about the balance of rights of a park owner in this circumstance. As to the comments you raised at the beginning about how this would prevent a park owner entering into an agreement between the long-term resident and the park

owner, it doesn't prevent that throughout the term of an agreement. What this does is give the opportunity to a resident, if they don't want it to roll over on the same terms, to raise those prior to the end of the agreement.

Ms ROSOL - Our view is that we want this legislation to be balanced and we think it's proper for a park owner to be able to seek a variation of the terms because there would be situations where it could be for the benefit of the residents. This puts an extra barrier in to a park owner being able to do that. In those situations where there might be an imbalance and the park owner has more power, the tribunal is there for that to be a place for it to go to. This is a difficult one for us to support.

Ms FINLAY - We and the community agree that being able to elevate matters to the tribunal is a massive improvement in the circumstances that have been existing now. We did specifically ask about this in the drafting. The intention of the drafting and how we understand it applies is that it provides that opportunity to the resident prior to the end of an agreement, but if at any time there is mutual benefit to a park owner and a long-term resident to enter into terms that they both see as favourable, this amendment doesn't prevent that from happening.

Amendment negatived.

Ms FINLAY - I'll read in the second amendment which has been dealt with and then we can take that without discussion. For the benefit of the record, the second amendment that has been discussed is that. I move the amendment -

Page 49, subclause (2).

Leave out that subclause.

Insert instead the following subclause.

- (2) If a long-term fixed agreement has not terminated at or before the end of the fixed term and the resident does not want the agreement to be reissued, on the same terms, under subsection (1) -
 - (a) the resident must give written notice to the park owner, at least 30 days before the end of the term of the agreement, that a variation of terms is sought; and
 - (b) the agreement must be reviewed in the prescribed manner; and
 - (c) following the review, the park owner must reissue the agreement -
 - (i) as a residential park agreement that complies with the requirements of this Act; and
 - (ii) for such a term, and on such other terms, as may be agreed with the resident.

I just read that in because I hadn't before so we need to vote on it again. I was dealing with them one at a time.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 34 agreed to.

Clauses 35 to 40 agreed to.

Clause 41 -

Certain payments for residential park agreements prohibited

Ms FINLAY - Deputy Chair, I move -

Page 55, subclause (2), paragraph (a).

Leave out 'bond'.

Insert instead 'security deposit'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 41, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 42 -

Bond not to exceed certain amount

Ms FINLAY - Deputy Chair, I have three amendments on this. I move -

Page 56, subclause (1), after 'may require that a'

Leave out 'bond'.

Insert instead 'security deposit'.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms ROSOL - Deputy Chair, I move -

Page 56, after subclause (1).

Insert the following subclause.

- (A) A person paying a security deposit under a residential park agreement, in accordance with subsection (1), is to pay the security deposit to the Rental Deposit Authority.
- (B) Interest earned with respect to any security deposit held by the Rental Deposit Authority is the property of the Authority and is not payable as a disbursement to the relevant park owner or resident.

This amendment requires a bond for the rental of a site in a residential park to be paid to the rental deposit authority in the same manner as a bond for other rental properties. The bill, as drafted does not dictate where a bond is to be held, but this would be entirely at the discretion of the park owner or the park management. It's not clear to us why a bond for a residential park or security deposit, as we've changed the terminology now, should be treated differently from a security deposit for a standard residential tenancy. It's important that an independent process for the return of a security deposit is in place to protect both residents and park owners from misuse following the end of an agreement.

We have further amendments which outline the process through which a bond can be applied for disbursement by both the park owner and the resident and establish appeal rights in the authority of the Residential Tenancy Commissioner to resolve dispute in respect of a bond disbursement, which I will go into in further detail in the relevant clauses.

Interest earned by the holding of a bond by the Rental Deposit Agency (RDA) is the property of the RDA and this is consistent with the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*.

Mr BARNETT - We have consulted with the honourable member and the Greens on this. We're not opposing this. We think there's some sense in this in terms of the rental deposit authority and in terms of interest that the honourable member has made reference to. We have no issues there. It does create some deposit holding opportunity and should commence at the proclamation at the appropriate time. I've indicated that earlier, that there needs to be an appropriate time to get the IT systems, the administration systems, together and the systems working. The advice is that that'll be approximately three months but we don't have any issues with this. We appreciate the full consultation and progress on the bill to help improve the bill.

Ms FINLAY - We've discussed the bond security deposit issue, and later in the amendments we propose that a security deposit is not necessary but before we get to that point, at this point, members of the community were concerned about it feeling like they were having to pay a bond over their personal property. That is why we sought to change the language to 'security deposit', which inferred that it was for external commercial property where the security deposit is held. If there is to be a security deposit as a result of the amendment later in our clauses, then we agree that this is the appropriate way for it to be treated.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - Second amendment on Clause 42. I move -

Page 56, subclause (2), paragraph (a), after 'more than one'.

Leave out 'bond payment'.

Insert instead 'security deposit'.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - I move -

Same page, same subclause, paragraph (b), after 'to be paid as a'.

Leave out 'bond'.

Insert instead 'security deposit'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 42, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 43 -

Bond may only be retained for certain reasons

Ms FINLAY - Deputy Chair, I move -

Page 56, after 'only retain from the'.

Leave out 'bond'.

Insert instead 'security deposit'.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 43, as amended, agreed to.

New clause A to follow clause 43 -

Ms ROSOL - Deputy Chair, I would like to move a new clause to be inserted. New clause A to follow clause 43. It is very long. I move -

- A. Disbursement of security deposits after end of residential park agreement
 - (1) At the end of a residential park agreement, a party to the agreement may apply to the Rental Deposit Authority for the security deposit, paid in respect of the agreement, to be disbursed in accordance with the application.
 - (2) An application under subsection (1) -
 - (a) is to be in a form approved by the Director; and
 - (b) is to specify the basis, in accordance with section 43, for any amount to be disbursed, to the park owner, from the security deposit to which the application relates.
 - (3) If, at the end of a residential park agreement, the park owner and all residents under the agreement agree with a proposed disbursement of the security deposit paid in respect of the agreement, and endorse an application under subsection (1) to that effect -

- (a) any party to the agreement may lodge the application, so endorsed, with the Rental Deposit Authority; and
 - (b) the Rental Deposit Authority is to disburse the security deposit in accordance with the application so endorsed.
- (4) If, at the end of a residential park agreement, one party to the agreement (the lodging party) lodges an application under subsection (1), without the application being endorsed by the other party to the agreement (the responding party) -
- (a) the Rental Deposit Authority is to take all reasonable steps to notify the responding party that -
 - (i) an application has been received under subsection (1) in respect of the agreement; and
 - (ii) the responding party may dispute the application in accordance with clause B; and
 - (b) the Rental Deposit Authority is to hold the application for whichever of the following periods is last to end:
 - (i) 10 days after the application is given to the Authority;
 - (ii) 10 days after the end of the residential park agreement to which application relates; and
 - (c) if, during the periods referred to in paragraph (b), the Rental Deposit Authority has received a copy of the application that is endorsed by the responding party, the Rental Deposit Authority may disburse the security deposit in accordance with the application; and
 - (d) after the end of the periods referred to in paragraph (b) has expired, the Rental Deposit Authority may, if the security deposit has not been disbursed under paragraph (c) -
 - (i) disburse the security deposit in accordance with the application if -
 - (A) the responding party is the park owner; and
 - (B) the application has not been disputed, by the park owner, in accordance with clause B; or
 - (ii) refer the application to the Commissioner if -
 - (A) the responding party is the resident; and

(B) the application has not been disputed, by the resident, in accordance with clause B.

(5) The Rental Deposit Authority may refer an application to the Commissioner for any reason the Authority considers appropriate.

This amendment establishes a new clause D which creates provisions for dealing with the disbursement of bonds following the end of a residential park agreement now that the authority to hold a bond is with the Rental Deposit Authority rather than a park owner.

Either a park owner or a resident may apply to the Rental Deposit Authority for the bond to be dispersed in accordance with the application. An application made is to be in a form approved by the Director of Consumer Affairs and may only be for the reasons outlined in section 43, those being reasonable costs for replacing keys or locks, and amount of outstanding rent or reasonable cost of removing refuse or abandoned property from the site.

If the park owner and the resident agree on the proposed disbursement of the bond made in the application under subsection (i), the endorsed application may be lodged with the Rental Deposit Authority and then the RDA can disperse the bond on those terms.

A park owner can lodge an application not endorsed by a resident in a situation where the park owner has provided the resident with an application endorsed by the owner and the resident has not submitted that application to the RDA within 10 days of receiving the application. The RDA is to take all reasonable steps to notify the resident that an application has been received and that they are entitled to dispute the application.

If an application has been lodged by one party and not endorsed by the other, the Rental Deposit Authority must hold the application for 10 days after application is received, or 10 days after the residential park agreement ends, whichever is last, to give the other party the opportunity to endorse or not endorse the application. If an endorsed application is received from the responding party, the RDA may disburse the application.

If the periods outlined in paragraph (b) expire without an endorsed application being received, the RDA may disperse the security deposit as outlined in the application, if the responding party is a park owner and the application has not been disputed by the park owner. If the responding party is a resident and the application is not disputed by the resident, the RDA is to refer the application to the Residential Tenancy Commissioner. The Rental Deposit Authority may refer an application to the Commissioner for any reason.

Mr BARNETT - It's consistent with what I've shared earlier. I thank the Greens for the consultation. We've been through this and we're more than happy to progress with this amendment. We won't be opposing that.

Ms FINLAY - As previously commented on a prior amendment, if there are to be security deposits and they are to be treated through this instrument, then this is appropriate and we appreciate the amendment.

New Clause A to follow Clause 43 agreed to.

New clause B to follow new clause A -

Ms ROSOL - Chair, I move a new clause B -

- B. Party to agreement may appeal security deposit disbursement
- (1) A resident may dispute an application made by a park owner under clause A(1) by lodging a dispute with the Commissioner -
 - (a) at any time before the application has been lodged with the Rental Deposit Authority; and
 - (b) within 10 days after the application has been lodged with the Rental Deposit Authority.
 - (2) A park owner may dispute an application made by a resident under clause A(1) by lodging a dispute with the Commissioner within 10 days after the application has been lodged with the Rental Deposit Authority.
 - (3) An application referred to the Commissioner by the Rental Deposit Authority, in accordance with clause A, is taken to a dispute under this section.
 - (4) A dispute under this section is to -
 - (a) be in writing; and
 - (b) include a copy of the application to which the dispute relates; and
 - (c) if lodged by a park owner or resident, be accompanied by the prescribed fee.
 - (5) The Commissioner may accept a dispute that is lodged outside of the relevant time period if the security deposit, to which the dispute relates, has not been disbursed by the Rental Deposit Authority in accordance with this Act.
 - (6) If the Commissioner receives a dispute under this section, the Commissioner -
 - (a) if the dispute is lodged by a park owner or resident, is to notify the Rental Deposit Authority of the dispute within 24 hours after the dispute is lodged; and
 - (b) is to take all reasonable efforts to notify each other party to the residential park agreement to which the dispute relates -

- (i) that the dispute has been lodged with the Commissioner;
and
 - (ii) each party has a right to make written submissions in respect of the dispute within the time specified in the notice; and
 - (c) may require the Rental Deposit Authority, and any party to the residential park agreement to which the dispute relates, to provide the Commissioner with information and documentation that is relevant to the dispute.
- (7) A person who is the subject of a requirement under subsection (6)(c) must comply with the requirement.
- Penalty: Fine not exceeding 10 penalty units.
- (8) Each party to the residential park agreement, to which the dispute relates, is a party to the dispute.
- (9) A party to a dispute, other than the party who lodged the dispute, may provide written submissions, and other information, to the Commissioner in respect of the dispute on payment of the prescribed fee.
- (10) The Commissioner may -
- (a) waive the whole, or part, of a fee payable under this section;
or
 - (b) refund the whole, or any part, of a fee paid, under this section, by a party to a dispute if the Commissioner believes that another party to the dispute has acted vexatiously or fraudulently.

Thank you for your patience with that. New clause B outlines the circumstances in which a resident or a park owner may dispute an application for a security disbursement. This amendment is consistent with the approach taken in the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*.

A resident may dispute an application for disbursement made by a park owner under new clause A by lodging a dispute with the Residential Tenancy Commissioner at a time before the application has been lodged by the RDA and within 10 days after the application has been lodged with the RDA. A park owner may dispute an application made by a resident by lodging a dispute with the Residential Tenancy Commissioner 10 days after the application has been lodged with the RDA. The commission is allowed to accept a dispute that is lodged outside the specified time period if the security deposit has yet to be disbursed by the RDA. The Residential Tenancy Commissioner is empowered to require relevant information to be provided by the RDA or any party to a Residential Park Agreement with penalties for non-compliance.

