



PREMIER OF TASMANIA

9 June, 2026

Hon Rosemary Armitage MLC
Chair
Legislative Council Committee B
Email: Julie.thompson@parliament.tas.gov.au

Dear Ms Armitage

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2026

DIVISION 10 – DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

Please find attached the following responses to questions raised in the examination of the Premier portfolio. I note there are still a couple of answers outstanding, and I will endeavour to have these to the Committee by the close of business tomorrow.

Q2. Please advise the timelines for the provision of the Northern Health Complex to be built at the Launceston General Hospital given the announcement in 2025 noted it would commence construction by 2028. (RA)

The construction of the Northern Health complex will commence following the completion of the new dedicated Northern Mental Health Precinct at Frankland Street, which is expected in 2028.

Q4. In the 2024-25 financial year, how many invoices for Ms Ogilvie's legal cost were approved by Cabinet? (MW)

Once indemnity has been approved by Cabinet, the Cabinet Secretary approves the invoices in line with any conditions.

Q5. What functions do you expect the Independent Complaints Commissioner to perform? Do you know how much was initially requested to fill that position? What is the expected timeline of the outcome to be achieved with these funds? (CH)

The Resolutions of Parliament require the Commissioners to manage the complaints made against Members and they will need to assess, triage, investigate, conciliate and otherwise deal with complaints, including record keeping, case management and reporting requirements. The initial appointees may also be required to assist in developing the framework for this work to occur.

There is funding of \$50,000 in all four years of the Budget to fund this work and the Government will continue to work with the Workplace Oversight Committee and the Presiding Officers to see the framework implemented as soon as possible.

Output Group 1 – Policy Reform and Government Priorities

Output 1.1 – Strategic Policy and Government Priorities

Q1. With reference to a media release from the Treasurer on 11 March 2025, entitled “Taking Tasmanian regulation and barriers to task”:

- **The claim is that Tasmania has “the highest number of legislative restrictions per capita in Australia” at 74 per 1,000 people.**
 - **What is the exact methodology behind this figure?**

The figure was sourced from the Institute of Public Affairs’ 2019 report, *The Growth of Regulation in Australia*.

- **Which independent source produced it, and how does it account for the quality or impact of regulations rather than just raw count?**

Further information in relation to methodological approach may be sourced from the Report directly, as well as Institute of Public Affairs and the Mercatus Center/QuantGov at George Mason University.

The Tasmanian Government recognises that a raw count of legislative restrictions, as indicated, is a high-level indicator and accordingly must not necessarily be treated as a standalone measure of regulatory performance.

- **How will success be measured? Will there be a public dashboard tracking the number of repeals, the estimated compliance cost savings, and actual improvements in business investment, employment, or productivity over time?**

On the basis that raw count may not necessarily be commensurate with quality or impact, success will not be determined on raw count.

Accordingly, no public dashboard will be developed at this time, measuring pre-determined metrics. The Government will consider appropriate ways to report on progress.

- **Has the government conducted a regulatory burden audit with independent cost-benefit analysis? If so, what were the key findings on the economic drag of the targeted 40+ Acts and regulations?**

The Government has commissioned an independent audit of State and local government licences, permits and approvals as part of its broader red tape reduction agenda. It is a high-level audit designed to identify potential areas for regulatory reform and streamline approval processes, rather than a cost-benefit analysis of a specific list of Acts and regulations. That Audit was not conducted specifically for the purposes of the approximately 40 Acts and Regulations previously identified.

The Acts and Regulations that were identified were based on a preliminary assessment of the Office of Parliamentary Counsel.

- **Can the government publish the full preliminary list of the 40+ Acts and regulations targeted for repeal or amendment, along with the specific reasons for each?**

The list was prepared with the assistance of the Office of Parliamentary Counsel. It remains preliminary, and was prepared on the basis to inform further consideration by Government.

The Government will consider the release of the information at an appropriate time and once relevant decisions have been made.

- **How will the government handle regulations that appear obsolete but still serve niche protective functions (e.g., old environmental or heritage rules)? (RA)**

This initiative is not directed at removing protections that continue to serve a legitimate regulatory purpose.

The purpose of the review is to identify regulations that are genuinely unnecessary or outdated. If regulations are not obsolete, it is unlikely their removal would satisfy this criterion.

