



**PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA**

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**REPORT OF DEBATES**

**Tuesday 21 September 2021**

**REVISED EDITION**



# Contents

<b>PETITION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
MT WELLINGTON CABLE CAR PROJECT .....	1
<b>LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
MEMBER FOR PEMBROKE .....	1
<b>SPECIAL INTEREST MATTERS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
PARADISE GORGE CLOSURE - SUPPORT FOR SMALL BUSINESS.....	1
<b>RECOGNITION OF VISITORS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
PRINT RADIO TASMANIA .....	2
LAUNCESTON HAZARA AFGHAN COMMUNITY .....	4
THE UNCONFORMITY FESTIVAL .....	6
RECOGNITION OF NURSE, PARAMEDIC AND MIDWIFE PRACTITIONERS .....	8
<b>GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT (ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES) BILL 2021 (NO. 14) .....</b>	<b>10</b>
CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS MADE IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL.....	10
<b>FOOD AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (NO. 27).....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>THIRD READING .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 1) 2021 (NO. 36).....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2) 2021 (NO. 37).....</b>	<b>11</b>
PERMISSIVE INSTRUCTION .....	11
<b>APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 1) 2021 (NO. 36).....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SECOND READING.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 1) 2021 (NO. 36).....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>IN COMMITTEE.....</b>	<b>12</b>
SCHEDULE 1 .....	13
DIVISION 1 - BRAND TASMANIA .....	13
DIVISION 2.....	13
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITIES TASMANIA.....	13
MINISTER FOR SPORT AND RECREATION .....	13
OUTPUT GROUP 4 - DISABILITY SERVICES AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.....	13
OUTPUT 4.7 SPORT AND RECREATION .....	13
<b>QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>32</b>
STAFFING REQUIREMENTS FOR SALE OF CROWN LAND.....	32
TASMANIAN SCHOOLS - INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITY LIST.....	33
ICU VENTILATORS .....	33
COVID-19 - VACCINATION CLINICS FOR YEARS 11 AND 12 STUDENTS.....	34
TASMANIAN SCHOOLS - SURVEY OF PE TEACHERS.....	35
TAXI LICENCES AND UBERS .....	36
TASMANIA POLICE - LEAVE LIABILITY.....	37
<b>APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 1) 2021 (NO. 36).....</b>	<b>37</b>
IN COMMITTEE .....	37

<b>APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2) 2021 (NO. 37) .....</b>	<b>71</b>
SECOND READING .....	71
<b>ADJOURNMENT.....</b>	<b>74</b>
APPENDIX 1 .....	76
APPENDIX 2 .....	77
APPENDIX 3 .....	79
APPENDIX 4 .....	81
APPENDIX 5 .....	82

**Tuesday 21 September 2021**

The President, **Mr Farrell**, took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., acknowledged the Traditional People and read Prayers.

## **PETITION**

### **Mt Wellington Cable Car Project**

**Ms Forrest** (by leave) presented an e-petition signed by 3506 citizens of Tasmania requesting the House, as a case study, to consider an inquiry be held into dealings on the cable car over the past decade, to provide the Tasmanian community with reassurance that the Hobart City Council has been acting responsibly, ethically and legally with all its dealings with the cable car proponent and in its responsibilities to the broader community as a planning authority.

**Petition received.**

## **LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

### **Member for Pembroke**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - Mr President, I move -

That the member for Pembroke, Ms Siejka, be granted leave of absence from the service of the Council for this day's sitting.

**Motion agreed to.**

## **SPECIAL INTEREST MATTERS**

### **Paradise Gorge Closure - Support for Small Business**

[11.07 a.m.]

**Ms HOWLETT** (Prosser - Minister for Small Business) - Mr President, on Saturday 29 May the Tasman Highway at Paradise Gorge was closed in order for unstable rocks on the adjacent cliff to be safely removed before they could pose any danger to the public. The announcement of the closure immediately sparked concern in the east coast community, particularly among local business owners.

Both before and during the road closure, I was on the ground in the communities of Triabunna, Buckland and Orford to engage in conversations regarding concerns expressed by the small business community. In recognition of these conversations and the hardships that some businesses endured due to the road closure, the Government very quickly announced a \$1 million support package to assist affected businesses. The Business Hardship Critical Support Grant program opened. The aim of the program was to provide grants to all eligible impacted businesses located south of the Lake Leake Highway, along the Tasman Highway to Buckland including, Buckland, Orford, Triabunna, Little Swanport and Swansea.

Those businesses that could demonstrate that they were part of the supply chain through the delivery of essential goods and services in and out of the impacted area were also eligible. Grants of between \$2500 and \$25 000 were made available and 78 businesses registered with Business Tasmania with most reporting a decrease in turnover due to low visitor numbers. The grants closed on 23 June and 60 applications were received with an independent assessment panel confirming 57 as eligible. All 57 businesses were paid their grants totalling more than \$600 000. A total of 33 of the businesses that were eligible for a grant indicated that they had employees. Those businesses that had continued to employ their staff during the road closure were eligible for further funding. Applications for this element of the program closed on 6 August and 31 submitted applications for the second phase of funding. The amount of additional funding dispersed was \$55 840.

As the Minister for Small Business I was pleased that we were able to assist so many businesses, so quickly, by getting funds out the door as quickly as possible. I sincerely thank all of those small businesses who communicated with me and have been engaging with my office and my staff since. On Sunday 22 August, Business Tasmania hosted a community event in Orford to celebrate the reopening of the Tasman Highway at Paradise Gorge, with more than 350 people in attendance. It was a fantastic afternoon and a great way to mark the end of a turbulent and difficult six weeks for east coast residents.

A big thank you to the east coast community for your patience during the road works, and thank you to all the contractors, suppliers and stakeholders involved in the rock removal project.

---

### **Recognition of Visitors**

**Mr PRESIDENT** - Honourable members, I welcome to the Reserve members, volunteers and staff of Print Radio Tasmania. We will be hearing about the wonderful work this group of people does in the community with their radio station, as well as their hopes and aspirations, and some of the hurdles they face. I know that members enjoyed meeting them this morning.

On behalf of every member here, I thank them for the great work they do for our community.

**Members** - Hear, hear.

---

### **Print Radio Tasmania**

[11.11 a.m.]

**Dr SEIDEL** (Huon) - Sometimes, but not often enough, we members of parliament highlight what makes Tasmania so unique. It is not just the historic buildings or our world-class events and tourist destinations that need to be experienced and, more importantly nowadays, instagrammed. It is and always will be the Tasmanian people. We Tasmanians don't take ourselves too seriously, even in this House; but we are quirky, dedicated and we care about each other.

Some Tasmanians do much more. Some work very hard yet quietly, often behind the scenes, to make a difference to community members who are vulnerable, and are not as able as many of us to navigate through the complex maze of going about our daily lives. Increasingly in these digital times, living means being connected and being informed; but with so much information and misinformation at our fingertips, to be in the know means having that information put into context. News is more than just recounting a series of events, it is a story of who we are as people, as a community and a state.

For many years I have started my day by reading the local newspaper. Why? Because I like to be in the know. I like to acquire knowledge through curated information presented contextually through an editorial lens, the filter for what matters to my community. Like so many other Tasmanians I struggle with vision, and I need a larger font just to be able to read the newspaper I have long relied on.

It is almost ironic that as the news becomes more readily available digitally, more and more people are finding it difficult to access these new sources. It becomes a genuine barrier. Most digital newspaper editions do not cater for readers who struggle to, or simply cannot, read. Yet almost fifty per cent of all Tasmanians are print disabled. People who suffer from the print disability include Tasmanians who are blind or vision impaired and are unable to read newspapers or magazines. It includes people like me, who find it quite difficult to read smaller print for longer periods of time. Some Tasmanians who suffer from arthritis or other painful chronic and disabling conditions may not even be able to turn a page or hold a book or hold a magazine. They really may not be able to turn a single page without great difficulty.

Many Tasmanians have poor literacy skills, yet they also need to be kept up to date with reliable and current information and the latest investigative journalism.

This is increasingly important for Tasmanians who understand English as their second or third language, but cannot read it easily.