Mr BARNETT - I don't have any problems with that. Thank you very much.

Ms FINLAY - Just for the benefit of interpretation for our guests today, I think it's valid and important that this amendment - if there is to be a security deposit - that there is an independent body that concerns can be raised with so that those disputes can be settled. The amendment outlining how that happens I think is important. We support the amendment.

New clause B to follow new clause A agreed to.

New clause C to follow new clause B -

Ms ROSOL - It's another one with lots of reading. I move -

B. Determination of disputes

- (1) The Commissioner may not determine a dispute in respect of a dispute, lodged under clause B, until at least 7 days have passed since the last of the notices required to be given under clause B(6) have been so given.
- (2) The Commissioner is to determine a dispute lodged under clause B in respect of a security deposit, paid on respect of the residential park agreement to which the dispute relates, by determining the amount, if any, of the security deposit which is to be disbursed to the relevant park owner, in accordance with section 43.
- (3) As soon as practicable after the Commissioner determines a dispute under this section -
 - (a) the Commissioner is to give written notice to the Rental Deposit Authority, and each party to the residential park agreement, to which the dispute relates -
 - (i) of the determination of the dispute; and
 - (ii) that the determination may be appealed in accordance with clause E; and
 - (b) if no application for appeal is made within the period specified in clause E, the Rental Deposit Authority is to disburse the security deposit, paid in respect of the residential park agreement to which the dispute relates -
 - (i) by disbursing to the relevant park owner, the amount of security deposit, if any, specified in the determination as the amount to be disbursed to the park owner; and
 - (ii) by disbursing any remaining amount of the security deposit to the relevant resident.

This new clause deals with the determination of disputes by the Residential Tenancy Commissioner. The commissioner may not make a determination in respect of a dispute until

at least seven days have passed since the relevant notices have been given under clause B(6). The commissioner may determine the amount, if any, of the security deposit which is to be disbursed in accordance with section 43 and a commissioner must notify the rental deposit authority as soon as practical after the dispute as to the outcome of the determination and a notification that the dispute may be appealed.

If there is no appeal, the Rental Deposit Authority is enabled to disburse the security deposit as determined by the RTC. The function and obligations of the Residential Tenancy Commission in respect of security deposits for residential parks is consistent with their function in the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*.

New clause C to follow new clause B agreed to.

Clauses 44 to 47 agreed to.

Clause 48 -

Tribunal may declare increase in rent excessive

Ms BURNET - Chair, I think both Ms Finlay and I have changes. Mine starts at subclause 2. I move -

Page 61, subclause (2), after 'the Tribunal, within'.

Leave out '30 days'.

Insert instead '60 days'.

I suppose, just in speaking to the bill, and I acknowledge everything that residents have gone through and all the work that these able Bass representatives have done, for their community in particular, I commend everything that's been done and commend the Attorney-General for bringing this bill on as well.

It's complex. It is very complex as a bill of legislation and it's really important to get parity and fairness right if we can. So, my amendment is really just in relation to having consistency with the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997* of 60 days to apply to the Residential Tenancy Commissioner to review the increase rather than 30 days. It's just creating a consistency, and this is really because not only is it fair as a standard thing, but sometimes where there are quite elderly or vulnerable people and there's no justification for giving them less time to appeal a rent increase. It simply ensures consistency with the time frame in the *Residential Tenancy Act* to dispute an increase in rent as per the submissions made by Shelter Tasmania and the Tenants' Union.

Mr BARNETT - Thanks very much, Chair, and thanks to the honourable member for Clark for sharing those remarks. We don't have any opposition to that and appreciate the update and consultancy with the government on this particular matter. Likewise, in terms of Labor's position on this, and I think this same amendment, we don't have any opposition at all.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - Chair, we also have an amendment to this clause. It's nice to see the member for Clark's contributions to this. It's not just members for Bass who are making their contributions, amendments and improvements here. There are 72 caravan parks in Tasmania, so, the ultimate outcome of this instrument is to apply fairness to all park operators and long-term residents. I move -

Page 62, subclause (3), after paragraph (a).

Insert the following paragraphs.

- () the percentage increase in rent charged, to the resident, in respect of the rented property since the resident became a resident; and
- () whether the increase is consistent with other rates and charges payable in respect of the residential park; and
- () what impact the increase may have on the resident; and

This relates to clause 48, where these are matters that the tribunal consider and, when the matter goes to the tribunal in deciding whether to declare an increase in rent as excessive, the tribunal must have regard to a certain number of matters. There are already a number of details included in this draft bill and, listening to the community, we added a number of elements to those. What that means is that there is some technical considerations that the tribunal must have regard to when deciding if an increase is excessive and to consider those matters that we have brought forward in this amendment.

Mr BARNETT - Thanks very much for that. Clause 48 already sets out the variety matters that the tribunal must have regard to when considering whether a rent increase is excessive. I note that 3(a) is the general level of rents for comparable rented properties in the same or similar localities. I note the 3(g) provides that the tribunal is to have regard to other relevant matters. That's the advice I have from my department.

The government is therefore of the view that amendment is not necessary, with the tribunal able to consider a wide range of matters under the provisions in the bill as tabled. However, the government will not oppose this amendment in light of our collaborative approach.

Ms ROSOL - Just to say that we are happy to support this amendment. We note that it's similar to provisions that we've moved in the past in relation to the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 48, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 49 to 56 agreed to.

Clause 57 -
Residents' Committees.

Ms FINLAY - Chair, this recognises the different scale of caravan parks across Tasmania. Of the parks that exist there are large and small, both caravan parks in size, but also in the size of the community of long-term residents. This is an amendment that reduces the number of long-term residents required to form a committee, and so it's lowering the threshold. I move -

Page 70, subclause (3), after 'park that has'.

Leave out 'more than 20'.

Insert instead 'at least 5'.

In hearing the recommendations from the community, having had experience of the benefit of collective action from a park when supporting themselves and their resident community, if there is a small number of long-term residents in a park, they should have the opportunity to form a residents committee. If you think about other property agreements across Tasmania in private property scenarios, there might be a small block of units that has a small number of people and they have their body corporate, as an example. Just because there is a smaller number of long-term residents shouldn't prevent them from being able to form a residential committee, and so we have brought forward this amendment on behalf of community members to reduce that number from 20 to 5.

Mr BARNETT - Clause 57, subsection (1) provides that the residents committee can be created when there are more than five different occupied sites with residential park agreements. Clause 57 of the bill includes a range of provisions aimed at facilitating the creation and operation of a resident's committee at a residential park. This includes clause 57, subsection (2), which makes it an offence for a park owner to unreasonably interfere with the residents' right to create a residents committee under subsection one.

In addition, clause 57 subsection (c) provides that a residents committee is in place. The park owner is obliged to take all reasonable steps to enable an enclosed area within the residential park to be used for the purposes of a meeting of residents called by a residents committee. The opposition is seeking to amend clause 3. This currently provides that a park owner of a residential park that has more than 20 fixed residential park agreements in force must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the park has a residents committee, in accordance with subsection one.

The opposition is seeking to amend this to lower the threshold for this obligation arising to five fixed term residential park agreements in force. This amendment would mean that a park owner has to take all reasonable steps when they have the minimum number of long-term residents able to form a committee. Government considers that this further increases the administrative burden on park owners without the evidence that the other provisions of clause 57 do not adequately enable the creation and operation of residents' parks committees. Notwithstanding the above, the government will not oppose the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 57, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 58 to 61 agreed to.

Clause 62 -

Sale of dwelling following death of resident

Ms FINLAY - Chair, I move -

Page 75, subclause (3), after 'within the period of'.

Leave out '28 days'.

Insert instead '24 hours'.

I suspect that the journey of this amendment will be similar to the previous one in regard to sale of property. This has the same effect in terms of following the passing of a person that is recognised as a long-term resident in a park and has an agreement. Unfortunately, in the local community we've had an experience, where there's been a passing of someone who was currently a resident in a caravan park, someone who I personally grew up with and played sport with. I feel particularly connected to this amendment. What this does is again, we believe, having had discussions with the community, that it is reasonable to be required to provide a courtesy indication to an owner of a park that there is an intention to sell a property, but we believe that it's not appropriate for that to have a delay of 28 days in the event that there is the intention to sell a property, we believe that the reduction from 28 days to 24 hours is reasonable, posing the question: why would you want to delay a family from transacting an asset that is part of their estate in the open market?

Mr BARNETT - We have been through this debate, as the honourable member has indicated earlier in our committee stage. The government doesn't support this amendment. In the bill as introduced, where a resident has died, the park's owner option to purchase lapses. If no agreement is reached within 28 days, the amendment would reduce that period to 24 hours.

That's plainly too short in the view of the government, and especially inappropriate in the context of a deceased estate. Matters following a death often involve family members, personal representatives, estate administration and practical uncertainty. A 24-hour deadline is neither reasonable nor practical. The bill already provides a sensible process. It preserves the owners option for a limited period but makes clear that there is no obligation on the personal representative or inheriting person to sell the dwelling to the park owner. We don't support this amendment.

Ms FINLAY - Happy to respond. We recognise that there's no obligation for that transaction to occur. It may be that in the conducting of an estate there is a long-term period that it takes for them to enter into that transaction. However, if there has been a long term illness, if the family is well prepared and if the family wants to prosecute that transaction, it seems that a period of delaying for 28 days the sale of personal assets and personal property, I mean no other circumstance - would there be a requirement to delay taking action on that?

There is no, by right, first refusal in other jurisdictions. We believe this provides for the courtesy without impacting estates or families going through the experience of having someone pass with their asset in a caravan park in Tasmania.

Ms ROSOL - As I mentioned in relation to clause 19, we think the 24-hour requirement isn't a reasonable timeframe into which to make these decisions and particularly in this kind of

a situation, we think it's manifestly not compassionate in a circumstance where we're talking about a grieving family. This kind of legislation might be in place and yes, not suitable in this situation.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 62 agreed to.

Clauses 63 to 64 agreed to.

Clause 65 -

Termination of residential park agreements

Ms FINLAY - Chair, under this part of the draft bill and under this clause in relation to the termination of residential park agreements, a number of circumstances that an agreement terminates have been outlined. However, there's the absence of mutual agreement and if there was mutual agreement and the terms were agreed, there would be no reason to include the tribunal in that matter. I move -

Page 77, subclause (1), before paragraph (a).

Insert the following paragraph.

- () the park owner and resident, jointly, agree in writing to terminate the agreement for any reason; or

Mr BARNETT - In short, this is really not necessary. The bill already provides for an adequate opportunity for consent to terminate an agreement, but we're not going to oppose the amendment, but it's really not necessary.

Ms ROSOL - In relation to this amendment, we think that it's probably covered by paragraph (f), but it doesn't seem to do any harm, so we don't intend to oppose it.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 65, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 66 -

Form notice of termination

Ms ROSOL - Chair, I propose moving both of our amendments to this clause together, so I will read them out now. I move -

First amendment

Page 79, subclause (1), after paragraph (e).

Insert the following paragraph.

- () if section 70 does not apply in respect of the termination - specify that the termination of the agreement may be appealed in accordance with clause D; and

Second amendment

Same page, subclause (2), after paragraph (e).

Insert the following paragraph.

- () if section 70 does not apply in respect of the termination - specify that the termination of the agreement may be appealed in accordance with clause D; and

In relation to these amendments, our first amendment to this clause requires a party serving a notice of termination given by a park owner to a resident to specify in the notice that a termination can be appealed regardless of the reason for the termination. This is a consequence of amendments to broaden the types of terminations that can be appealed to the tribunal.

This provision exists under section 70 of the bill, which provides for terminations for a breach of the residential park agreement. However, other forms of terminations, which are detailed in divisions two, three and four of this part, do not require a notice to specify that the other party has the right of appeal.

Rather than amend all of those sections of the bill, we've opted to amend section 66 to require a notice of termination to explicitly include this information so that a resident understands that they do have the ability to appeal the termination regardless of the circumstances in which they occur.

This amendment was a recommendation from the joint submission of Community Legal Centres Tasmania, Tenants Union Tasmania, TasCOSS and Shelter Tasmania. They note in their submission that in their experience, notices that don't inform parties of their right of review are often interpreted as meaning that they must vacate the property.

It's our view that requiring a notice of termination to specify that a termination may be appealed provides clarity to all parties of the right to appeal a notice of termination. The second amendment does the same thing as the first amendment, but for circumstances where a notice of termination is given by a resident to a park owner.