Q2. What whole-of-government work is being undertaken to identify and monitor hate groups in Tasmania? Are there any groups or individuals currently on a watch-list? (Not seeking personal identification details of individuals) (MW) Are there any guidelines established to ensure government agencies or representatives are not unwittingly liaising or entering into government contracts with potential hate groups, individuals or those associated closely with them? (MW)

The Tasmanian Government is part of a national approach to countering terrorist and hate groups. Our approach is aligned to national frameworks that have been developed through groups such as the Australia-New Zealand Counter-Terrorism Committee and the First Secretaries' Group, under the direction of National Cabinet. Senior officers in my department, as well as representatives of Tasmania Police, the Department of Justice and other relevant agencies participate in interjurisdictional groups to share information and coordinate a national policy response.

The *Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth)* established mechanisms for listing three types of terrorist and hate groups:

- Terrorist organisations
- State sponsors of terrorism
- Prohibited hate groups

Currently listed groups are available on the Australian Government National Security website. There are two currently listed prohibited hate groups: Hizb ut-Tahrir and White Australia.

The mechanisms for listing state sponsors of terrorism and prohibited hate groups were introduced by the Australian Government in late 2025 and early 2026. This was done with the support of states and territories, including Tasmania, in response to the antisemitic activities of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps in Australia and increased threats from hate groups. Listing decisions are made by the Australian Federal Police Minister based on intelligence advice. States and territories are generally consulted or informed about listings.

I am unable to provide specific information which may prejudice or compromise ongoing Tasmania Police investigative activity, either in Tasmania or elsewhere.

The Tasmanian Government is implementing Tasmania's Protective Security Policy Framework (TAS-PSPF), which is designed to achieve a coordinated, risk-based approach to managing the broad range of security risks that affect government. This includes:

- Obligations to systematically report and investigate security breaches and incidents, to help identify and address incidental or unintentional security risks
- Consistent minimum requirements for managing information, including restrictions on the use and distribution of valuable information beyond government
- Guidance for managing people with access to government resources, including the use of security clearances or other certifications/checks where appropriate

The TAS-PSPF recognises that good security practice, pursued across all security domains, is the best way to build resilience in a security environment where it may not be possible to foresee every specific threat.

Output Group 2 - Government System Support Output 2.2 – Principal and Subordinate Legislation

Q.1 Budget Paper No. 4, pg 77 notes the following performance indicator.: *Proportion of key clients that are satisfied that the legislation drafted for the client meets the relevant, and implementable, policy intentions in a legally effective manner.* This is trending well. Please provide detail as to how this is measured. (CH)

At the end of each financial year, the Office of Parliamentary Counsel releases an annual Stakeholder Survey to Government members and government departments, and other entities such as Marine and Safety Tasmania, who have regularly engaged with its services over the preceding 12-month period. This survey captures performance information that is used to enhance and improve service delivery.

From 2026 onwards, the Office of Parliamentary Counsel will extend an invitation all Members of Parliament who have engaged with their services to provide feedback through a targeted stakeholder survey.

DIVISION 7 – MINISTERIAL AND PARLIAMENTARY SUPPORT

Output Group 1 – Support for Members of Parliament

Output 1.1 – Support for Ministers and certain Parliamentary Office Holders

Q1. Provide a detailed breakdown to account for the difference in 2025-26 Budget and 2025-26 Estimated Outcome, including a breakdown by position for any employment separations as part of that increase. (MW)

There are two primary and inter-related reasons for the increase in expenditure for MPS – including the expansion of the House of Assembly to 35 members, the appointment of two new Ministers, and the operational and staffing impacts arising from, and following, the two elections in 2024 and 2025.

The following table provides a detailed breakdown of the additional MPS employment costs forming part of the 2025-26 Estimated Outcome:

Details	Total Amount
Funding to meet salaries and salary on-costs for two new ministerial offices, staffing and operational costs for 10 new Members of Parliament and additional funding for Labor and the Greens	\$5,000,000
Funding for MPS employment separation costs including leave entitlements and termination payments – across Government, Labor, Greens and Independents – outlined by positions below.	\$938,860
Additional electorate office fit out and leasing costs as part of the increase to a 35-seat parliament	\$1,900,000
Additional supplies, consumables and expenditure	\$387,140

The following table provides a detailed breakdown of the MPS employment separation costs forming part of the 2025-26 Estimated Outcome:

Position Title	Total Amount
Adviser	\$93,439
Chief of Staff	\$144,241
Community Organiser	\$4,957
Director Communications	\$5,743
Director Digital	\$3,237
Driver	\$46,506
Electorate Officer	\$236,368
Executive Officer	\$91,211
Media Adviser	\$47,058
Office Manager	\$19,224
Policy Adviser	\$2,509
Principal Adviser	\$41,150
Senior Adviser	\$157,436
Senior Media Adviser	\$2,338
Senior Political Adviser	\$43,443
	\$938,860