The obvious solution is for a newspaper to be read out loud, taking the editorial content from print to the airwaves. In an ever-changing world with increasing demand for up-to-date information and knowledge, putting print to radio on a daily basis provides a solution for many Tasmanians who, for whatever reason, have difficulty accessing print. For them, and indeed for us, almost half the community, Print Radio Tasmania is an essential and indispensable service.

Print Radio Tasmania is a not-for-profit volunteer-driven community organisation which has been providing radio reading and information services to Tasmanians with a print disability for almost 40 years.

It is a fabulous team and I am so pleased that many of them were able to visit Parliament House today for this small public recognition of their great community service. A warm welcome to Elizabeth Macdonald - President; Neil Broomfield - Vice President; and the great team consisting of Steve Bailey, Nigel Green, Anne Keller, Graeme Kennedy and Mark Toccock.

The radio station is based in Davey Street here in Hobart and I was pleased to visit the studio a few weeks ago. It is an unassuming, yet busy and vibrant place and oozes community

dedication. The service is on air 24/7 on Hobart 864 AM; DAB+, Launceston 106.9 FM; and Devonport 96.1 FM.

The broadcast offers more than 90 different segments. For many listeners, the highlights are the daily reading of Tasmania's major papers, the *Mercury*, the *Examiner* and the *Advocate*. I also enjoy the weekly reading of *Tasmanian Country*.

You do not find Print Radio Tasmania in any media rankings. They are not in competition with commercial radio or the ABC. However, they make the diversity of our print media and journalism more accessible to all Tasmanians. It matters. It is appreciated by so many in my community in the Huon electorate as well as the wider Tasmanian community.

I often ask people what they are listening to when I hear radio in the background, and members would be surprised how often the answer is 'Print Radio - I've been listening to them for many years'.

But in spite of their vast reach, Print Radio Tasmania operates on a shoestring budget and relies almost exclusively on their wonderful team of over 80 volunteers. In the past, funding support has been provided by a mix of state and federal grants. Successive Tasmanian governments have understood the importance of Print Radio and provided financial support since its inception in June 1982. However, all funding was abruptly discontinued in June 2019, with the introduction of the NDIS.

The state government's rationale for discontinuing the funding was that the NDIS would take over the state's funding role in the future. But this has not happened. Why? The NDIS does not provide funding for organisations which do not provide one-to-one personal support for people with disabilities, irrespective of the benefit a charity such as Print Radio brings to a community.

It is hard for me to understand why, after almost 40 years of collaboration and genuine support by successive Tasmanian governments, the state government has seemingly abandoned a large proportion of the Tasmanian community who live each day with a print disability. It is hard for me to understand why that decision has not been reversed, considering the exceptional circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic which has underlined the crucial need for everyone to have access to current, factual journalism.

Bridging the funding gap through donations from the private sector and bequests has helped enormously so far, but clearly this is not sustainable. There is a role for the Government to again step up and to continue the collaboration and support that has been generally bipartisan for so many decades.

Mr President, let us do it as it will be very newsworthy in print and on radio.

### **Launceston Hazara Afghan Community**

[11.20 a.m.]

**Ms ARMITAGE** (Launceston) - Mr President, today I speak about the incredible Hazara community in Launceston and the vibrant, wonderful people who are part of it. I wrote an opinion editorial about this issue for *The Examiner* recently and the importance of it bears



repeating in this place. We have all been touched in the past weeks and months by the tragedies that have unfolded in Afghanistan.

Following the withdrawal of American military forces, the Taliban swiftly took over in a matter of weeks, undoing many of the social and political advances that had been made in the past two decades. Very few of us were not touched by images of families attempting to flee from Hamid Karzai Airport, crammed into or clinging to aeroplanes, and Afghans handing their children to any soldiers who could take them. Heartbreaking does not begin to describe the desperation these people must be feeling.

Going back decades, one of the most oppressed groups in Afghanistan are the Hazaras, who hail from Hazarajat in the mountainous region of central Afghanistan. The Hazaras comprise the third-largest ethnic group in Afghanistan, with an estimated nine million Hazara out of the approximately 33 million-strong population of the country. Since 2001, a significant number of Hazara Afghans now call Launceston home.

Over 50 families granted humanitarian visas live, work and go to school here. This wonderful, vibrant and close-knit community has obviously been significantly affected by the developments in Afghanistan. The rights many of us here take for granted, the freedom to assemble, to free speech, to education, health care and justice are now not available to many Afghans, Hazaras in particular.

The President of Launceston's Hazara Association, Yousef Mohammadi, has a grandmother in Afghanistan in an area under Taliban control. Yousef's family, who fled Afghanistan when he and his brother Yasin were very young, know what life is like under Taliban rule. People's hands were cut off in the street as a form of cruel, retributive justice, often for crimes committed as acts of desperation and caused to begin with by the inhumane policies of the Taliban.

Yousef and Yasin's family made their way through Afghanistan and Pakistan to eventually receive some semblance of safety in Iran. Eventually, the family was resettled to Tasmania through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees resettlement program and were able to experience a life of safety and security for the first time. To learn English, go to school and do normal teenage things like joining a soccer team became a reality.

Whilst extraordinary stories like these are not uncommon amongst the Hazara community in Launceston, there are people like Hosein Mohseni, who has family who remain in Taliban-controlled Afghanistan and believes any time he talks to a family member at home it could be the last time. Unreliable communications infrastructure combined with the types of uncertainty and cruelty that characterise Taliban rule causes a great deal of distress for Hosein and many other members of the Hazara community in Launceston.

Seeing how the Hazara community in Launceston has grown over the past few years has been inspiring, with an active Facebook page, community events held in the city and a Hazara market in Elizabeth Street which provides a little taste of home. In early September, I joined with the Hazara community, my local, state and federal colleagues and other Launcestonians to stand in solidarity and show support to those who are suffering and in need of support in Afghanistan. To see the effect of Taliban policies on those suffering has been absolutely heartbreaking.

For the Hazara families who now call Launceston home, each one has a story. Each family still has ties to Afghanistan and are connected through their shared beliefs, customs, adversities and triumphs. We are very lucky to have them as part of our community and we are made stronger and richer for them being here with us. I am sure I stand with everyone in the community who support Hazara Afghans and along with my local, state and federal counterparts commit to doing whatever I can to welcome them and alleviate their suffering here and at home.

## **The Unconformity Festival**

[11.25 a.m.]

**Ms FORREST** (Murchison) - Mr President, we are back:

We're back. Not that we really went away.

Like a radiant moon that wins over dark clouds on a bleak night, The Unconformity festival is shining again after three long years.

But we are constantly in orbit; waiting, creating, challenging.

Mr President, you are most likely aware, having been to previous festivals, The Unconformity festival is an event not to be missed and it is on again after a COVID-19-related delay last year.

The Unconformity is an arts-based organisation that delivers more than a biennial festival. The Unconformity is a platform for arts-led cultural development on the west coast, including the production of artistic, tourism and educational projects in partnership with the community beyond the biennial festival. In the interests of full disclosure, I am lucky to be a board member of this amazing organisation led by Chair, Rick Snell and experienced board members, including members of the local community.

Our creative team, led by Travis Tiddy and Kate Harrison, have done an incredible job pulling together this year's festival with all the challenges COVID-19 has presented us. As the program documents note and I quote from the website:

So much has changed since our last meeting.

We gather again in times that are more volatile, more uncertain and more unpredictable. And we're not talking about the West Coast weather.

Oh the irony. Our place of wild isolation and of unrelenting and unforgiving terrain is now regarded as one of the safest places on earth.

Where else would you rather be?

Like a majestic full moon, let The Unconformity lead you back. Let us be your beacon in these extraordinary times; where we shall prospect together again in a place that revels in its uncertainty: where nonconformity is its very fabric.

Change is afoot here too, others are discovering our secret.

The mighty mountains are becoming playgrounds of a different kind, piquing the curiosity of newcomers seeking new forms of adrenaline-fuelled adventure.

Let them come; let them discover us too.

So lift your gaze from our unstable earth to our unbounded future and let us provoke, perplex and inspire you.

Welcome back.

I hope that inspires all. The festival is coming up very soon, on 15 to 17 October, and there are events for everyone. Sadly, some events are already fully booked but you can go on a waiting list and there are many other free events with bookings open for them now.