Mr BARNETT - In short, thanks very much for the Greens' consultation on this amendment. We have no issues with this; I think it improves the bill. It requires a termination notice to specify the termination may be appealed under clause D where section 770 does not apply. It certainly improves procedural fairness and I appreciate the acknowledgement of the various stakeholders who have also made a contribution and I thank them for their support.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 66, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 67 and 68 agreed to.

Clause 69 -

Tribunal approval required for termination in certain circumstances

Ms FINLAY - Chair, under this clause, it is outlined where tribunal approval is required.
I move -

Page 81, after subclause (1).

Insert the following subclause.

- () A termination notice given by a park owner under section 73, 75 or 76, in respect of a residential park agreement in place in respect of a long-term resident, is of no effect unless -
 - (a) the long-term resident agrees with the notice of termination;
or
 - (b) the Tribunal has authorised the notice so given to the long-term resident.

Mr BARNETT - The government won't be supporting this amendment. Section 69 of the bill already requires the tribunal approval in certain specified circumstances, namely where the rented property must be demolished, cannot lawfully be inhabited or where an excessive rent order under section 48 is in force or proceedings for such an order have commenced. The tribunal may authorise termination if satisfied the giving of the notice is reasonable in the circumstances.

The amendment goes much further. It would make a termination notice under section 73, 75 or 76 given to a long-term resident of no effect unless the resident agrees or the tribunal authorises it. In other words, it would graft a new consent or tribunal approval requirement onto frustration, sale of rented property and change of use or redevelopment, but only for a newly created class of long-term resident. That is a significant policy shift. It does not merely add a safeguard, it creates a stronger and separate tenure class, and my advice is it substantially narrows legitimate owner rights in circumstances already dealt with by the bill. The government's position is that the bill already contains an appropriate tribunal approval mechanism where one is justified, so this amendment would go well beyond that and should not be supported.

Ms ROSOL - This amendment relies on a definition of long-term resident and it's not workable without one, and we can't see how this would work and we can't support it.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 69 agreed to.

Clauses 70 to 79 agreed to.

Clause 80 -

Termination based on hardship of either party to agreement

Ms FINLAY - Chair, under this clause, it deals with termination based on hardship. There are already a number of subclauses that outline that. Our amendment is to include a number of matters. I move -

Page 92, after subclause (2).

Insert the following subclause.

- (3) If the Tribunal makes an order under this section for the termination of a residential park agreement in respect of a site where a dwelling is installed or located, the Tribunal may also make one or more of the following orders:
 - (a) an order regarding the sale, relocation or disposal of the dwelling;
 - (b) an order regarding the disbursement of sale proceeds from the sale of the dwelling;
 - (c) an order requiring the relevant park owner to permit the owner of the dwelling to access the site for the purpose of selling the dwelling in accordance with the order.

The purpose of this amendment, similar to the abandoned site provisions, is to create comfort for people who may have previously experienced challenges with the sale of their asset. This requires that a park owner permit an owner of a dwelling to access the site for the purposes of selling and gives instruction to the tribunal about the disbursement of sale proceeds and this processes of selling or relocating or disposing of a dwelling. As we know, in the local community, there have been a number of circumstances that needed to have been tested at the Supreme Court. One, there have been a number of examples of different things where homes have been encased in fencing, where people are being prevented from returning to a site once they were unlawfully required to not be at the site having difficulty to sell their asset and then to redeem proceeds of the sale, with that not being able to go ahead.

The community felt that these clarifications were required in the legislation being considered by us today, to give security to a long-term resident about what could happen and should happen in the tribunal's consideration of sale regards to proceeds and also being able to access the site to make the transaction and the sale process occur.

Mr BARNETT - Very quickly, the government notes a significant discretion that TASCAT holds in relation to making orders under this bill. There's been insufficient time, unfortunately, to seek TASCAT's view on the operation of this amendment, and we'll take that on board, and between now and the Legislative Council, take further advice but in the meantime, the government will not oppose the amendment.

Ms ROSOL - The Greens are happy to support this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 80, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 81 to 85 agreed to.

Clause 86 -

Action to deal with protected abandoned property

Ms FINLAY - As outlined in the previous item, this is mirroring that intention. I move -

Page 99, after subclause (2).

Insert the following subclauses.

- (3) If the Tribunal makes an order for possession of a site where a dwelling is installed or located, the Tribunal may also make one or more of the following orders:
 - (a) an order regarding the sale, relocation or disposal of the dwelling;
 - (b) an order regarding the disbursement of sale proceeds from the sale of the dwelling;
 - (c) an order requiring the relevant park owner to permit the owner of the dwelling to access the site for the purpose of selling the dwelling in accordance with the order.
- (4) Section 85 does not apply to a dwelling, installed or located on a site, to the extent that that section is inconsistent with an order of the Tribunal made in respect of the dwelling.

Mr BARNETT - Same position as clause 80. Won't oppose.

Ms ROSOL - We're happy to support this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 86, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 87 agreed to.

Clause 88 -

Amendment of park rules

Ms FINLAY - So, this is how rules can be amended and everyone in the Chamber will be well aware, particularly if you're a member for Bass, that there were, on occasion, various rules being applied in different ways within the Beauty Point Caravan Park and I don't know if it's happened in other caravan parks, but it definitely was a feature of the misuse of rules in that

caravan park. So, our amendment seeks to clarify circumstances around the amendment of park rules. I move -

First amendment

Page 102, subclause (2), after 'Subject to'.

Leave out 'subsection (3)'.

Insert instead 'subsection (3) and (aa), if relevant'.

Second amendment

Page 103, after subclause (3).

Insert the following subclause.

- (aa) If a park owner proposes to amend a park rule in respect of a residential park and the park rule primarily relates to long-term residents of the park, the park owner must not make that amendment -
 - (a) unless -
 - (i) the park owner arranges a meeting of the residents of the park; and
 - (ii) at least 14 days before the meeting referred to in subparagraph (i), the park owner has notified all residents of the proposed meeting and provided a copy of the proposed amendment to each resident of the residential park; and
 - (iii) after that meeting is held, a majority of the long-term residents of that park have approved the amendment; or
 - (b) unless the Tribunal has approved the proposed amendment after the proposed amendment was not approved under paragraph (a).

Mr BARNETT - Clause 86 provides for the process for amending park rules for a residential park. The opposition's proposed amendment would see the introduction of a presumption that a park rule that primarily relates to long-term residents cannot change without the support of the majority of residents or a TASCAT ruling. This is a substantial change to the existing provisions in relation to rulemaking by park owners. It gives long-term residents, as a class, an effective veto over certain rule changes unless the owner obtains tribunal approval. If long-term residents of a particular park are not engaged or interested in park management and therefore do not attend the planned meeting or participate in voting, a park owner is still required to go to TASCAT or to have a rule change endorsed. The amendment has the potential to result in significant delay and administrative burden for park owners. In addition, the amendment raises difficult questions about how to determine whether a proposed rule primarily relates to long-term residents, which may itself become a source of

dispute. It's noted that the bill already requires that a park owner consult and consider the views of the residents committee in relation to a proposed rule change if there is a committee in place. There's also a requirement that residents are required to be provided with 14 days written notice of the proposed rule change. In light of those views, we won't be supporting this amendment.

Ms ROSOL - We don't have any problems with this amendment as such, but it relies on the definition of a long-term resident which didn't pass. It can't be inserted here because we don't have that definition, so it's not clear who it applies to.

Ms FINLAY - I will just make some observations around that. Firstly, in the minister's comments, I can understand the technical response to these amendments as proposed. However, the processes within which either previous park rules were amended or created and then distributed and relied on has been problematic for residents in some caravan parks in Tasmania. Recognising that the previous definition of long-term residents wasn't supported and that had previously been advocacy from the community to clarify the status of long-term residents by having a definition - when we drafted this with OPC, we did actually clarify the drafting about it being that all residents were notified that it is the long-term residents with that long-term agreement that are in that subclass, although not defined in the definitions at the front of what will become the piece of legislation.

We believe it is appropriate for an amendment like this to be considered given the history of what has happened. We acknowledge that there've been masses of improvement made in the delivery of this draft bill, but there is still a feeling in the community that these inclusions are appropriate for the legislation.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 88 agreed to.

Clause 89 -

Application to tribunal if park rules are considered unreasonable

Ms ROSOL - Chair, I move -

Page 102, subclause (1).

Leave out that subclause.

Insert instead the following subclause.

- (1) An application may be made to the Tribunal, by one or more residents of a residential park, to declare a park rule in respect of the park unreasonable.

This section allows an application to be made to the tribunal to declare a park rule in respect of a residential park unreasonable but as written, the section only allows for this to occur when a joint application is made by residents from a majority of the occupied sites in the park. The justification for requiring this to be a joint majority application given was not a strong

justification, in our view. It feels like overkill to prevent an individual resident from making an application in respect of park rules just to prevent a vexatious application from being made.

As I mentioned in my second reading, section 89 of the *Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2020* already provides for the tribunal with broad powers to deal with frivolous or vexatious matters. We feel it's incredibly important for an individual resident to be empowered to make an application to the tribunal to declare a park rule unreasonable. I recognise that in the case of Beauty Point, those residents were able to come together and establish a residents' committee in order to further collective action. We welcome the fact that this bill establishes the rights of residents to create those committees in other residential parks. However, we believe it's appropriate for an individual to have the right to appeal to the tribunal if a park rule is considered unreasonable. If you require a majority of residents, there's a real risk that an individual or a minority could be victimised with unreasonable and targeted rules with no recourse. That's why we're moving this amendment.

Mr BARNETT - Chair, I thank the honourable member for putting forward this amendment. I can understand the intent of it and certainly support the intent. The government also considered the proposed amendment to the park rules provision, which would allow a single resident or one or more residents to apply to TASCAT in relation to a change to park rules, rather than requiring broader resident support. We recognise the concern that, in some circumstances, the majority view may not adequately protect the rights, amenity or comfort of an individual resident. That is a legitimate consideration. It's important that park rules operate fairly for everyone in a park, including minority residents, which is a point the honourable member raised. However, the reverse risk also needs to be acknowledged.

Park rules are intended to support the practical day-to-day operation of a residential park and are often developed through discussion between park owners and residents to reflect what works for the park community as a whole. If the threshold is reduced so that an individual resident can initiate proceedings on their own, there is a real risk that the collaborative arrangement supported by a majority of residents and the park owner, could be undermined by a single objection. That would shift the framework away from collective resolution and towards individual contest, even when the rules have broad support across the park. It also raised the prospect of more frequent disputes being brought to TASCAT, in circumstances where there is not a wider resident concern, but rather a disagreement held by one resident alone.

The government's view is that there needs to be a balance threshold for external review. That threshold should be high enough to ensure TASCAT is dealing with matters that reflect a genuine broader concern within the resident community, while still preserving appropriate safeguards against unreasonable rules. As a government, I don't think we're persuaded that moving to an individual application model strikes the balance appropriately. However, having said that, and my strong confidence in TASCAT and believing that's one of the best justice reforms in the last decade or more, we won't be opposing the amendment. I wanted to put those remarks on the record to make it very clear that there's arguments for and against, and very strong arguments as well, and we want to get a balanced approach. For that reason we won't be opposing your amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 89, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 90 to 93 agreed to.

Clause 94 -

General powers of Tribunal to resolve disputes

Ms ROSOL - Thank you, Chair. I move -

Page 106, subclause (1), after paragraph (h).

Insert the following paragraph.

- () determine how a security deposit, paid in respect of rented property, is to be disbursed between the relevant park owner and resident; or

To talk about this amendment, this relates to the introduction of the Rental Deposit Authority and it includes in the general powers of the tribunal the ability to determine how a bond paid in respect of rented property is to be disbursed between the relevant park owner and the resident on application by a party to a residential park dispute.

Under the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*, the Residential Tenancy Commissioner is the initial authority that is able to resolve disputes related to the disbursement of security deposits with appeal rights available to the Magistrates Court. The framework under this bill is somewhat different to that and as the Residential Tenancy Commissioner does not have a role and the tribunal instead determines disputes on this basis, the model works a bit differently from the RTA and disputed claims are determined by the tribunal.

Mr BARNETT - We don't plan to oppose this. It expressly allows the tribunal to determine how a security deposit is to be dispersed between the park owner and the resident. If parliament adopts the deposit package, which is what we expect, the tribunal should have an express role in disbursement disputes, so there's no issue at all.