Output 1.2 – Support for Members of the House of Assembly

Q1. What is the total number of staff allocated to all members of parliament in each area of parliament ie. Minor parties and micro parties, independents, including members of the legislative council and what is the total number of staff they are entitled to? (CH)

House of Assembly – Electorate Office Staffing @ 31 March, 2026

Liberal	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Eric Abetz, MP	1.0	1.0
Bridget Archer, MP	1.0	1.0
Guy Barnett, MP	1.0	1.0
Felix Ellis, MP	1.5	2.0
Rob Fairs, MP	1.0	1.0
Michael Ferguson, MP	1.6	2.0
Jane Howlett, MP	1.0	1.0
Roger Jaensch, MP	1.0	1.0
Gavin Pearce, MP	1.0	1.0
Jacquie Petrusma, MP (1 FTE Mat Leave)	2.3	3.0
Mark Shelton, MP	1.4	2.0
Marcus Vermey, MP	1.6	2.0
Totals	15.4	18.0

Labor	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Shane Broad, MP	1.5	2.0
Meg Brown, MP	1.0	1.0
Jen Butler, MP	1.5	2.0
Anita Dow, MP	1.5	2.0
Janie Finlay, MP	1.3	2.0
Jess Greene, MP	2.2	3.0
Ella Haddad, MP	1.4	2.0
Brian Mitchell, MP	0.6	1.0
The Honourable Josh Willie, MP	1.5	2.0
Dean Winter, MP	1.5	2.0
Totals	14.0	19.0

Tas Greens	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Tabatha Badger, MP	1.0	1.0
Vica Bayley, MP	1.6	2.0
Cecily Rosol, MP	1.6	2.0
Rosalie Woodruff, MP	1.6	2.0
Totals	5.8	7.0

Shooters, Fishers and Farmers	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Carlo Di Falco, MP	2.4	3.0

Independent	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Helen Burnet, MP	2.6	3.0

Independent	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Craig Garland, MP	1.5	2.0

Independent	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Peter George, MP	2.4	3.0

Independent	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
Kristie Johnston, MP	2.0	2.0

Independent	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
David O'Byrne, MP	2.6	3.0

Independent	Paid FTEs	Paid H/C
George Razay, MP	0.8	1.0

FTE - Full-Time Equivalent paid

HC - Head Count paid

The Labor Opposition, Tasmanian Greens and Independent Members of the House of Assembly are allocated an overall office budget that includes funding for employee salaries. This allocation is provided as a total budget rather than as a specific full-time equivalent (FTE) or headcount entitlement, with MPs able to allocate funding at their own discretion.

In relation to Legislative Council Electorate Office funding, the Government provides funding for 1.5 FTEs per member, which includes one full-time Band 4 employee, and a further additional recent allocation of \$50,000 per member to spend on electorate office staffing at their individual discretion – bringing the total funding allocation to 1.5 FTE electorate officers per Member.

Yours sincerely



Jeremy Rockliff MP
Premier



TASMANIA
PREMIER OF TASMANIA

10 June, 2026

Hon Rosemary Armitage MLC
Chair
Legislative Council Committee B
Email: Julie.thompson@parliament.tas.gov.au

Dear Ms Armitage

I write further to my letter dated 9 June 2026 providing answers to Question on Notice during Budget Estimates.

Please find a further response below, noting that there are still two outstanding responses which we will endeavour to get to the Committee as soon as possible.

DIVISION 7 – MINISTERIAL AND PARLIAMENTARY SUPPORT

Output 1.2 – Support for Members of the House of Assembly

Q2. Regarding Budget Paper No. 3, page 5 — travelling allowance and committee fees do not escalate over the Forward Estimates. Can you please explain why?

Travelling allowances and committee fees are Reserved by Law and are provided for under the Parliamentary Salaries, Superannuation and Allowances Act 2012.

The relevant allowances are determined in accordance with the statutory framework, including determinations made by the Tasmanian Industrial Commission.

For Budget purposes, the relevant figures are entered into the relevant budget information management systems by the House of Assembly. As these allowances are determined under the statutory framework, rather than through the ordinary agency appropriation process, and are generally fixed by the relevant determinations, they have not been escalated over the Forward Estimates in Budget Paper No. 3.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jeremy Rockliff".

Jeremy Rockliff MP
Premier