Visitors can also enjoy all the other aspects the west coast has to offer and make a full weekend of it. I and all those involved in The Unconformity note and appreciate the ongoing and increased support from the Government. I note the comments in the program from the Premier and the Minister for Hospitality and Events, Ms Courtney, and the Minister for the Arts, Ms Archer, who noted:

After responding magnificently to recent challenges, Tasmanians continue to demonstrate their thirst for extraordinary experiences and activities that set our state apart.

... The Unconformity is an outstanding example; bringing together the amazing landscapes of our West Coast region with the stories of the people who have carved out their lives and imprint their own character on this culturally rich and historic part of lutruwita/Tasmania.

The arts and engagement in all forms of the arts is so important to our health and wellbeing. This is even more the case at this time with COVID-19 which has certainly forced The Unconformity to think differently and to plan an event that can overcome these challenges.

You will see from the program the team is up for the challenge and if you need a bit of quiet time you can sit on the train at the reading stations, something I think you would really enjoy. The program is available online and as I said, bookings are open. From the Welcome to Country to Crib Road, for amazing food and drink options in the heart of town to the live music, theatre, dance, visual, sound, sculpture and all other forms of art and culture, including immersive performances, The Unconformity has it all.

The opening world premier event this year is Colosseum, described in the program as:

Much like Rome's ancient stage for vast public spectacles, Queenstown itself, sitting within a valley ringed by hills and mountains, can be seen as a colosseum where dramas are played out. With the people of the West Coast at its centre, Colosseum will celebrate their uniqueness with an image and sound installation.

... exploring the relationship between industry, landscape and people, bringing to the fore the voices of everyday people who, with grit and determination, live in our remote community.

What a wonderful community it is. The festival concludes with the Unconformity Cup with 'the rest' versus 'the west' in a footy match like no other on the famous gravel oval, a game not to be missed and also not for the faint-hearted. The genesis of this festival is intrinsically linked with the mining industry and the festival itself commenced following the temporary closure of the Mount Lyell copper mine many years ago now. Sadly, the mine still has not recommenced operations but the Unconformity lives on giving new life to Queenstown and the west coast as it explores the connections, the contradictions, the challenges and the cohesion that the arts have the power to do.

Congratulations to Trav and the team and I hope to see many of you there. I will be there.

### **Recognition of Nurse, Paramedic and Midwife Practitioners**

[11.30 a.m.]

**Mr GAFFNEY** (Mersey) - Mr President, I am grateful for the opportunity today to speak for a few moments on the vital role of nurse practitioners, paramedic practitioners and midwife practitioners in communities across Australia and potentially here in Tasmania. I would not be surprised if I am currently receiving a few quizzical glances from around the Chamber at this point. It is fair to say that until I had the privilege of meeting with both the national and state representatives of the Australian College of Nurse Practitioners (ACNP) during the consultation for the, then, End-of-Life Choices (Voluntary Assisted Dying) Bill I was not well acquainted with the contribution NPs make to our health system. Nor was I aware that this extended career path was possible in both the paramedic and midwifery sectors.

Nurse practitioners who have a bachelor's degree, registration and years of experience complete a master's degree, specifically preparing and upskilling them for a more senior and independent clinical practice role. They bring a wealth of experience, knowledge and education but most importantly a proven commitment to their local community. Currently, there are only 35 to 40 NPs in Tasmania with only half to two-thirds of those working in NP roles due to a lack of funded positions.

In the private setting, NPs work to their full scope of patient care including full assessment workup, ordering X-ray and pathology tests, providing patient rebates through Medicare, writing prescriptions and access to pharmaceutical benefit scheme medicines. NPs also refer patients to hospitals and specialists when required. The paramedic practitioner, the PP role, will offer a similar scope of practice.

In the public system, however, NPs attempt to work to full scope. They run clinics, order tests, diagnosing and managing care. However, currently NPs cannot access Medicare as they are not entitled to have a provider number and thus cannot bill for their services. The issue of lack of access to Medicare item numbers and the significantly lower rate paid to NPs for their consultations by the Medicare system needs to be addressed with our federal colleagues. This inequity creates financial disincentives to both practitioner and patient. NP roles in Australia have been highly scrutinised and have resulted in a proven track record of efficiency and safety since inception.

In other Australian states NPs have been a proven mainstay of ED departments and regional areas are now being sought for primary and specialist roles including GP clinics, chronic disease management, respiratory clinics, cardiac clinics and urgent care centres. While PPs are a relatively new addition to the health workforce in Australia they are well utilised and have a similarly proven track record in the United Kingdom. The Australian universities have realised the enormous potential and are currently offering accredited master's level programs to create experienced, educated mobile healthcare providers who can practice to an equivalent level of an NP.

It is a fact that our hospitals that cannot contract long-term doctors have been reliant on revolving locums, sometimes for only two or three days, paying for interstate flights, cars and accommodation as well as exorbitant daily rates of pay. Emergency departments and the ambulance service bear the brunt with increasing numbers of low acuity cases presenting and clogging an already overburdened system.

In the north-west of the state it sometimes takes up to two to three weeks to get an appointment with your own GP and there are no after-hours GP clinics at all in the Mersey locality, I believe, with just one clinic open to 7.30 p.m. week nights in Murchison. The costs of an NP or PP salary is approximately one-third of the most junior locum. It has been suggested that utilising the skills of nurse practitioners would be a more cost-effective use of finite resources.

Most significantly for our communities, NPs and PPs take permanent contracts. They live permanently in the local areas, they provide stability and consistency to patients, they build local networks and understand local demographic socioeconomic and population health issues.

An immediate and plausible support for our overextended health system would entail funding for options such as an urgent care centre, UCC, with extended opening times, close to or co-located to radiology, pathology services or a hospital that is multi-disciplinary where both NPs and PPs can lead the clinic and outreach as required by GPs, ambulance, ED, nursing homes et cetera to any location.

The proposed centre could also serve as a training hub for NP and PP candidates to build our workforce and attract further expertise permanently to Tasmania. Already, PP students from Victoria are signing up to come to Tasmania for their placements. I believe there is a huge potential for NPs and PPs to be part of a long-term sustainable solution to some of the deficiencies in our health system, given the right support from the Government.

The benefits to patients for these models of care include, affordable access to health care; increased hours of access; and a health assessment and treatment option in their own home. An example might be a palliative care client who has a concern and the only usual option is transport to hospital by ambulance. The patient could be treated at home and left in comfort by a PP. This is especially important, as I am informed that there are no palliative care services on the north-west coast after 5 p.m. weekdays or on weekends.

**Ms Forrest** - The college nurses do cover.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - They do but not all the time.

Other benefits to patients include continuity of care with the patient's own GP as the team leader, a collaborative and multi-disciplinary approach across health fields, reducing the

exposure risk by not attending hospitals and possible testing, vaccination, health assessment on one site.

The benefits to the THS and employer include a stable workforce with career progression pathways to retain our best staff, a cheaper but efficient and a safe workforce. It reduces ED presentations and access block. It reduces ambulance transports, keeping ambulances for high acuity patients. Tasmania will be a leader in innovative solutions for health delivery and will benefit from the draw of nurses and paramedics to the roles. It is a cost-effective solution by upskilling an existing professional to do more in the community.

Modelling has already been conducted by the THS for an NP-led centre, the Invermay UCC and should be expanded upon for inclusion of PPs. I encourage the Government to consider and move forward with this innovative reasonable and affordable solution and support the development of alternative models of care that are sustainable and safe in a volatile health climate.

There is no question what was done in the past - and I am speaking of decisions made by successive governments over many years - is not working as effectively as it should be.

With a new minister and extra focus on health, the time for change and reform is here with practical solutions for practitioner-based care to provide greater access for patients while at the same time easing the pressure on our hospitals and ambulance services.

Representatives of the ACNP and ACPP are keen to meet with the minister and interested members to further discuss this innovative approach to improving our health system and I would encourage members to speak with them.

## **GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT (ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES) BILL 2021 (No. 14)**

### **Consideration of Amendments made in the Committee of the Whole Council**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the bill as amended in Committee be now taken into consideration.

**Motion agreed to.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the amendments be read for the first time.

**Amendments read the first time.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the amendments be read for the second time.

**Amendments read the second time.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) - Mr President, I move -

That the amendments be agreed to.