Ms FINLAY - We're also, as described by the minister as a package of amendments here, this is in addition to the previous amendments that we have agreed to. For the benefit of those people listening on in terms of there being ended up at the end of this, there being security deposits and how they're treated, how they're dispersed, how they're managed, this is another element to that and allows for independent management and decision-making about that.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - On clause 94, the general powers of tribunal to resolve disputes, there are a number of matters that are outlined once there's been an application by a party, what the tribunal may do. I move -

First amendment

Page 106, subclause (2).

Leave out 'The Tribunal'.

Insert instead 'Except as specified in subsection (3), the Tribunal'.

Second amendment

Same page, after subclause (2).

Insert the following subclause.

- (3) The Tribunal has the jurisdiction to make a monetary order, under the Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2020, for the payment of compensation, up to a value of \$15 000, for loss or damage that the Tribunal is satisfied is the result of -
 - (c) a breach of this Act; or
 - (d) a breach of a residential park agreement.

The purpose of this amendment - and this caused some discussion at our first consultation - there was personal injury included. We've removed that reference. There were questions around the value included in this clause. The level of \$15,000 is equivalent to that of small claims. There was a question at our consultation about this being appropriate for the tribunal. On consultation with OPC and with other research that we have done, if there is a party at the tribunal and there are matters being considered and there has been damage or loss, the tribunal do already have this power to consider such matters. We feel that is appropriate for a small claim for the tribunal to be able to include this consideration within the collection of matters that they may consider.

We believe where there has been loss or damage by a breach of the act or by a breach of the residential park agreement, it is reasonable that a party can bring forward a claim in this way.

Mr BARNETT - The proposed amendment by the opposition provides a specific addition to clause 94, providing TASCAT with the ability to make an order for compensation of up to \$15,000 for loss or damage resulting from a breach of the act or a breach of the Residential Park Agreement. I'm speaking to both amendments together, as has the Deputy Opposition Leader.

There has been insufficient time to seek TASCAT's view on the operation of the amendment. However, it is noted that the bill already provides at section 94, subsection (c), that the tribunal may, on application by a party to a residential park dispute, to order a person to make a payment which may include compensation.

The government does not consider that the opposition has demonstrated a need for any further addition to what is already provided for in clause 94(c) or elsewhere in the act, so we don't support this amendment.

Ms ROSOL - We have serious concerns about this amendment because as it's written, it opens up residents to being fined up to potentially \$15,000. We're uncomfortable with supporting this significant financial liability being placed on residents without some serious consultation and consideration by key bodies like TASCAT or the Department of Justice, not to mention residents of caravan parks throughout the state.

It's the view of the representatives of the Beauty Point residents that either party should be able to seek compensation, but it's not fair to limit it to just residents or just park owners. Compensation should be determined by the relevant facts in the matter before the tribunal, including any loss and damage the party seeking compensation has suffered. We wouldn't want to see residents unintentionally exposed to the risk of being fined up to \$15,000, and so we can't support this amendment for that reason.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 94, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 95 agreed to.

Clause 96 -

Tribunal may rescind or vary harsh or unconscionable terms.

Ms FINLAY - I'd like to ask some questions of the minister here. We have discussed this previously. I appreciated the briefing that we had around this draft bill and the consultation that we had at the end of last week. It's in regard to the consideration that both harsh or unconscionable, as I understand in the briefing given, has a similar level of application and where there was a request from community experience to include the reference to 'unfair'. Can I first ask on this for the government's interpretation or intention of 'harsh or unconscionable' and how that may or may not differ to unfair?

Mr BARNETT - Are you moving your amendment?

Ms FINLAY - I can move it first or ask that question. The first amendment, I move -

Page 107, subclause (1), after 'the term is'.

Leave out 'harsh'.

Insert instead 'unfair'.

Mr BARNETT - As I've said earlier, the opposition, or at least with respect to this amendment that the deputy's just read into *Hansard*, the opposition are seeking to replace the reference to 'harsh and unconscionable' in clause 96 to 'unfair or unconscionable' and the government is satisfied that the phrase 'harsh and unconscionable' is well understood, and what is appearing in comparative legislation in four other jurisdictions. Just to give clarification for honourable members in this place, in terms of those other jurisdictions, they are Western Australia, South Australia, Northern Territory and Victoria.

That gives us in Tasmania some comfort with respect to the meaning and understanding and the interpretation of those words, from the commencement of the act. I just wanted to indicate that there is a clear understanding in those jurisdictions. We have drawn from that, using those same words so TASCAT and any other authorities and, indeed, long-term residents and park owners, have a clear understanding of that interpretation.

Ms ROSOL - We understood, from the questions we asked the minister in our second reading speech, that the language that was used in the legislation did cover 'unfair' already and

that was the government's intent. So, I thank the minister for clarifying that again today. This amendment that replaces the word 'harsh' with 'unfair' - in our view, 'harsh', 'unfair', 'unconscionable' are all captured by the terms in the bill. Replacing one with the other doesn't necessarily change very much. It's all covered. Having said that, we'll support this amendment.

Ms FINLAY - Thank you and I appreciate the Greens' approach to this amendment. As the minister indicated, and as we received information in the original briefing, the basis for this draft bill was originally around the South Australian model, and the South Australian model that used 'harsh' and 'unconscionable' was prepared and brought into service prior to the Australian Consumer Law becoming a thing - that's not very technical, sorry - and in Australian Consumer Law, the reference to 'unfair' is used.

It was the belief and feeling of the community advocate voice in the preparation of responses to the draft bill that it was reasonable to include 'unfair' in the final legislation, so I appreciate the Greens' position towards this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - The second amendment, I move -

Same page, subclause (2).

Leave out that subclause.

Insert instead the following subclause.

- (2) On making an order under subsection (1) in respect of a matter, the Tribunal may take one or more of the following actions:
 - (a) make a variation, or consequential change, to the relevant residential park agreement or another related document;
 - (b) make such consequential orders necessary to give effect to such a variation or consequential change;
 - (c) if the Tribunal is satisfied that a park owner has acted in a manner that -
 - (i) is unfair, impose a civil penalty not exceeding [200] penalty units; or
 - (ii) is unconscionable, impose a civil penalty not -

Ms FINLAY - I'm going read that again, if I can, because I did actually make an amendment to that which hasn't been picked up in this drafting. I'm going to read from (c) -

Mr Barnett - Do we have this amendment? Has it been circulated?

Ms FINLAY - I'm going to read what the intention of this was, because I've made, based on feedback on the scale of the penalties, we did request that the drafting drop the penalties for. I move -

Same amendment, in new subclause (2)

...

- (c) if the Tribunal is satisfied that a park owner has acted in a manner that -
 - (i) is unfair, impose a civil penalty not exceeding 50 penalty units, or
 - (ii) is unconscionable, impose a civil penalty not exceeding 100 penalty units.

Mr BARNETT - Through you, Chair, The amendments have to be circulated.

DEPUTY CHAIR - Ms Finlay, it does need to be circulated in writing.

Ms FINLAY - Even if I read that into the *Hansard*?

DEPUTY CHAIR - Yes.

Ms FINLAY - Okay, I can do that.

The purpose of these amendments are - and it does go back to community experience and the bringing forward of concerns. When there has been unfair or unconscionable action by park owners in the past, the consequence has been for long-term residents to take that to the Supreme Court. This provides the opportunity, through the Tribunal, to find a matter with penalty units, and that it would act as a deterrent to people acting either in an unfair or unconscionable way. So, the purpose of this amendment is to deter unfair behaviour with a penalty unit not exceeding 50 penalty units, or to deter unconscionable behaviour of a penalty not exceeding 100 units.

Mr BARNETT - Through you, Chair, it's getting to the point of policy on the run when we're having amendments to amendments on the floor with handwritten amendments, changing a 200 penalty unit back to a 50 penalty unit - I remind colleagues in this place and elsewhere that a penalty unit is right now \$205. Changing the 'unconscionable imposition of a civil penalty not exceeding 600 penalty units', now 100 penalty units, there is a very big difference.

In terms of delivering good legislation and doing the best we can as a parliament, this is not recommended, to be handwriting amendments like that when you're talking about thousands of dollars. Having said that, I am really reluctant to support this amendment. That will be the position of the government.

I do not like policy on the run. This is an opportunity for the honourable member to consider or reconsider her position, and then bring it back in the Legislative Council. That's why we have two Houses of Parliament, getting the best possible outcomes for our legislation. We're working very hard here, we're being collaborative, but I'm making a point. I have been

in the Senate. It's a very good operation at the federal level to review. We've made wonderful improvements at that level for many years - nine-and-a-half years for me. I've been here since 2014. This is not how to manage this process.

I ask the honourable member to consider withdrawing this amendment, bringing it back into the upper House with the correct penalty units, whatever they are, absolutely, and it can and should be considered carefully upstairs.

As a government, we will not be supporting this amendment.

Ms ROSOL - I am quite concerned about this, because it seems to be making up legislation on the fly. I know that during the various versions of the amendments it went back and forward with the penalty amounts, and now we have another change. I don't feel comfortable voting for legislation that's changing on the fly like this when it's something so important.

As the minister said, if it was brought forward in the Legislative Council then we would consider it there, but I'm not willing to vote for something that's changed on the floor of the House now.

Ms FINLAY - Chair, I appreciate the feedback of both. That's an error and my oversight in not seeing that final version distributed. The amendment reducing it to 50 or 100 penalty units was as a result of the consultation and the conversations had and the feedback that was provided to reduce the penalty units. I hear the member for Bass, in terms of consideration in the upper House and will bring forward that amendment in that way. There is provision for making those amendments in this way, but I hear the minister's position. The reduction in the penalty units was as a result of collaboration and consultation and, as a result of those conversations, we intended to reduce that. It's my oversight and I apologise that the final distributed version didn't have those penalty units in it.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 96, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 97-

Park owner may make urgent application to terminate residential park agreement.

Ms FINLAY - Chair, I move -

Page 108, after subclause (3).

Insert the following subclause.

- () The Tribunal must not determine an application under this section without the resident, to which the application relates, being represented at a hearing of the application unless the Tribunal is satisfied that all reasonable efforts have been made to notify the resident of the hearing.

That amendment, I think, speaks for itself - that it is appropriate that a resident be represented.

Mr BARNETT - Chair, I appreciate that. Just to be clear, the amendment proposed by the opposition is that when a park owner makes an urgent application to terminate an agreement, under section 97, that:

The Tribunal must not determine an application under this section without the resident to which the application relates being represented at a hearing of the application, unless the Tribunal is satisfied that all reasonable efforts have been made to notify the resident of the hearing.

I just want to make the point, I am very confident in TASCAT. This is one of the best reforms that we've implemented as a government in the last decade, in fact, as a parliament in the last decade. Without speaking for TASCAT - TASCAT has broad discretion and scope to manage proceedings, and the *TASCAT Act* itself provides for the appearance of parties or representatives to a matter. However, in this situation, I'm not going to oppose the amendment. I think it's stating what is currently occurring. Again, I say I'm very pleased with TASCAT and confident in its processes, but we won't be opposing the amendment.

Ms ROSOL - The Greens are happy to support this amendment.

Mr GEORGE - Chair, I'm sorry to intervene and slow matters down. May I ask, with this amendment, as I understand it, and I may have misread it, that a representative must be in attendance, but nowhere that I've seen is there the choice to have a representative. There must, surely, be a position where someone who's appearing before the Tribunal can decline a representative to appear on their behalf or with them.

Ms FINLAY - Thank you for the clarifying question. It makes sense that you would ask such a question. If the Tribunal is satisfied that all reasonable efforts have been made to notify a resident to be at a hearing, and the resident chooses to either not attend or to be there or be represented, that would be their choice. But given the opportunity to have that choice, what we were seeking to do by the intention of this amendment is to make sure that, at the minimum, a resident is notified that there is going to be a matter and they have the opportunity to either attend or be represented, unless the Tribunal is satisfied that they have made all attempts.

Mr GEORGE - Is the Attorney-General content that that makes the allowance for someone appearing before the Tribunal not to be represented?

Mr BARNETT - The answer is yes, but that's a decision for TASCAT, and it must be reasonable and using their discretion and their judgement.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 97, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 98 and 99 agreed to.

New clause D to follow clause 99 -

Ms ROSOL - Chair, I move -

- D. Party to agreement may appeal termination of agreement
- (1) If a party to a residential park agreement terminates the agreement other than in accordance with a notice under section 70, any other party to the agreement may apply to the Tribunal for an order reinstating the agreement.
 - (2) On hearing an application under subsection (1), the Tribunal may make an order -
 - (a) declaring that the residential park agreement, that is the subject of the application, has not been terminated; or
 - (b) declaring that the residential park agreement, that is the subject of the application, has been terminated.
 - (3) If the Tribunal is satisfied that a residential park agreement, that is the subject of an application under subsection (1), has been terminated but that it is reasonable in the circumstances to reinstate the agreement -
 - (a) the Tribunal may make an order reinstating the agreement on such terms and conditions as the Tribunal considers appropriate; and
 - (b) if an order reinstating the agreement is made under paragraph (a) and is subject to conditions, may also make alternative orders that, if the specified conditions are not complied with -
 - (i) the resident is to give up vacant possession of the rented property to the park owner; or
 - (ii) other terms and conditions that may apply to a party of an agreement so reinstated are waived.