**Amendments agreed to.**

**Bill as amended agreed to.**

**Bill read the third time.**

### **FOOD AMENDMENT BILL 2021 (No. 27)**

#### **Third Reading**

**Bill read the third time.**

### **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2021 (No. 36)**

### **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) 2021 (No. 37)**

#### **Permissive Instruction**

[11.41 a.m.]

**Ms FORREST** (Murchison) (by leave) - Mr President, I move -

That with regard to Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 2021 (No. 36) and Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2021 (No. 37), the Committee of the whole Council be empowered to consider output and other expenditure detail contained in the document, 'Government Services Volumes 1 and 2', and further;

That the committee be empowered to exercise a vote on each proposed output as part of the process of approving appropriations contained within the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 2021 (No. 36) and Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2021 (No. 37) under the two lines of operating services and capital services appropriation, and further;

That the Committee of the whole Council be empowered to consider the outputs as recommended in the reports of Estimates committees A and B, and that the outputs recommended in those reports be not subject to debate and only the outputs recommended as listed as being subject to further consideration be open to debate in Committee, provided that should any member require further consideration of any output, then the procedural mechanism of recommittal is to be used.

**Motion agreed to.**

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2021 (No. 36)**

### **Second Reading**

[11.42 a.m.]

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -

Mr President, I move -

That the bill be now read the second time.

**Motion agreed to.**

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2021 (No. 36)**

### **In Committee**

**Madam CHAIR** - Before I start the process, I will make a brief statement about the way the Committee is to be run. The stages of the bill are intended to achieve two primary objects: to enable full discussion of both substance and form of the legislation; and to ensure that decisions already made at one stage are not reopened for discussion at a subsequent stage and do not, as a result, unnecessarily prolong passage of the bill.

In the context of debate on the appropriation bills, members are reminded that the purpose of consideration in the Committee of the whole Council is to report to the House as to whether the bill should pass and whether clauses and items in the schedule to the bill should be first, agreed to; second, subject to a request; or third, amended where the line is not for the ordinary annual services of the Government.

The consideration of the budget papers during the Estimates process is intended to assist the efficient consideration of the appropriation bills by resolving issues prior to the debate of the bills in the Committee of the whole. This facilitates the efficient consideration of the bills in accordance with the permissive instruction; only those outputs that are recommended for the debate be addressed in detail during the Committee stage unless the output is recommitted.

I have directed that a list of the outputs recommended for further debate in each of the Estimates committee reports be provided to members. You will note that the list specifies the matters that gave rise to the recommendation for further debate. In addressing these outputs, members should confine their questioning to those particular matters.

The permissive instruction to enable the Committee of the whole to consider and vote on items under output groups in the budget papers is to facilitate debate on proposed appropriation of public money contained in the appropriation bills. The instruction does not broaden the scope for debate which will take place in the Committee of the whole. It is not an invitation to make statements unrelated to the proposed appropriation, to revisit the second reading debate or to introduce issues unrelated to the proposed appropriation.



I remind members that debate in Committees of the whole is not a grievance-type debate and therefore ask members to be succinct and to keep these comments in mind when speaking to items in the budget papers.

Members may also note that the Deputy Clerk will not call items where there is no appropriation for this financial year and members will note some of the COVID-19-related appropriations from last financial year still appear in the Budget papers but there are no appropriations against them. These will not be called but there is an exception where one item has been left open for further debate.

**Clauses 1, 2 and 3 agreed to.**

**Clause 4 and 5 postponed.**

**Clause 6 agreed to.**

#### **Schedule 1**

##### **Division 1 - Brand Tasmania**

**Item agreed to.**

#### **Division 2**

##### **Department of Communities Tasmania**

##### **Minister for Sport and Recreation**

##### **Output Group 4 - Disability Services and Community Development**

##### **Output 4.7 Sport and Recreation**

---

#### **Tabled Paper**

#### **Estimates Committee B - Additional Information**

**Ms RATTRAY** (by leave) - Madam Chair, I table additional information. By way of explanation, these answers came in after the committee had met and I table the additional information provided by the Minister for Sport and Recreation in relation to Output Group 4.7 to be included as part of the report of Estimates Committee B. The information was provided after the committee has finalised its report and therefore, the relevant output group was left open for further discussion.

---

**Mr WILLIE** - As the member for McIntyre said we left this open because the answers to our questions had not been provided. I took a particular interest in this area, Deputy President, because as you probably know, and others in the Chamber, there was an Integrity Commission investigation into the Liberal Party 2018 election commitments that was abandoned because it could not be finalised under the terms of reference. I had heard during the election campaign there was an organisation that was cold-called by a member of the Government's office and asked to put forward a proposal. I am not going to throw people or organisations under the bus.

Members in this Chamber would be interested to know post the election a local communities facilities fund was established to pay for the Liberal Party commitments. This was \$14.9 million of taxpayers' money which funded community groups, local government, sporting organisations all across regions of Tasmania's north, north-west regions receiving over 50 per cent of the election commitments as a result of the 2020-21 election.

Language is important and in our answers to questions, the answer was referring to it as a grant. These are not grants. This is not a normal process the Department of Sport and Recreation goes through to facilitate grants for the communities. These are election commitments made by the Liberal Party. Language is important and I wanted to note in the answer it was talking about this as being part of a grants process. It is not.

**Madam CHAIR** - Do you have a question for the minister?

**Mr WILLIE** - No question, I am just commenting on the line item given we did not have the answers at the time and it was left open.

**Mr WILLIE** - I have one more on 4.7 because there were two.

**Madam CHAIR** - So we are at 4.7, we have a bit of leeway but please get to your feet - sorry, I did not see you. Member for Hobart on 4.7.

**Mr VALENTINE** - As it turns out the answer has been provided in the late notice.

**Mr WILLIE** - During the Estimates committee I asked for a survey which the minister and the department talked about. This was a survey of PE teachers across the education system on regional sports coordinators. I am particularly interested in sport and education as many members know. Those appointments of three regional sports coordinators in the department are relatively new and were interrupted by the pandemic. Is this working and are they helping to facilitate more sport in our schools and access for kids? I asked for the survey and was provided with the survey questions to the PE teachers, but could the minister provide me with the answers to the survey, which would be of far more use?

**Ms HOWLETT** - The survey is actually run by the Department of Education. I would have to seek that information from the Department of Education.

**Mr WILLIE** - Some clarification here, Chair. Can the minister take that on notice in this process, because I will have to close the item, won't I?

**Madam CHAIR** - There are avenues for asking the question. You can ask it in question time. This is about the Budget and the minister here at the table cannot answer a question on behalf of the Minister for Education.

**Mr WILLIE** - Perhaps if I stand up in question time, I will ask the minister the question there and she might be able to take it on notice at question time.

**Madam CHAIR** - She might.

**Item agreed to.**

## **Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

### **Output 90.17 Improving the Playing Field**

**Item agreed to.**

#### **Grants and Subsidies**

**Item agreed to.**

#### **Capital Services**

##### **Capital Investment Program**

**Ms RATTRAY** - With regard to this particular line item, in the Budget Paper No. 1, page 96, there was \$20 million allocated to Stadium Tasmania. I asked the question on notice, minister, with regard to providing information on what that \$20 million is for and what it might do.

I do not believe that the information was received and I am happy if the minister points me to where it is, but at this point in time, I am still waiting for that response. \$20 million allocated to Stadium Tasmania.

**Ms HOWLETT** - It is my understanding we provided the answer to that information for you.

**Madam CHAIR** - Maybe you could read it out, minister?

**Ms HOWLETT** - I can certainly read it out. Would you like me to read out the question or only the answer?

**Ms RATTRAY** - Both.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Provide information in relation to the amount of \$20 million allocated to Stadiums Tasmania, page 96 of Budget Paper, No. 1.

In the same election commitment to establish Stadium Tasmania, a range of capital upgrades were also committed, including \$65 million to upgrade UTAS Stadium, with the balance of this project funding to be sought from the Australian Government.

This project has been approved by government and is currently in planning, so this money will be [inaudible]. The project has been funded in the Budget as part of the Stadium Authority Trust over the forward Estimates as a key deliverable.

Separate to the funding for Stadiums Tasmania as an entity, the UTAS Stadium redevelopment will be managed by Infrastructure Tasmania in advance of Stadiums Tasmania being created. Once it is established, it is envisaged the asset will transfer into that entity, but the upgrades have been committed by government that are being undertaken regardless of the status of Stadiums Tasmania.

**Mr VALENTINE** - My question was asking for information regarding the future operation and funding model of Stadiums Tasmania. I do not believe that has been provided so far and would appreciate an answer.

**Ms HOWLETT** - My apologies, because those answers were actually sent at the same time. I will certainly read out the answer to you.

Stadiums Tasmania is being established as the new statutory entity to own and oversee the management and future capital development of Tasmania's major public stadium assets and infrastructure.

The Stadiums Tasmania Bill 2021 is currently being drafted and is expected to be tabled in the House of Assembly in mid-October 2021, enabling Stadiums Tasmania to begin operating in 2022. The establishment of Stadiums Tasmania will centralise the ownership, management and capital development of Tasmania's major public stadiums in a single entity with a statewide perspective. It will enable it to operate effectively and efficiently and ensure it continues to meet the future needs of sporting codes, other users and audiences, as occurs in other jurisdictions.

Initially, Stadiums Tasmania is expected to assume responsibility for up to four stadiums: MyState Bank Arena and the Silverdome, which are owned by the government; and Blundstone Arena and University of Tasmania Stadium, if their inclusion can be negotiated. Stadiums Tasmania is being established to be as commercial as possible, while each stadium has the capacity to generate a level of income that will help it to cover its operational costs. The cost of operating each stadium often exceeds earning capacity.

In addition to this, Stadiums Tasmania will have a role in delivering community benefits and public policy objectives. As a result, ongoing financial support will be made available to Stadiums Tasmania through an annual appropriation. The funding model being proposed reflects the arrangements adopted by similar statutory bodies in other Australian jurisdictions including New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and Western Australia.

**Mr Valentine** - I will have to wait for the bill to come forward so that I can properly scrutinise it.

**Ms HOWLETT** - You will certainly be able to do that here.

**Ms RATTRAY** - I am not sure where the answers went because I do not recall seeing them.

**Ms Howlett** - My apologies.

**Ms RATTRAY** - I am interested in how this authority is going to manage the stadiums that are not owned by the government. Are you advising us, minister, that the UTAS Stadium and the Blundstone Arena will be secured from local government? Correct me if I am wrong, but the Launceston City Council owns the UTAS Stadium and I believe Clarence City Council owns the Blundstone Arena. Is the Government looking to take those stadiums away from where they now sit, and put them into this Stadium Authority Trust where they hope to generate funds to look after repairs and maintenance? Is that the initiative the Government's seeking to undertake?

**Ms Armitage** - I certainly hope so. It would be great for the state to bear the brunt, rather than the Launceston community.

**Madam CHAIR** - Let the minister answer the question.

**Ms HOWLETT** - We were approached by the Launceston City Council to do this, and we are in negotiations with that council. We are also in discussions with Blundstone Arena.

**Ms RATTRAY** - My next question to the minister is, can any sporting organisation across the state approach the government and ask them to take over their sporting facility, in the hope that they will not have to pay any money to look after the facility in the future?

**Ms HOWLETT** - Theoretically, they could; but we are talking about major sporting infrastructure, like stadiums.

**Ms Rattray** - Major facilities are just as important to a small community as the big ones are to big cities.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Yes, they are.

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Aboriginal Affairs**  
Operating Services

**Output Group 4 - Disability Services and Community Development**  
Output 4.4 Aboriginal Affairs

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Women**  
Operating Services

**Output Group 4 - Disability Services and Community Development**  
Output 4.5 Women's Policy

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Disability Services**  
Operating Services

**Output Group 4 - Disability Services and Community Development**  
Output 4.2 Disability Services

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Veterans' Affairs**  
Operating Services

## **Output Group 4 - Disability Services and Community Development**

Output 4.6 Veterans' Affairs

## **Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.9 Returned Service League Support

**Items agreed to.**

### **Minister for the Prevention of Family Violence**

Operating Services

## **Output Group 5 - Safe Homes, Families, Communities**

Output 5.1 Safe Homes, Families, Communities: Tasmania's action plan for family and sexual violence 2019-2022

**Item agreed to.**

### **Minister for Community Services and Development**

Operating Services

## **Output Group 4 - Disability Services and Community Development**

Output 4.1 Community Services

**Ms WEBB** - I am following up on some answers to questions on notice, to get some further detail. I have a series of questions related to the questions taken on notice. I'll put each of them now and if we need to revisit in subsequent calls, I can.

In response to the question on notice about the allocation of the research component of the core, from the Gambling Support Program, information was provided that the 2020-21 Community Support Levy research funding was concentrated on the fifth Social and Economic Impact Study of gambling in Tasmania (SEIS). What was the focus of the research component in years prior to that - those years in which the SEIS did not occur- or are research projects, other than the SEIS, undertaken with that funding? That is the first question.

The second question relates to the next question on notice, which was about a breakdown in funding allocated to the four functions of the Gambling Support Program in the 2021-22 financial year. The response indicated that it is in development, so I do not have details. Could we have the breakdown from the previous financial year, 2020-21, because that would, perhaps, be indicative of what is to come for this next financial year?

The next question related to the Know Your Odds program ad, when it was last evaluated and whether that evaluation is publicly available. The answer notes that the most recent analysis of Know Your Odds and the website was undertaken in 2016. I would like to know if that analysis was a formal evaluation and if so, who undertook it? The latter part of the answer says, 'Evaluations are not generally published but are available on request'. I therefore request the evaluation of the Know Your Odds campaign done in 2016. If it cannot be provided today, perhaps it can be provided to me at a later date.

The final question related to the community programs, working with schools and community organisations and local government. In the answer provided to me for parts (a),

(b) and (c) of that question, I have a description of funded services, undertaken primarily by Anglicare Tasmania, that fit into those categories. The focus of my question was about whether those programs were evaluated in terms of their effectiveness and that does not seem to have been answered. I reiterate my questions on those programs you have described in your answer, and that is, are they evaluated and assessed for their effectiveness and, if so, are those evaluations publicly available or available on request?

Additionally, in relation to that question, the answer has provided lists for the 2020-21 financial year in which Anglicare Tasmania has undertaken community education initiatives. There is a dot point list of where those initiatives have been undertaken. Could more detail be provided of the number of sessions or programs undertaken in each of those sites during the 2020-21 financial year?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The team I have with me does not have that information at hand. They did not expect such a detailed questioning further to what you have been provided. The department is happy to take them on notice and provide them to you at a later date, if you are happy to proceed with the budget papers at this point.

**Ms Webb** - Yes, I am happy to do that.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We will make sure those are provided to you as soon as they are available.

**Ms Webb** - Will you need me to repeat the specifics in writing?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - That would be very good.

**Item agreed to.**

Output 4.3 Community Development - Policy Advice and Ongoing Community Development

**Item agreed to.**

### **Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.2 Community Support Fund

Output 90.4 Emergency Accommodation Support

Output 90.15 TasCOSS

Output 90.16 Emergency Food Relief Providers

**Items agreed to.**

### **Minister for Children and Youth**

#### **Output Group 1 - Children Services**

Output 1.1 Children Services

**Ms RATTRAY** - These were left open for the member for Pembroke, Ms Seijka, who is a member of our committee and as we know, is not in the Chamber today. We have had a discussion and we do not have any further questions in regard to this.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - My question is with regard to answers I received to do with detail as to the length of waiting times for identified students requiring access to speech and psychology support services -

**Madam CHAIR** - You are in the wrong output group, you are in education.

**Item agreed to.**

**Output Group 2 - Independent Children's and Young Person's Review Service**

Output 2.1 Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People

**Item agreed to.**

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.6 Child Safety System

**Item agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for State Development, Construction and Housing**

Operating Services

**Output Group 3 - Housing Services**

Output 3.1 Housing Services

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.1 Private Rental Incentive Scheme

Output 90.10 Statewide Safe Spaces

**Items agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Item agreed to.**

**Division agreed to without request and without amendment.**

**Division 3**

**Department of Education**

**Minister for Education**

**Output Group 1 - Education**

Output 1.1 In School Education



**Ms ARMITAGE** - Back to my question, in-school education, provide detail as to the length of waiting time for identified students requiring access to speech and psychology support services breakdown by region. Could I have further information please?