In its current form, under section 99, the Tribunal may either determine that a section 70 termination is invalid or a reinstated residential park agreement that has been validly terminated under section 70 of the act when it is reasonable in the circumstances to do so on such conditions as the Tribunal considers appropriate. This means that where there has been a breach of a residential park agreement that has resulted in a notice of termination being issued to either party, the Tribunal may make a finding that the termination was invalid or that it was valid, but in the circumstances, it's reasonable for the resident to not be evicted from their home.

This new Clause D extends this power of the Tribunal to terminations other than those made under section 70 of the act. As mentioned earlier, there are numerous grounds on which

a residential park agreement may be terminated by either party. We believe that a resident should have the right to appeal to have their agreement reinstated regardless of the grounds of the termination. That's a matter of human rights. We don't have to delve into the realm of hypotheticals to think of a circumstance it would be reasonable to reinstate a validly terminated park agreement.

In the case of Beauty Point Tourist Park, a terminally ill cancer patient was prevented by a park owner from exercising their rights to sell their property to fund their cancer treatment. We want the Tribunal to be able to take into account the personal circumstances of a person when deciding on the effect of terminating an agreement.

The Tribunal has the ability to reinstate the order, subject to appropriate terms and conditions. We believe this approach provides sufficient scope for the Tribunal to exercise their judgment and discretion to apply conditions to protect both residents and park owners where the termination has occurred on unfavourable terms to either party. This human rights approach was recommended by the joint submission from Community Legal Centres Tasmania, Tenants' Union Tasmania, TasCOSS and Shelter Tasmania.

Mr BARNETT - I want to indicate there are no issues with this. This is consequential to previous support that the government's provided for the Greens' amendment. We've consulted on it and it's not a problem.

New clause D to follow clause 99 agreed to.

New clause E to follow clause 99 -

Ms ROSOL - Thank you, Chair. I wish to move -

- E. Party to agreement may appeal disbursement of security deposit
 - (1) Within 7 days after a dispute under clause B is determined by the Commissioner under clause C, a party to the dispute may apply to the Tribunal against the determination of the dispute.
 - (2) In determining an application under subsection (1), the Tribunal is to hold a new hearing in respect of the dispute.
 - (3) In deciding an appeal in respect of a dispute under clause B, the Tribunal may -
 - (a) confirm the determination of the Commissioner made under clause C in respect of the dispute; or
 - (b) vary the determination and specify how the security deposit, paid in respect of the residential park agreement to which the dispute related, is to be disbursed to the relevant park owner and resident.

- (4) The Tribunal may make any ancillary or incidental orders that the Tribunal considers appropriate in respect of an application under this section.

This amendment allows a party to a residential park agreement to appeal the disbursement of a security deposit determined by the Residential Tenancy Commission to the Tribunal within seven days of the determination. The Tribunal is required to hold a new hearing to either confirm the determination of the Commissioner in respect of the dispute or vary the determination and specify how the security deposit is to be disbursed. This is consistent with section 30 of the *Residential Tenancy Act*, which allows a party to appeal a determination made by the Residential Tenancy Commissioner to the court.

Mr BARNETT - It's consistent with our discussions earlier in terms of deposit arrangements and appropriate safeguard where the initial deposit decision is made administratively by the Commissioner. I was asked earlier in the day in terms of who was the Residential Tenancy Commissioner. Robyn Pearce is the director of CBOS, and I thank her for her excellent work.

New clause E to follow clause 99 agreed to.

Clause 100 to 113 agreed to

Schedule 1 -

Transitional provisions

Ms FINLAY - Chair, in bringing forward this amendment, we're seeking to provide security for existing residents. I move -

First amendment

Page 128, clause 1, subclause (2).

Leave out that subclause.

Insert instead the following subclause.

- (2) Despite subclause (1), if a residential park agreement is in force at the commencement of this Act -
- (a) the agreement is taken to be valid even if the agreement is not in writing nor complies with any other requirement of section 14; and
 - (b) within 6 months of this Act commencing, a park owner is to provide each existing resident, of the residential park operated by the park owner, with a residential park agreement that complies with section 14.

Second amendment

Same page, after clause 1.

Insert the following clauses.

W. Application of Act to certain residents

- (1) On the commencement of this Act, a resident of a residential park is taken to hold a fixed term residential park agreement in respect of a site if -
 - (a) the resident -
 - (i) has been a resident of the park for the immediately preceding 5-year period, regardless of whether the resident had residential park agreement in respect of the park on the commencement of this Act; or
 - (ii) owns the dwelling that is located on the site; and
 - (b) the address for the site, or the residential park, is the resident's principal place of residence.
- (2) A fixed term residential park agreement that is taken to be in force under subclause (1) is taken to be in force for a fixed period of 5 years.
- (3) Subclause (1) does not apply in respect of a resident if, as soon as practicable after this Act commences, the resident notifies the park owner, in writing, that the resident does want the agreement, in force immediately before the commencement of this Act, to be a fixed term residential park agreement under this clause.

X. Payment of security deposit by long-term residents

- (1) If, on the commencement of this Act, a long-term resident of a residential park has not paid a security deposit in respect of an agreement to occupy a site at a residential park, the park owner must not require the resident to pay a security deposit while the long-term resident remains a resident of that park.
- (2) Subclause (1) ceases to apply to a long-term resident of a residential park if, after the commencement of this Act and at the sole request of the resident, the resident occupies a different site at that residential park under a residential park agreement.
- (3) If, on the commencement of this Act, a park owner holds a security deposit, however described, in respect of a long-term resident, the park owner is to refund the security deposit to the long-term resident as soon as practicable after this Act commences.

CHAIR - Do you want to speak to those amendments?

Ms FINLAY - Yes. Thank you, Chair. In the first instance, the amendments ensure that the agreements are provided to residents within a six-month period of this act commencing. The second set of amendments ensure existing residents in the caravan park are granted with their agreements, and the X part of this amendment regards the matter that we raised at the very beginning in clause 3, which was about the need to require a security deposit.

As we know, there is no absolute requirement that a security deposit needs to be paid by long-term residents at a caravan park, and the voice of the community is that they would prefer that there are not security deposits paid. When they're dealing with their own asset, their home, they are responsible for that asset and their relationship in the agreement with the park owner on other matters be managed on those matters in terms of clearing excess refuse or in lost security tags. It is the intention of these amendments to provide certainty to existing residents, provide certainty in terms of the time it will take to create the agreements and to seek to remove the security deposit by long-term residents.

Mr BARNETT - Thank you, Chair. The amendment proposed by the opposition adds to the existing provision in schedule 1, which currently provides that the act applies to all residential park agreements that are in place on the day the act commences. Subclause (ii) provides that despite this, the agreement is still in force if the agreement is not in writing on the date of commencement.

The opposition is seeking to add an additional requirement: that an agreement that is not in writing on the date of commencement is put into writing and provided to the resident within six months of commencement. I note that this amendment has not been consulted with the relevant industry stakeholders; however, the government does recognise the importance of ensuring agreements are well understood by both parties.

Six months appears to be a reasonable time frame, and that support material, including model park agreements that can be tailored for use by owners and residents, will be available from the commencement of the act. We are getting on with the job in preparing model agreements and model rules, and that will come forward in the not-too-distant future, subject to this legislation passing. In light of that, the government won't be opposing the amendment.

Ms ROSOL - Thank you, Chair. Our reading of this is that this amendment is consequential to and relies on the definition of the long-term resident, which wasn't passed. Therefore, it shouldn't be included here, because it adds to the confusion about things and I think that some of the language in there highlights the concerns that we had about the arbitrary application of long-term residents or residents, so we can't support this amendment. I had planned to support the first part of the amendment, but because they've been put together that makes it difficult, and so we'll be voting against this amendment.

Mr BARNETT - I can clarify the government's position because I think you've read through each of your amendments, it is my understanding.

Ms Finlay - I did read (1)-(2) and extended into X which I can see on reflection was -

Mr BARNETT - I was responding to the first amendment, but one does relate to 2, 3 and 4, so I want to put on the record regarding new clause W, which has been read in the amendment

proposed by the opposition to include a new clause W to schedule 1, is a significant change in the operation of the transitional arrangements and will not be supported by the government in relation to people in parks at the date of commencement.

This provision significantly broadens the scope of the Act due to the *or* between 1 and 2. This amendment, through similar drafting to the definition of long-term resident proposed by the Opposition, provides that anyone who owns the dwelling on the site and the address for the site or the residential park is the resident's principal place of residence, on the date of commencement, is automatically entitled to a five year agreement and thereby benefits of a long-term fixed agreement, and that's the point that the honourable member for Bass, Cecily Rosol just made, because that earlier amendment hasn't progressed, then this is OTEO's provided a park resident owns the dwelling, which they must do in order for the act to apply anyway, and they have the park as their principal place of residence, they have the benefits of indefinite occupancy, regardless of the agreement at the time they moved in. This could result in parks who have, for example, had caravans etc staying on an agreement for a term of four or five months over the low season at the date of the commencement, unable to have those sites free as planned for the tourist season.

This may also serve to significantly increase the issue of residents living on land that is not zoned as residential, as park owners prior to the commencement may have been allowing longer, but not indefinite stays for emergency accommodation, seasonal work, or just because they have the space due to a quiet season.

This amended transitional provision has the potential to have significant practical ramifications on park owners from day one. This is fundamentally different to the provisions consulted. Regarding the new clause X, the government believes that doesn't flow from the amendment that didn't get passed earlier in the committee stage.

We will likewise be opposing that and part Y, which is Labor's third amendment, which I'm just foreshadowing. We find that problematic and won't be supporting that as well, as new clause Z, the sale of dwelling not prevented in certain circumstances, so just foreshadowing government's position on those parts.

Ms ROSOL - If I could just add to my comments earlier, in relation to the new clause X, we have concerns about that clause, particularly relating to paragraph (3). We consulted with the lawyer who's been representing the residents of the of Beauty Point Park and from a legal perspective our understanding is that the legal status of certain actions that occurred in the past, changing that legal status could be contrary to the rule of law and there's a common law assumption is against retrospectivity.

We should only consider retrospective application of things in cases of the utmost importance. I question whether the notion of paying a security deposit back, some of which could be decades old, meets that threshold. We have significant concerns about clause X.

Ms FINLAY - On taking on the feedback, we will seek to advance the first of those amendments through to the upper House. In regard to the historic nature in retrospectivity of making decisions in this legislation, I understand that, when we did do our consultation, it was recognised that - perhaps I can ask this as a question, through you, Chair - there will be a requirement for any monies held currently as bonds that would then in the future be security deposits; how do you see that's treated in terms of those funds, recognising they'll need to then

all move to the commissioner tribunal or are historic bonds staying as they are and only new ones going through?

Ms ROSOL - My understanding, and perhaps the minister could confirm this, is that there are transitional arrangements in this legislation to cover things like that.

Ms FINLAY - Yes, so the only reason why I ask that question is, in terms of this moment in the legislation, for the bonds currently held to be treated in a certain way, they will all need to be treated in a certain way at this point.

Amendment negatived.

Ms ROSOL - Chair, We have an amendment about security deposits as well. I move -

Page 128, after clause 2.

Insert the following clause.

X. Security deposit to be paid to Rental Deposit Authority

If, on the day on which this Act commences, a park owner holds a security deposit, however described, in respect of a residential park agreement, the park owner must provide the security deposit to the Rental Deposit Authority as soon as practicable after this Act commences with such information as the Rental Deposit Authority requires.

Which goes to the question that you were asking and that's the transitional provisions that would deal with the issue that you raised there.

Mr BARNETT - To the honourable member, it's consistent with your earlier remarks. The government supports those amendments and will support this one.

Amendment agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - Chair, I move -

Same page, after clause 2.

Insert the following clauses.

Y. Draft agreements and rules to be prepared

Within 3 months after the commencement of this Act -

- (a) the Director is to publish a model residential park agreement in accordance with section 10(2); and
- (b) the Minister is to ensure that model park rules are prescribed.

We believe that providing timing on this is important.

Mr Barnett - We're speaking on Y now?