The answer I was given: school psychology, Learning Services Northern Region, one month for intervention which follows assessment, and Learning Services Southern Region, two weeks for intervention which follows assessment.

Could I also have how long it took for the assessment, because I am assuming assessment is not when it was identified by a teacher, but when they are actually assessed by - I would hope - a psychologist and then for their intervention? If I could have those questions first it would be great. Thank you.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Learning Services Northern Region is five-and-a-half months for assessment and one month for intervention. Learning Services Southern Region is three months for assessment and two weeks for intervention.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I appreciate that and, in the future, if I could have that in the answer. It is a bit ambiguous to say there is one month when there are six-and-a-half months. The answer to my question should not be one month if you have five-and-a-half months to wait for an assessment.

My next question is with regard to speech and language pathology. Learning Services Northern Region just says four months. Is that for intervention? Do they have assessment, or is it the same? Do they simply turn up and have treatment? The same for Learning Services Southern Region, it says: six-to-seven weeks. Is that for intervention following assessment or just for assessment or for treatment?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The figures quoted were for a full assessment. It is four months for the Learning Services Northern Region and the Learning Services Southern Region is six-to-seven weeks for a full assessment.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - That is for assessment. Obviously, that then requires someone to come back for treatment once they have been assessed. With respect, I should not have to be pulling teeth to get the answer when the question was fairly simple. What is then the waiting list after they have been assessed to actually have the treatment?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Once the assessment is done, the treatment starts immediately. It is four months in the northern region for assessment and once that four months is completed or the assessment is completed, the treatment starts.

**Mr Willie** - Intervention, it is not necessarily a treatment.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - So there is no waiting list for the intervention at all?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I will have to seek some more advice on that.

After the four months assessment, the intervention starts immediately. A plan is developed. It depends on the severity of the intervention that is required as to what goes into that plan.

**Ms Armitage** - But there is no waiting list for it to start? That is my question.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - A plan is developed immediately after the assessment period. That plan may be, I do not know -

**Ms Armitage** - That is fine, but they start getting treated immediately? I only want to know that there is no waiting list.

**Mr Willie** - There might be an adjustment to their learning program.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It depends on the severity of the intervention that is required.

**Mr WILLIE** - During Estimates, the minister and I had a bit of to and fro about these questions and I do understand her concern, but also acknowledge that data is confronting.

Yesterday, when I was in the paper, I spent a lot of the day on the phone to parents and receiving emails sharing their experiences. I have come up with a bit of a compromise, potentially, where I could get this data at the school level but it does not identify the school.

If we could have the data for these questions, perhaps for schools in the south, schools in the north, schools in the north-west, but I want the data at the individual school level. Each school would have data presented at their school level but it would be attributed to a school in the south. Potentially, that is a compromise without naming specific schools, but we would be able to see the individual school level data. Is the Government is prepared to answer that question in that way?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I will have to seek advice on that.

I am advised that they are happy to take that on notice and get the information together for you and possibly provide it very soon, but not immediately. As soon as in the next couple of days, perhaps before we finish the Budget. Are you happy with that, member for Elwick?

**Mr Willie** - Do I need to submit that through your office, or are you taking that on notice now?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - No, we can do that here and now if you are happy with that.

**Mr Willie** - Sure.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, the question is submitted and hopefully I will have an answer back for you.

**Mr Willie** - To be very clear. Individual schools, just not attributed to the school, maybe schools in the south, schools in the north.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Regions?

**Mr Willie** - Yes. I do not want regions collated as a region. I want them as individual schools but attributed to a school in the south, a school in north and a school in the north-west.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I think we understand the question, yes.

**Item agreed to.**

**Output Group 1 - Education**

**Output Group 2 - Libraries Tasmania**

**Output Group 3 - Education Regulation**

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

**Items agreed to.**

**Grants and Subsidies**

**Item agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Mr VALENTINE** - I received an answer to this but it is not as full as I would like. The question was to provide an update in relation to the nature and value of the capital works upgrades to Goulburn Street Primary School, Albuera Street Primary School, Campbell Street Primary School and South Hobart Primary School.

The response with regard to South Hobart Primary School certainly had some detail in it but the other schools were not specifically separated out. It says, 'in addition several of these schools were part of the \$10 million School Revitalisation Maintenance Program at the beginning of the pandemic to fast-track projects across our schools, libraries and kindergartens'.

It does not give me any detail as to what each of those schools may have received in the value and the nature of the development at those schools. I am interested in having a fuller response. I have a question on notice lodged with respect to South Hobart in particular, given the fact that those 2017 works were full the day they were opened. I would like the rest of that question answered more fully.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I have quite a comprehensive breakdown here for the member. Would you like me to read it or table it?

**Mr Valentine** - I am happy for you to table it.

---

### **Tabled Paper**

#### **Answer to Question - Capital Investment Program in Schools**

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Madam Chair, I seek leave to table a document and have it incorporated into *Hansard*. This document contains information on the Capital Investment Program in schools.

**Leave granted; see Appendix 1 for incorporated document (page 76).**

---

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 3 is agreed to without request and without amendment.**

**Division 4**

**Finance-General**

Treasurer

Operating Services

**Output Group 1 - Debt Servicing and Management**

Output 1.1 Debt Servicing

Output 1.2 Interest on Sundry Debtors

**Output Group 3 - Government Business**

Output 3.1 Sustainable Timber Tasmania

Output 3.2 State fire Commission

Output 3.4 Government Businesses

**Output Group 4 - Miscellaneous**

Output 4.2 Treasurer's Reserve

Output 4.3 Miscellaneous

Output 4.4 Payment to Australian Tax Office: GST Administration

Output 4.9 Ex-Gratia Assistance

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.2 Local Government \$200 million Interest Free Loans

Output 90.8 Tasmanina HomeBuilder Grant

**Items agreed to.**

**Grants and Subsidies**

**Items agreed to.**

**Minister for Finance**

Operating Services

**Output Group 2 - Employee Related Costs**

Output 2.1 Superannuation and Pensions

**Output Group 4 - Miscellaneous**

Output 4.1 Information and Communication Technology

Output 4.7 Property Management Services

Output 4.8 Infrastructure Investment Project Planning

**Output Group 89 - Public Building Maintenance Program**

Output 89.1 Public Building Manintenance Program

**Items agreed to.**

## **Output group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

### **Output 90.1 Youth Employment Scheme**

**Madam CHAIR** - I note that there is no appropriation but some questions were left open in debate during the Estimates process. So, I will allow a bit of leeway here.

**Ms LOVELL** - My question is in relation to the answer to the question on notice provided by the Minister for Finance. Specifically, part 2 of the question on notice which was - I will read the question out so it is clear what I am speaking about: Last year it was suggested that this scheme, the Youth Employment Scheme, would support the jobs of about 2000 young people and 250 employers. How many young people were supported through this allocation in 2020-2021 and how many employers were supported?

The response the minister provided is significantly short of those figures given during Estimates last year. In fact, the answer was: of these, approximately 44 employers and 278 employees related to the Youth Employment Scheme.

My question is to clarify whether those commitments given in Estimates last year, specifically 2000 young people to be supported through this scheme, were correct? If so, why are we seeing such a significant shortfall from that 2000 number to only 278 employees being supported, despite more than this \$280 000 - in fact, \$384 000 - being provided in claims to support youth employees?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - In the 2020-21 Budget Speech the Treasurer indicated that a range of skills and training programs would support 4000 new full-time jobs for apprentices, trainees and youth employees. This includes extending the payroll tax rebate scheme and small business grant scheme for a further 12 months to 30 June 2022, and broadening these schemes to all industries. It also included the extension of the payroll tax rebate for all youth employees for a further 18 months from the end of 2021 to 30 June 2022, as well as benefits achieved through the Australian Government's apprenticeship wage subsidy.

Current numbers of employees for each of these programs include, as follows: 3414 grants were approved under the small business grant schemes, comprising the targeted small business grant from 1 July 2020 to 30 December 2020 and the apprentice and trainee grant for small business from 1 January 2021 to 30 June 2021; and 236 employers, supporting 1437 employees, utilised the payroll tax rebate scheme for apprentices, trainees and youth employees. The Government does not hold data relating to the Australian Government.

**Ms WEBB** - I am interested to clarify this further. The information provided in response to the question on notice and the information provided now is still not clear to me. In 2020-21, \$280 000 was allocated for the youth employment scheme. From the answer provided to the question on notice, it appears that supported 44 employers and 278 employees. Is that correct?

How many were supported through the other funding, grants or subsidies provided? For example, when you quote those numbers of 1437 employees, is it in addition to or inclusive of the youth employment scheme? Does that include the 278 in the youth employment scheme? Can you unpick it for us, so we have clarity as to what applies to the youth employment scheme and what applies to those other initiatives?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The apprentice, trainee and youth employers' rebate for all employee types was utilised by 236 employers supporting 1436 employees. Of those figures, 44 were employees and 276 were the youth only; they are included in that.

**Ms Webb** - They were included in those numbers?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - They are included in those numbers.

**Ms LOVELL** - To be clear, the commitment given during Estimates last year by the minister, that 2000 young people were to be supported by these stimuli - the youth employment scheme and the payroll tax rebates for apprentices and trainees. Is that correct?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The member for Rumney is correct; but small business grants schemes were also part of that.

**Ms LOVELL** - Can the Leader confirm whether all of those 1437 apprentices, trainees and youth employees fall into the category of being a young person; or does that include apprentices and trainees who may be older?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Some of the apprentices and trainees will be young people, but we don't have the breakdown.

**Ms WEBB** - Can the Government explain why we have fallen well short of the 2000 young people committed to last year? I am interested to know why at least 25 per cent of that commitment was not met, given that some of that 1437 are not young people?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We do not have the full breakdown to give you; but the 3414 is the small business grant scheme.

**Ms Webb** - I was not asking about that figure.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Whilst I'm on my feet, would you like to clarify your question succinctly?

**Ms Webb** - You provided a figure of 1437 apprentices, trainees and youth employees supported by the various subsidies, schemes and grants. You said that not all of them would have been young people; some of them will have been people in older age brackets. My question is, can you explain why, having given a commitment last year of supporting 2000 young people, we have achieved 75 per cent - or less - of that, at the 1400 or so mark? What is your explanation for falling so far short of supporting 2000 young people?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It appears that the big bulk of the remainder of the people you are looking for is included in the 3414 applications that went into the small business grant scheme. They are there, but in a different category.

**Ms Webb** - You are able to provide a number for the young people supported?

**Madam CHAIR** - Order, as there is no budget allocation on this line item for this year we really have no constitutional power to request anything other because it was last year. It may be more productive to use other avenues to follow this question up outside of the budget

process because it is not something we can fully consider. I cannot move any request to this line item, it really is just that we note this line item. I might just pull up at that point and if members have outstanding questions they might use other forums, like question time or questions on notice to follow it up.

**Item 90.3 noted.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 4 agreed to without request and without amendment.**

**Division 5**

**Department of Health**

**Minister for Health**

Operating Services

**Output Group 1 - System Management**

Output 1.1 System Management - Health

**Output Group 2 - Health Service**

Output 2.1 Admitted Services

Output 2.2 Non-admitted Services

Output 2.3 Emergency Department Services

Output 2.4 Community Health Services

Output 2.6 Ambulance Services

Output 2.7 Public Health Services

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.6 Community Healthcare

Output 90.7 Elective Surgery

**Items agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Items agreed to.**

**Minister for Mental Health and Wellbeing**

Operating Services

**Output Group 1 - System Management**

Output 1.2 System Management - Mental Health and Wellbeing

**Item agreed to.**

## **Output Group 2 - Health Services**

### **Output 2.5 Statewide and Mental Health Services**

**Ms FORREST** - The question I was interested in in the Estimates process was the cost of agency nurses in Statewide Mental Health Services. We have some information about the costs all portioned in terms of the agency nursing costs across the state and Mental Health Services only provided figures for the south and I assume it is because it is a statewide service and they are employed by the south. I would have thought there were nursing staff, as ours in the north and north-west of the state, that would rely on agency nurses across the state.

I note the answer to question 4 with regard to the breakdown of medical locum costs by region that there was a portion cost right across. I was really unclear as to why we do not have that. Have we an indication of the number of agency nurses engaged in the north and north-west, even if they are funded from the south? It is lack of clarity and I was looking for a breakdown of the demand across the region by region of locums and agency nurses in our Mental Health Services.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The individual figures are not collected from across the north and north-west because it is a statewide service managed through the south through Hobart. This has been the way it has been managed since 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21. At the minute, we have some updated figures that include accommodation costs also, do you want me to run through them from 2018?

**Ms Forrest** - For the locums or agency nurses?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Agency nurse costs, so the new figure, if we start with this Budget, 2020-21 is \$1 407 137.00 which includes the extra accommodation. It has been like this forever, since agency nurses have been in.

**Ms Forrest** - This is the first time Committee A has had mental health and wellbeing as a separate entity.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Since 2018-19, the Statewide Mental Health Services agency nursing costs has been presented in the same fashion.

**Ms FORREST** - Is it then possible to get a breakdown of the number of nurses in the regions employed by statewide services, the number of hours that agency nurses work in the regions acknowledging they are paid from the south but surely, they do not just work in the south? I am not asking for it right now but that breakdown is the sort of information I was looking for.

What are the costs per region of nurses working, mental health agency nurses working across the regions, because it does not give us any indication of where the real demand is in this? It looks like it is terribly difficult in the south with staffing, but I am sure it is because they are being deployed to other parts of the state.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Agency nurses are paid by invoice which is managed on a statewide service. We do not have that information at the moment, but the department is happy to look to improve their data collection for next year if the member is happy. That is the best I can give you at the moment.



**Ms LOVELL** - I have a follow-on question from the question on notice relating to beds available in the St Helens Mother Baby Unit available for public patients. The answer we got back from the minister was on average one bed's worth of activity is purchased; however, there have been occasions where two mothers from the public system have been admitted at the same time.

My follow-up question to the Leader is whether we can get information on how many occasions two mothers were admitted, and is there a waitlist for the one or occasionally two mother-baby beds for public patients? Is there any plan to provide mother-baby beds, particularly in the north and the north-west where there is an opportunity with redevelopments currently underway and whether those mother-baby beds will be part of those redevelopments?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Statewide Mental Health Services is able to access beds on an as-needed basis. The SMHS pay approximately \$970 dollars per day per bed in the mother and baby unit at St Helens Hospital. Based on the table of costs here and our understanding an average stay is approximately 14 days, this equates to approximately 240 bed days for approximately 17 patients over the seven months of data currently available for the 2020-21 catchment. In the past 60 days, we were aware that two SMHS patients have been transferred from the north-west to the mother and baby unit at St Helens Hospital.

As part of the reforms occurring through the SMHS, including the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services reform, consideration will be given to the need for a standalone mother and baby unit within the public health system. Subject to agreement on contract and governance, up to two mother-baby beds could be progressed at the private hospital in Burnie and this would require an investment in staff training for this specialised area.

Once phase 1 of the CAMHS reform has been achieved for the north-west, which will focus on increasing the capacity of CAMHS, further work will be progressed to scope the requirements for perinatal services. There is a list of costings here back to 2015-16, if you want me to run through them.

St Helens Mother-Baby Unit costings: in 2015-16, it was \$154 061.04; in 2016-17, it was \$189 054.92; in 2017-18, it was \$199 456.86; in 2018-19, it was \$128 982.74; in 2019-20, it was \$258 745.75; and up to the end of January 2021, it was \$232 659.39.

**Ms Lovell** - Could I ask you to repeat the cost per day?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It was \$970 per bed per day in the mother and baby unit in the St Helens Hospital.

**Item agreed to.**

## **Capital Services**

Capital investment program

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 5 agreed to without request and without amendment.**

**Division 6**  
**Department of Justice**  
**Attorney-General and Minister for Justice**  
Operating Services

**Output Group 1 - Administration of Justice**

Output 1.1 Supreme Court Services  
Output 1.2 Magisterial Court Services  
Output 1.3 Births, Deaths and Marriages  
Output 1.4 Support and Compensation for Victims of Crime  
Output 1.5 Tasmania Legal Service  
Output 1.6 Legal Assistance  
Output 1.7 Equal Opportunity Tasmania  
Output 1.8 Elections and Referendums

**Items agreed to.**

Output 1.9 Tasmanian Industrial Commission

**Mr VALENTINE** - An answer was provided, but it was slightly confusing because the table provided had the six-month period, 99 and then it has a note that says, '... includes 84 that were closed within three months.'. It does not give an exact indication as to how many were finalised within the six-month period. I do not know what the split is between the Industrial Relations Act 1984 and the State Service Act 2000.