Ms FINLAY - Yes.

Mr BARNETT - Thanks very much. In terms of the advice I have, we'd like to note that the government is already committed to producing model park agreements and model park rules in accordance with the Act in readiness for the commencement of the Act. I think I've mentioned it a few times today and on the public record. We've been working through this reform in a methodical way. Those opposite have perhaps - yes, just to express views that are not consistent with those that I'm sharing now.

They've also indicated that perhaps we can't achieve this; we've worked very hard and my department is working very hard to get these model rules and park rules sorted and made available to the public and my expectation is that they will be available as soon as possible, finalising that hard work and, of course, there will be an opportunity for feedback and comment in due course on that but part Y would require, within three months after commencement, the director to publish a model residential park agreement and the minister to ensure that model park rules are prescribed.

The difficulty is that section (10), subsection (2) already provides that the director may publish a model residential park agreement that may be used or adapted by park owners. The bill therefore already allows this to occur administratively where useful, so part Y would convert that flexible implementation tool into a rigid statutory deadline and it would go further by mandating prescribed model park rules as well. There is a difference between allowing guidance to be developed and hard wiring that exercise into the act on a fixed timetable. The latter risks are creating an unduly prescriptive implementation requirement at commencement rather than allowing the model documents to be developed properly and in an orderly way. Therefore, the amendment is not necessary, and we're not inclined to support it.

Ms ROSOL - I have a procedural question because these amendments were circulated together as one amendment, but have been read out separately, so I wanted to clarify that please.

Mr Barnett - Part Y or Part Z?

Ms Finlay - I have only read out part. I have separated them.

Ms ROSOL - So can they be moved separately?

Ms Finlay - Yes.

Ms ROSOL - Okay, in that case just to say that we don't oppose clause Y.

Ms FINLAY - In response to the minister's comments, I think setting an expectation of timing for work to be completed so that model residential park agreements and model park rules are prescribed, the government respectfully have had years to bring forward this legislation. At the opening the minister was emboldened to speak positively about the fact that this legislation is here today. However, there have been years of trauma and hurt in the community given the delay it's had. The government's had a long time to prepare and put its mind to model residential park agreements and the model park rules. We believe that it's

appropriate and we expect that this work has been happening in parallel, and we think it's appropriate that there is a timing on the delivery of those two instruments.

The fact that it's already referenced in 10(2) is irrelevant. It doesn't replace that because that said it may have them, but this says you need to do it within a certain period of time. The community have not been patient; the community have been impacted by the delay in bringing it here and we think these amendments are appropriate.

Amendment agreed to.

Sitting Times

[5.48 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Deputy Premier) - In light of the time and in light of our ambition, to progress with the bill, pursuant to Sessional Order 18, I move that -

For this day sitting, the House shall not stand adjourned at 6.00 p.m. and that the House continue to sit past 6.00 p.m.

I hope you understand that I'm hoping to progress positively with this bill today. That's the purpose of that motion.

Motion agreed to.

Ms FINLAY - This is Z, whichever - one of those. The purpose of this amendment is to remove barriers to sale. I move -

Z. Sale of dwelling not prevented in certain circumstances

If a resident intends to sell a dwelling located at a residential park within 5 years of the commencement of this Act, the sale of that dwelling is not prevented solely on the basis that the residential park is located on land in a particular purpose zone, within the meaning of the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993, that prevents the land from being used for residential purposes.

The intention of this amendment is to provide a transitional arrangement from current home owners that have been prevented from selling their land because of unresolved planning matters and we believe that giving grace for a period of time for those matters to be resolved will ensure that someone at the point that they wish to sell their property, if within this limited five year period, will be able to do so. It gives time for the correction of things to meet the requirements of Land Use Planning and Approvals Act (LUPAA) and give certainty to current homeowners who live in residential caravan parks who are currently prevented from selling their property, the opportunity to do so.

Mr BARNETT - The opposition amendment seeking to ensure that for five years from the commencement of the act, a dwelling can be sold regardless of the sale of that dwelling is not prevented solely on the basis that the residential park is located on land in a particular purpose zone within the meaning of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993*, that

prevents the land from being used for residential purposes. I note that the bill already provides for the making of transitional regulations as well as issuing of ministerial exemptions. These have been included in the bill to ensure that work can be done to support certain identified sites and parks to overcome planning, zoning, as well as building-related regulatory issues. So, the government doesn't believe that it's necessary and won't be supporting the amendment.

Ms ROSOL - Chair, the Greens have serious concerns with this clause. We understand, as the minister has already referred to, that there are transitional provisions that are intended to address this issue by working through a range of technical planning matters, including safety matters, whereas this amendment doesn't work through any of these matters. We've been speaking with the lawyer who's been representing the Beauty Point residents. They've noted that all of the sites in Beauty Point have prior use rights, and residential use is permitted at the park even if the current zoning prohibits residential use, so those protections are already there.

Amendment negatived.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule 2 agreed to.

Title -

Mr BARNETT - Chair, I'll just take this opportunity on the title of the bill to pass on my sincere thanks to all those involved in this very long and thoughtful, comprehensive and important debate. I realise we're in Committee stage; it's not the opportunity for full-on discussion at this stage. We've expressed our views during the second reading speech. I thank all members of this Chamber for their cooperation and collaboration. This is how legislation can progress with goodwill to get things done for the good of our community. I want to acknowledge the intent of everyone around this circle, and who have contributed today and, of course, last week.

I acknowledge the Beauty Point Tourist Association - Sherryl and your team, Steve and the team, not just here, but who are also back at Beauty Point. No doubt some of them might be listening. I acknowledge and thank you for your advocacy, but also for all those who've been involved in the debate over a long period of time, I acknowledge that time period. I want to say there's been a lot of goodwill expressed, and we've got the job done.

I acknowledge my team: Felicity Poulter in the Department of Justice, together with other members in the Department of Justice and, of course, Sean Barry in CBOS, who's done an incredible job and, of course, visited with the residents at Beauty Point many weeks ago now. I appreciate that opportunity and, of course, the delicious morning tea.

I just wanted to make a few final remarks to concur and thank you to one and all for the collaboration. I believe that we are stepping forward a milestone event for this legislation. We are making rock solid the rights of long-term residents in caravan parks across Tasmania. They will be improved. They will be locked in legislation. Likewise clarity for park owners. I think we've got the balance right with this legislation and it's a real milestone event for the parliament and for the people of Tasmania.

Ms FINLAY - Chair, I'd like to add my voice to that of the minister. It is a milestone moment in terms of it's a massive shift for Tasmania to now have legislation, or once it advances through the upper House, for us to be at this part of the process for the last state in Australia that hasn't had these protections. They haven't had this level of clarification for park owners and/or long-term residents. It's great that we're here. It's great that we're at this point. I want to acknowledge the briefings that were offered and the consultation that happened across the Chamber, but I do also want to put on the record that it's taken years and many ministers to get to this point. There are other ministers and other members in the Chamber who have previously been ministers who were also across this and many other ministers in this place who have had carriage of this at some point. The impact of the delays of bringing such a piece of a draft bill to this place has been -

CHAIR - Ms Finlay, you need to wind up. It's not a chance for a second debate.

Ms FINLAY - No, I'm just mirroring what the minister said. It has caused great concern in the community with this delay. It is an improvement. There's been a number of amendments made today by multiple members to further improve it and we look forward to the carriage through the Upper House.

Title agreed to and bill taken through remaining stages.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Third Reading Forthwith

[5.56 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Minister for Small Business, Trade and Consumer Affairs) - Honourable Speaker, I move -

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the bill being now read the third time.

Motion agreed to

RESIDENTIAL PARKS BILL 2026 (No. 2)

Third Reading

Bill read the third time.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

Comments Regarding the Speaker of the House of Assembly

[5.57 p.m.]

The SPEAKER - Before we go into Adjournment, I need to make a short statement to the House. I remind all members of the House of the rules regarding criticism of the Speaker's actions, either incidentally in debate or outside of the House. Any reflection on the character

or actions of a Speaker inside or outside the House is highly disorderly as, by convention, a Speaker does not participate in public debate about matters that occur in the House except to clarify rulings. Therefore, a Speaker is not in a position to defend themselves against public reflection from a member. Any such criticism can only be done by way of a substantive motion.

Today, I've become aware of a social media post by the honourable member for Bass, Ms Finlay, reflecting on the reasons for her suspension from the House. I remind the House that the reason for the suspension of Ms Finlay was the constant interjections in contravention of the Standing Orders. The Speaker is required by Standing Order 117 to maintain order in the House during proceedings.

I have spoken with the honourable member for Bass. She advised that she was unaware of these rules in regard to outside of the House and she has subsequently immediately removed the post, which I thank her for. However, consistent with precedent, I ask the honourable member for Bass to withdraw her comments and to apologise. I also ask for all members to be mindful of these rules in the future.

Ms FINLAY - Speaker, I apologise and I withdraw.

The SPEAKER - Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

[5.59 p.m.]

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Deputy Premier) - Honourable Speaker, I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Fight Motor Neurone Disease Campaign

Mr BARNETT (Lyons - Deputy Premier) - Honourable Speaker, I'd like to speak on the Adjournment and pay a wonderful tribute to all those who've got behind the Fight Motor Neurone Disease (MND) campaign last weekend in Launceston. I want to pay a tribute in particular to the organisers, Anne Page and all those who are behind the Fight MND campaign. It was an absolutely wonderful event. Bec Daniher was the champion guest speaker and is, of course, Neale the daughter of Neil Daniher. It was so great to see Bec again. I was there with my wife, Kate. Of course, it's very special for me, which I'll come to shortly. I'm advised that more than \$30,000 was raised and was hosted and compared by the honourable Jo Palmer MLC and, of course, attended by Tania Rattray and about 200 others.

MND is a progressive and terminal neurological disease that impacts thousands of people across Australia and of course worldwide. It gradually weakens the muscles, affecting movement, speech, swallowing and breathing and it's devastating. It has no known cause, no known cure and the average life expectancy is short of three years. In Australia alone, two people are diagnosed with MND every day and two people lose their lives every day.

I want to pay tribute to Sam Woolcock and the Woolcock family for contributing to the lunch. Sam's a wonderful auctioneer, and he did a great job. Over \$30,000 was raised with various auction items, silent auctions and raffle prizes as well. Anne Page is a force of nature

and her family are directly affected. Many in this place would remember Anne and the late Graeme Page as well.

Certainly, by educating, raising awareness, providing resources, we can make a real difference in the lives of those with MND and their families. Seeing individuals from across the MND community come together, sharing insights, experiences and a common goal is deeply inspiring. For me it's personal with my late father passing away in May 1985 after just short of three years with motor neurone disease. I would like to pay a tribute to dear mum who was there by his side every step of the way, providing that support is a very tough time.

It's a very tough disease for the families involved and it affects all of the family and of course carers and loved ones alike. My dear mum became the patron of MND Tasmania and helped get the organisation started here in the mid-1980s. I subsequently became president here for a short time and then an ambassador for MND Australia, particularly when I was in Canberra, in my time in the Senate. It's been a real joy and a privilege to be involved in supporting people with MND and their families.

I want to pay a particular tribute to Bec Daniher. She's a beautiful woman and she's doing it tough with her dear dad, Neale, who's been such a fantastic role model. I've received his book and I'm looking forward to reading it. They've raised tens of millions of dollars through the ice bucket challenge, as colleagues here in this place would know about and I've been part of as well in past years with my wife, Kate, and many others. It's a devastating disease, but we are fighting back, we're trying to make a difference and providing that support to those people with MND and their families is definitely the way to go.

Congratulations, a tribute to all those who were involved and again to Jo Palmer MLC who was our wonderful MC on the day, just pulled together the event so beautifully. To all those Tasmanians who are working and fighting for MND, to the MND Association of Tasmania and to Steve Simmons, who's doing such a wonderful job based on the north-west coast. He's likewise a force of nature. Together with his committee they are fantastic advocates for people with MND and I give them a tribute tonight.

Tasmanian Leaders Program

[18.03 p.m.]

Ms FINLAY (Bass - Deputy Leader of the Opposition) - Honourable Speaker, I rise this evening to put on record comments about an individual and an organisation doing incredible things across Tasmania. I had the absolute pleasure on Friday night to meet Clair from Tassie Mums at an event that was put on by a group within the just graduated Tasmanian Leaders Program (TLP).

As you progress through a Tasmanian Leaders Program, one of the things that you do is work on a community-impact project and the teams give themselves a name. The six pack from Tas leaders put together a community impact project to run a trivia night to raise funds, to provide raised awareness and much needed financial contributions for Tassie Mums.

For people who haven't heard about Tassie Mums, it's been going for 10 years and it's this incredible organisation in Tasmania, founded and led by Clair. They put together packs of clothing for young Tasmanians with mums who need a little help. From premature birth, right

through to 14 year olds, they put together a pack of a preset list. A pack of about 70 items, they will go across two size classes of enough clothes that would last a young person a year. There are beautiful, warm, puffer jacket-style, winter jackets and there are summer and winter clothes, long and short sleeves . Also the packs include books to help with that engagement about reading and a soft toy.

We know that this year, Tassie Mums are on target to support 3000 young people in our community, and they're only just scratching the surface in terms of being able to support mums in the community who need that little extra help, or families and mums who are experiencing poverty in our community. There is an extraordinary number of young people living in circumstances where they are supported by Tassie Mums.

It's an incredible offering; it's an incredibly beautiful, emotional way to support young mums in our community. They also provide dignity hygiene packs for mums themselves, which have some shampoo and some oral hygiene and some soaps and a beautiful toiletries bag in it as well, because it's really important to look after yourself as a mum, but also personal hygiene is so essential for yourself and when you're looking after your young person.

I rise this afternoon to help that process of raising awareness for Tassie Mums in Tasmania. If there's anyone minded to help out an organisation supporting our young people, Google Tassie Mums and see how you can make a contribution, because every dollar makes a difference. I want to shout out to the 6 Pack as part of Tasmanian Leaders for the work that you did. There were people in here this evening, members for Bass, Rob Fairs and Bridget Archer, who were also at the event on Friday night. It brought together over 130 individuals from Launceston and the greater Launceston area that, at last tally, have raised almost \$15,000 for Tassie Mums.

So, 6 Pack, you smashed it, you've done a really good job. Tas Leaders, thank you for the work that you do; for everyone who came to the event, nice work, well done, for the fun Trivia People Tasmania for putting on what was a great event. To everyone involved, the financial supporters, the sponsors, the people who donated the prizes: you have made an exceptional difference, an extraordinary difference in the lives of many Tasmanian mums and their young ones, and we want to raise you up and thank you and help raise awareness for what you do.

Ian Sauer OAM - Tribute

[6.07 p.m.]

Mr PEARCE (Braddon - Minister for Primary Industries and Water) - Honourable Speaker, I rise tonight to speak of the incredible contribution of Ian Sauer OAM to TasFarmers and more broadly to the Tasmanian agricultural sector. Ian has served as President of TasFarmers since March 2022, and he's been on the board since 2017. After nine years, Ian will step down from both of these roles tomorrow morning at the TasFarmers annual general meeting.

Ian's experience across agriculture, natural resource management, policy development, project management, and community development has been valued by all the members at TasFarmers and by the broader agricultural sector. Ian has led and helped manage through

massive change in TasFarmers, and it's been for the positive, not only in the rebrand from Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers, the relocation to Longford, but the Tasmanian website says:

... a renewed commitment to representing the next generation of Tasmanian farmers while honouring the organisations deep roots in advocacy, leadership and community.

Ian's a bloke who is passionate about Tasmanian agriculture. He really is, and he doesn't step back. He calls a spade a spade, and if it's anything to do with farming, with agriculture, with policy or protecting our next generation of farmers, he's at the forefront. He's been a visible, well-respected, highly-effective advocate. Whilst at times I know this has put Ian at loggerheads with government policy or the national agenda, but his passion for the sector he represents remains. I care, and I know that he cares equally about all that he represents and all futures that he is there to protect.

The good thing about a discussion with Ian is you know exactly where you stand. You are never left any in any doubt. You know what he thinks and you often walk away with a solution. As Ian steps down as president tomorrow, he leaves TasFarmers well positioned for the future, and he leaves a legacy of principled and strong advocacy. On behalf of a grateful state and on behalf of a grateful industry, I want to thank Ian Sauer OAM for his leadership and for his tireless contribution to Tasmanian agriculture. Ian, I wish you all the very best for what comes next in your life, most likely still advocating for farmers and agriculture. Thanks, Ian.

Homelessness and the Housing Crisis in Tasmania

[6.10 p.m.]

Mr BAYLEY (Clark) - Honourable Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on positive steps in the housing space and the need for further urgent action. The government's recent move to disband Homes Tasmania is welcome because the model just wasn't working. The review into Homes Tasmania confirmed that, and the figures speak for themselves. The social housing wait list is only increasing. It's up over 5300 applications.

Homelessness is amongst the worst in the nation; people are sleeping rough and winter is approaching. Meanwhile, this government has been more focused on fudging the figures to fake the making of targets than building the 10,000 homes that it promised. The provision of social and affordable housing is the responsibility of government. It had a hand in making the crisis. It needs to fix it. This responsibility should never have been moved out of government and it's good that it's coming back, but an announceable is not the action that's needed. Government needs to be clear on the plan and get on with it.

Where are its plans for housing delivery going forward? What happens to the Homes Tasmania debt and how will it be funding it in the future? Where will frontline service staff offering face-to-face support for some of Tasmania's most vulnerable sit in the context of this new structure and how will they themselves be supported? Tasmanians are struggling to find an affordable place to live and the cost-of-living crisis is only being made worse by the chaos in the Middle East.

The Liberals have to act and act quickly. Every Tasmanian deserves a safe and affordable place to call home. It's not just a basic need; it's a human right and what is needed from government is real investment in building more homes. Now is the time to deliver. While 12 years of the Liberals has created a budget mess, it shouldn't mean that Tasmanians don't get the essential services they need. It's a matter of priorities, choices.

The housing crisis is not just a shortage of public and social housing, an ever-lengthening wait list and tents in our parks and reserves. As put by the former CEO of Homes Tasmania in Estimates last year, failures in the private rental market are driving people out of private rentals and transferring pressure onto the public system. Rents are too high, protections too low and standards below what's both comfortable and ethical.

But first to some good news: in recent days, renters have finally been given the right to keep a pet, and that is worth celebrating. It's an important step forward for renters rights that the Greens have been fighting for for years, alongside advocates like the Tenants' Union and the Dogs' Homes of Tasmania. We commend their work and congratulate them on this outcome. It was thanks to this work that the Liberals finally took up these calls as a policy commitment in the 2024 election.

Renters should never be denied a safe place to live simply because they own a pet. They're part of the family and people shouldn't be forced to choose between a home and a hound, or whatever their pet may be. At a time when people are really struggling to find an affordable home, this will make finding a place to live just that little bit easier. While this progress is welcome, more work needs to be done to give renters the rights they deserve.

The *Residential Tenancy Act* is now under review and we await a discussion paper and community consultation. It's important that this results in better protections for renters. At the moment, renters can be subject to rent hikes which are completely unreasonable. In Hobart, rents rose by 7.1 per cent in just one year, faster than any other capital city. Launceston, Devonport and Burnie and our regions are not immune. Renters also need action on unfair evictions and minimum standards for energy efficiency. This will afford them security and savings in a cost-of-living crisis that seems to have no end.

To finish, there is, of course, short-stay accommodation and Airbnb stripping whole homes from the rental market. With supply under stress, losing private rentals to tourist accommodation simply exacerbates the problems. This sits outside of the *Residential Tenancy Act* and is a planning issue that needs the urgent attention of minister Vincent, parallel with the announced reforms to Homes Tasmania and the review of the act. The crisis in our housing sector is intense and people need support. It's time for this government to step up and deliver the services that Tasmanians urgently need and deserve.

Public Sector Wage Negotiations and Industrial Action

[6.15 p.m.]

Mrs GREENE (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, we are witnessing widespread industrial unrest in the Tasmanian public service right now because the Rockliff government has fundamentally lost the trust of its workforce. We saw multiple school strikes late last year; NAPLAN testing has been disrupted and this week we have 24-hour rolling strikes disrupting classrooms across the state.

Hospital workers have been taking action visibly and consistently now for months which is impacting on patient care, while other workers across the state service have also been taking action in record numbers, impacting the services that Tasmanians rely on. Just last week, child safety services in Hobart took a full day of stop-work action as did Parks and Wildlife staff. People working in some of the most remote and challenging parts of our state took industrial action, too. Industrial action on this scale is what happens when workers feel ignored, disrespected and pushed to the brink.

In this place today, the honourable Deputy Premier talked about the fair and fulsome offer that had been presented to unions late last week. He failed to tell this House some of the strings that were attached to that offer. The most significant one was requiring unions to agree to reducing the size of the public service and to agree to the Department of State Growth cuts within the year. He lectured us in this place today about good-faith bargaining, but it's important to place on record what has been occurring over the last few months from a worker perspective.

They've had bargaining meetings cancelled. They've watched the government's own chief negotiator walk away from the bargaining table and quit. They've had threats of backpay being taken away, threats of Easter Tuesday and Christmas shutdown being removed from their industrial agreement, and we've had ministers say, 'It's not my job to intervene'. Then we come to this place and here ministers stand up and lecture us about public sector workers and good-faith bargaining.

Is it good-faith bargaining to get an offer at 5 p.m. on a Friday and demanding a response by 10 a.m. the next business day? I don't think it is, but that's what we saw earlier this month. How exactly were unions meant to consult with members in that type of timeframe? That's not good-faith bargaining. How are workers meant to consider offers and how that will impact their livelihood and their family and their futures? It's deeply disrespectful, and while all of this is happening, what do workers hear from this government? They hear the Treasurer say the police have a harder job than other public servants, pitting workers against other workers. They hear commentary suggesting that this is all some big union and Labor conspiracy theory, which is laughable in terms of the Rosevears' election.

Ms Butler - It's disrespectful.

Mrs GREENE - That's right, it is disrespectful. Let's be clear here. There is no conspiracy. It's the reality of what Tasmanian public sector workers are experiencing each and every day. They're standing up and they're saying they've had enough.

These are Tasmanians, Tasmanian with families, Tasmanians who are experiencing cost-of-living pressures. They are teachers and TAs who are trying to support kids in overcrowded classrooms. They're allied health professionals and hospital staff holding together a health system under immense strain. They are WorkSafe inspectors, court clerks and library workers. They are Service Tasmania employees, family violence workers.

It's even staff who work in this very building. Hansard staff and ICT workers, people who we all rely on each and every day for this place to function. Parks and Wildlife workers and biosecurity officials protecting our island and our natural environment and agricultural sector. Many of them are not highly paid workers. Many of them are struggling with rising costs, trying to pay their mortgages and their rent, groceries and fuel and some are the sole-income earners for their families. They're doing so in workplaces that are already under

resourced, stretched and under pressure. They're asking for respect. They're asking for a fair deal. They're asking for a government who listens.

The truth is this: when you treat your workforce with contempt, you get conflict. When you shut down genuine negotiation, and that's what's happened, you get strikes. When you refuse to value the people who deliver the services that Tasmanians rely on each and every day, the entire system begins to crack and that's what we're seeing this week.

This government cannot keep blaming workers. It can't keep dismissing their concerns and it can't keep pretending that this level of industrial action is normal because it's not. It's not normal. The strength and breadth of the industrial action that's occurring right now is significantly higher than bargaining rounds in the last decade that I've participated in. When I've been at the bargaining table, it hasn't been this bad, so this is a real warning to those of you who are sitting opposite. Tasmanian workers deserve better and it's time that this government started listening to them.

Ending Native Forest Logging Rally

[6.20 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin - Leader of the Greens) - Honourable Speaker, I want to give a huge shout out to all the people who attended the enormous Ending Native Forest Logging rally last weekend. It was a huge success and incredibly inspirational for the thousands of people who turned up.

It is amazing to see. This is now the third year where there's been a rally in March, not just in Tasmania, but across other states in Australia, and across other major cities. What we're seeing is, year on year, spreading numbers and increasing places where people are turning up in March to call for an end to native forest logging across this country. Nowhere is the focus and the front of activities greater than it is here in Tasmania, because we have such a huge and important part of our global heritage that we are responsible for looking after into the future. We have the tallest flowering plants, we have incredible species like the masked owl, like the swift parrot, the Tasmanian devil and the azure kingfisher. All of these beautiful animals are under threat from native forest logging in Tasmania today, so I want to thank the Bob Brown Foundation for the work they did.

Bob and some other very inspirational speakers spoke, and I want to let people understand the scale of what we're facing in Tasmania, the scale of loss of critically endangered, endangered, and threatened species, which every single day are falling as trees across Tasmania are clear-felled, logged and then burned, so that there is nothing left in that landscape. Not a single fungus can grow after Forestry Tasmania has done its job of incinerating the landscape.

That is landscape which of course has been cared for by palawa pakana in Tasmania for over 40,000 years. That country has defenders like Jim Everett Puralia Meenamatta and Ruth Langford, who have been recently arrested for defending their country. We've seen hundreds of Tasmanians who have put themselves in front of bulldozers and stood up and got arrested because they care, and they are doing it not just for themselves but for our children.

It is our children and our grandchildren. People in this Chamber may not thank the Greens for getting up and talking about this, but I can be absolutely confident in the climate crisis that

we're facing with the ecosystem collapse that we're looking at across this globe. Our children, our grandchildren, will thank every single person who has been involved in protecting our ancient forests and keeping them standing because those forests hold the carbon that will help us in our future.

Every tree, every bit of carbon that we can stop falling and going into the atmosphere is another resource that we have to try and slow down the heating of the planet. But there's so much more to do. As well as ending native forest logging, we have to transition workers into meaningful work, and there's so much that can be done in the forests of Tasmania. There's plenty of good work for generations to come, restoring those forests, protecting them, keeping them bushfire safe, and looking after the tourism assets as it is. People come to Tasmania to see our masked owls, to see our swift parrots, to see our Tasmanian devils. That's why they come here.

Those beautiful animals that live nowhere else on earth, and a whole bunch of these are critically endangered and the reason they're endangered is primarily from Forestry Tasmania's activities. This is something the Liberal government can do. They can put money back into the coffers, instead of subsidising a government business, which is appallingly degrading our landscape, killing off critically endangered species and costing us a fortune because they don't earn the money themselves. That money could go into nurses and teachers.

We stand with the Bob Brown Foundation and the Wilderness Society and their fantastic campaign of educating the consumers who buy wood from Bunnings and who buy tree ferns which are being ripped out of our forests and sold in Bunnings. We support them for educating consumers. People have a right to know that nothing that they buy that is certified PEFC from Tasmania has done anything except destroy ancient forests.

SES Groups - Need for Corflute Signs

[6.25 p.m.]

Ms BUTLER (Lyons) - Honourable Speaker, with the time for rough weather approaching, it was brought to my attention that the SES is, again, in need of corflute signs to aid temporary repairs to windows from storm damage. I would like to put the call out to all members in here, in this place and in the other place, to rummage around in your sheds, in your storerooms, in the backroom of your offices and pull out some of those old signs for a good cause. For those watching at home, if you also have all the signs that you don't need anymore, or you don't know what to do with, please contact your local SES or you can drop them to my office and we'll make arrangements for those signs to be dropped to an appropriate SES group.

The SES is nearly an all-volunteer outfit, they shouldn't have to ask for help like this and, frankly, they should be better funded. I feel the least we can do is give them some of our old signs, some of our campaign signs. It does go to show that our corflute signs don't have to just be annoying to the general public. They can actually be put to good use.

Basketball in Northern Tasmania

[6.26 p.m.]

Mr FAIRS (Bass) - Honourable Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about an exciting new era for basketball in northern Tasmania. The Northern Force is the exciting new club for northern Tasmania. I was lucky enough to attend the season launch at Spreyton Cider company on Sunday night, and what a great little place that is. It's fabulous. I could honestly say there was so much excitement and enthusiasm, and I'm sure a lot of nerves because they're taking to the court for the first time on Friday and Saturday night, which is absolutely wonderful. This new entity combines the men's north-west Thunder licence with the women's club from Launceston, the Tornados. As I said, excitement is certainly building ahead of their official debut in the NBL1 South this Friday and Saturday night.

Behind the scenes, there's obviously been a power of work going on to get this new entity up and running. I know that the Northern Force committee would sincerely like to acknowledge the support and direction from Basketball Tasmania and also the Minister for Sport, which has resulted in providing this important pathway program for all players and supporters in the greater northern region of Tasmania. It's wonderful to have pathways because it's such an exciting time for basketball in Tasmania with our WNBL club, the Jewels, coming in as well. This provides another step where our youngsters can dream to play for the Northern Force and then step up and hopefully play for our Jewels in the WNBL in years to come.

I personally know it hasn't been easy and I acknowledge the tremendous commitment and support from members of the board for their hard work in preparing for the opening rounds this weekend. President Craig Gibson, Maddie Drackler, Tim Borick, Jenny Brown, Kate Sullivan, Jay Cowan and Debbie Pulford, thank you so much. They have worked tirelessly to get this club up and running. Also a huge shout out to all the dedicated volunteers because without volunteers, nothing happens and they've donated so much time to help make the NBL1 South program viable and accessible for basketballers in our region.

The Northern Force will play a double header across northern Tasmania. The club's first game, official first game, will be against Frankston at the Ulverstone Sports Centre this Friday night, 27 March, followed by a game, too, against Nunawading, at the Elphin Sports Centre on Saturday the 28th. Tip off for the women's matches will be at 6.30 on both Friday and Saturday night. The men will be starting at around 8.30 p.m. each night, so that's when tip off will get underway for the respective teams.

I congratulate and wish Zoe Mesman and all her players, and Jayden Smith and all his players, for the upcoming NBL1 South competition. There's going to be teething problems. It's a brand new entity, but I know the enthusiasm and the passion that Tasmanians always display, especially when they're playing their respective sports, tends to come out - doesn't it? White line fever, no matter what they play. It's going to be very exciting. I wouldn't want to be Frankston or Nunawading for any amount of money come this Friday and Saturday night. I encourage everyone across northern Tasmania to get courtside, Ulverstone Friday night, and Launceston Elfin Sports Centre on Saturday night to show their support for the new club with Northern Force. Can I wrap it up by saying 'go get them'.

The Tasmanian National Trust

[6.30 p.m.]

Prof RAZAY (Bass) - It's a privilege to stand before you today to acknowledge and celebrate the remarkable work of the Tasmanian National Trust.

Across our community, history is not simply something we read in books. It lives in our landscapes, our buildings, our tradition and in the stories that shape who we are. The National Trust in Tasmania plays an essential role in ensuring that these stories are not lost to time managing and protecting 11 key heritage sites across the state. Beyond maintaining buildings and landscapes, it preserves something far more important: the identity and memory of Tasmania itself.

At a recent garden party at Franklin House, a stately Georgian residence that sits proudly in the Launceston suburb of Youngtown, I had the pleasure of meeting the trust's CEO, Jen Fry, along with several of the volunteers who care for the historic site. This picture is sitting, and chatting under a shady 180-year-old oak tree and I was struck by how lucky we are to have this connection to the past.

Preserving our heritage is not easy. It requires dedication, expertise and deep respect for the generations who came before us. This is the mission that the National Trust of Tasmania has embraced for decades. The small and dedicated trust team, which operate with an equivalent of six full-time staff, is powered by a passionate band of 150 active volunteers. It's a collective effort. The dedication of these volunteers, many of whom contribute countless hours of their time is inspiring. These individuals serve as caretakers of history, ensuring that these important sites are maintained, visitors are welcomed and stories are shared.

The trust is Tasmania's largest community based not-for-profit heritage organisation. It depends on the state government's annual operating grant of around \$312,000 and simply could not exist without the energy and commitment of its volunteers. The trust made a submission to the most recent federal inquiry into arts and cultural philanthropy asking to have its volunteers' hours acknowledged, which equates to about \$1 million annually.

This successful partnership has been officially recognised with the Hobart Convict Penitentiary, named the number one top attraction in Australia and the South Pacific in the 2025 Tripadvisor Travellers' Choice Best of the Best award. This award places the site in the top 1 per cent of experiences globally for its historic depths and storytelling. It's a remarkable achievement. The penitentiary also won the prestigious Cultural Tourism award at the 2024 Tasmania Tourism Award, recognising its outstanding contribution to heritage and visitor experience.

While the trust's passion lies with the past, it is using innovative ways to deliver its message of preservation to modern audiences, ensuring that the importance of heritage conservation remains relevant and present. The success of its recent social media campaign, Touchstone Heritage, is a testament to this. The CEO, Jen Fry, says the trust must remain forward thinking. It's this forward thinking that will see a self-guided, accessible version of the Unshackled tour at the Hobart Penitentiary launched in April. With a guided tour, often sold out, this means more people will get the chance to experience this award-winning offering.

The trust also operates several heritage conservation appeals to raise funds for restoration and maintenance of significant community owned heritage sites, offering tax deductible status for donation. Recent projects under this umbrella include restoration work at the 1840 built Launceston Synagogue, Australia's second oldest synagogue, and a rare example of Egyptian revival architecture in Australia. The trust has also been assisting with works at the Nile Chapel at Deddington, which is historically significant as the burial place of renowned painter, John Glover.

At the moment the trust is preparing for the 2026 Australian Heritage Festival, which will run over April and May and will feature an array of events across the state with highlights including the Ladies of the House clothing exhibition at Clarendon House. The festival theme of change will explore how history shaped us and how we shape history.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of the National Trust of Tasmania is the way it encourages all to think about relationships with heritage. Heritage is not only about the past, it's about the choices we make today and the legacy we leave for future generations. Heritage is not just something we inherit.

Time expired.

Devonport Motor Show

[6.35 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon) - It began with an idea and a swap meet. The late Ian Murcott's vision of a simple gathering for enthusiasts gave the Rotary Club of Devonport North something to build on and build they did. The first show in 2007 was modest. Around 60 vehicles turned up, with hot rods, restored classics and spare parts spread around Roundhouse Park. Ian, a passionate hot rodder and sprint car racer, built his own rod, which his wife, Cindy, still drives today.

None could have imagined what that first day would grow into. By 2009, the committee was visiting events around Tasmania and interstate, borrowing ideas and raising the bar. Numbers climbed from 270 vehicles in 2010 to 360 in 2011 and the event took on a new name, the Devonport Motor Show.

Long-serving Rotarian Mac Russell sketched the now familiar silhouette of his Morgan sports car for the new logo. Mac, who passed away in 2023, left a mark that remains on the trophy bearing his name.

The years brought dino runs, feature marks, rare concept cars and venue changes as the event outgrew its early footprint. When the show moved to Aikenhead Point in 2022, Rotary volunteers spent weeks watering the reserve by hand to turn dry summer grass into show-ready lawn. Through storms, cancellations and even a pandemic, the event adapted and returned.

Across 20 years, more than 8000 vehicles have rolled through the gates. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been raised for local, national and international causes, and around 80 volunteers are behind the scenes each year, backed by loyal sponsors who have supported it from the beginning.

Today, the Devonport foreshore hums, engines start, bonnets lift, cameras come out, conversations spark and people linger. Twenty years on, the story of the Devonport Motor Show continues.

These words are from the official program of the 20th anniversary Devonport Motor Show, a celebration of chrome, craftsmanship and community spirit, two decades in the making, which is now itself a collector's item. The 20th Devonport Motor Show was held last Sunday. It attracted a record 750 exhibitors and thousands of enthusiasts, as well as ordinary people who just came along to enjoy the spectacle.

After 20 years of growth and many thousands of volunteers hours, it was the last show that will be run by the Rotary Club of Devonport North. As a car person who has been to nearly every Devonport Motor show from its beginning and who has exhibited my own cars at more than half of them, I want to record my thanks and deep appreciation to the Rotary Club of Devonport North organising committee Rod Owers, Leon Peck, the late Mac Russell, Leigh Titmus and around 40 other Rotarians who have served in various roles on the committee since 2006, and the 80 or so volunteers who have helped them deliver the show each year for 20 years.

As a member of both the north-west community and the car community, I also thank them for the time and effort that they've put in, their thousands of hours of service, but also what this has turned into for our communities: hundreds of thousands of dollars invested into worthwhile community causes through Rotary and, on the other hand, support for a whole ecosystem of businesses and skills, networks that barter and trade in cars and parts, and knowledge and skills, many of which are not taught anymore outside of this special community.

Also, the shows attract an incredible diversity of vehicles and owners, from the sublime to the ridiculous, from the concours purist to the hot rod artist to the humble tinkerer with an affordable classic, like my good self, and everything in between. There's room for everyone, we're all different, but we all have something in common, something to share, and we look forward to the Devonport Motor Show every year to give us the opportunity to do just that. Over the past two decades, more than 100 businesses and organisations have contributed. The organisers particularly want to thank the following:

- SeaRoad, the major sponsor since 2018;
- Chas Kelly Transport;
- D-Signs;
- Gowans Toyota;
- Supercheap Auto;
- TT-Line;
- Knight Frank;
- Devonport City Council;
- Ian Macleod Photography; and
- The Island Creative

It was also supported by the Tasmanian government through Events Tasmania, and there was a whisper at the show on the weekend that there's another community organisation that is considering taking on the Devonport Motor Show. They will have lots of supporters and we will keep the date free for this time next year.

The House adjourned at 6.40 p.m.