I would appreciate it if that could be provided. There is something in the budget papers for three months but the others are not aggregated; the finalised nine months does not include the six months, for instance. Why would the six months include the three months?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The reason it is not there is because a three-month table was not provided. Of the three months, there were 84 and the balance was over six months. That was the 15. It was the way the table was put together, there was not a three-month line.

**Mr Valentine** - Do we have a split, between the Industrial Relations Act and the State Service Act for those three-month ones, so we can work out?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We do not have that information at hand. Are you happy if we seek that information? We can get it, but we have do not have it here now. Are you happy to progress that?

**Mr Valentine** - Thank you. So that we can be clear exactly how many were finalised, and which act?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - As soon as that comes to me, I will forward it on, if you are happy to progress the Budget.

**Mr Valentine** - I am, thank you.

**Item agreed to.**

Output 1.10 Tasmanian Civil and Administrative Tribunal  
Output 1.11 Office of the Public Guardian  
Output 1.12 Child Abuse Royal Commission Response Unit  
Output 1.13 Safe at Home

**Items agreed to.**

**Output Group 2 - Legal Services**

Output 2.1 Crown Law  
Output 2.2 Legislation Development and Review

**Items agreed to.**

**Output Group 3 - Corrections and Enforcement**

Output 3.3 Enforcement of Monetary Penalties

**Item agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 6**

**Minister for Local Government and Planning**

**Output Group 4 - Regulatory and Other Services**

Output 4.2 Tasmanian Planning Commission

**Dr SEIDEL** - Could I seek clarification, in particular about the State of the Environment report? The State of the Environment reporting is listed as an output under 4.2 Tasmanian Planning Commission in each and every budget paper since 2009 but no report actually has been delivered.

It turns out when I asked in Estimates, when did work on the State of the Environment report cease, the answer was: 'The commission has advised that no specific work has been undertaken on the production of the new State of the Environment report since the last report was released in 2009'. So, no work has been done since 2009 but it has been listed as an output in each and every budget paper ever since. I want to seek some clarification why that is?

**Madam CHAIR** - Are you going to ask any further questions? Do you want to keep going while you are up there?

**Dr SEIDEL** - I can keep going, if that is okay. It is probably easier, isn't it?

The second question was, in Estimates I asked why was no specific work done and the answer given by the commissioner was: 'I can't speak for the former executive commissioner but to the best of my knowledge, the commission has not been resourced to be able to produce a State of the Environment report'.

The question I then put was, 'Has the minister received a request from the TPC seeking additional funds to prepare the State of the Environment report'? The answer was, 'The Department of Justice has advised the commissioner has not made a formal request to any minister for additional funds to prepare a State of the Environment report'.

Yes, I understand there was no formal request but has any request been made? That was my question. I understand no formal request has been made but have any requests been made?

**Madam CHAIR** - Any more?

**Dr SEIDEL** - As a follow-up, is the Government able to give any other examples of statutory authorities who seem to have plenty of leeway on what they are meant to be reporting or not reporting? It is the statutory requirement to do a State of the Environment report every five years. If that is the case, can the Government please give examples of any other statutory authority that has these options to report rather than the legislated dictum to report?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Can I respectfully request, that is not a question for the advisers I have. Maybe the member could put it on questions without notice?

**Dr SEIDEL** - Fair enough.

**Madam CHAIR** - We will see how we go with the responses to his other questions and there may be time over the break to seek further information.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - In answer to your first question, it is required under the legislation. Therefore, that is why it is in the Budget. There is no formal request and there is no record of any formal requests.

Question three, I think we have sorted that one if the member could put that on as a question without notice.

**Sitting suspended from 1 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.**

## **QUESTIONS**

### **Staffing Requirements for Sale of Crown Land**

**Ms RATTRAY question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.32 p.m.]

In the recent Budget, funding of \$1.9 million has been allocated over two years for additional staff to respond to crown land transaction turnaround times to meet the PESRAC recommendations. What is the increase in the number of staff to respond to the increase in sales requests and development applications?

## **ANSWER**

Mr President, I thank the member for her question. Six staff have been employed on full-term contracts: one Band 6 staff member (Lease and Licence); one Band 5 staff member (Lease and Licence); one Band 5 staff member (DA and Works Assessments); one Band 4 staff member (DA and Works Assessments); and two Band 4 staff members (Sales).

### **Tasmanian Schools - Infrastructure Priority List**

#### **Mr WILLIE question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.33 p.m.]

My question is about the state government infrastructure list for the Department of Education. The state government has provided the school infrastructure priority list when it has been requested in the past. Can the Minister for Education please provide a Department of Education school infrastructure priority list?

## **ANSWER**

Mr President, I thank the member for his question. The school infrastructure priority list was tabled at the Legislative Council Estimates hearing earlier this month and the same list is provided again in response to your question. Mr President, I seek leave to table this document and have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

**Leave granted.**

**See Appendix 2 for incorporated document (page 77).**

### **ICU Ventilators**

#### **Ms FORREST question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.33 p.m.]

I asked this question during the last sitting. The Leader did not have the answer provided during that time. I was given the answer before Estimates because it was related to questions I wanted to ask at Estimates. I am happy for the Leader to table this document, or to read it out.

With regard to the availability of ventilators and the staff required to care for ventilated patients in intensive care units (ICUs) in Tasmania's three major hospitals:

- (1) How many ventilators are available at each ICU at the Royal Hobart Hospital, Launceston General Hospital and North West Regional Hospital?

- (2) How many qualified and experienced staff are available to provide care for ventilated patients at the Royal Hobart Hospital, Launceston General Hospital and North West Regional Hospital?
- (3) How many staff are needed per ventilated patient, to provide 24-hour care?

**ANSWER**

Mr President, I thank the member for her question. As indicated by the member for Murchison, I seek leave to table the answer and have it incorporated into *Hansard*.

**Leave granted.**

**See Appendix 3 for incorporated document (page 79).**

**COVID-19 - Vaccination Clinics for Years 11 and 12 Students**

**Ms ARMITAGE question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.35 p.m.]

Mr President, I realise the situation may have changed since I raised the issue. Regarding a media release from the Minister for Health issued on 22 August 2021 it had been advised that a COVID-19 vaccination clinic would be organised for years 11 and 12 students from Elizabeth College, which can also be accessed by year 11 and 12 students at Ogilvie and New Town.

- (1) Can the Leader please advise when we can expect to see a similar clinical arrangement in the north and north-west of the state? I believe this is already underway.
- (2) On what basis was it decided to begin these clinics for young people in the state's south when the health outcomes are poorer and the health needs are arguably greater in the state's north and north-west?

**ANSWER**

Mr President, I thank the member for her question. I will read the answer because it is important to know what is going on. The statewide in-reach COVID-19 school vaccination program is in the process of being rolled out statewide with a priority focus on years 11 and 12. The program is currently on track to complete first doses to participating schools in all regions and across the public, Catholic and independent sectors by the end of this term, on 25 September.

Face-to-face meetings were held with schools across the state to confirm dates, agree on a suitable and safe vaccination area at each school, and explain the vaccination process. It has been pleasing that schools have worked together across the public, Catholic and independent sectors to maximise the opportunity for students by either participating as host or guest schools. The COVID-19 school vaccination program commenced in the south in several colleges near

the Tasmanian Vaccination Emergency Operations Centre in Hobart. Additional time was required to recruit immunisers in the north and north-west to run the schools program without disrupting the wider vaccination program.

Eligible students do not need to wait for the clinics in schools; they can also attend community clinics. There's a full list of the schools here, which I'll read out. The second dose is complete at Elizabeth College and participating extension schools. First doses are completed at: Claremont College and participating extension schools; Hobart College and participating extension schools; Rosny College and participating extension schools; Launceston College and participating extension schools; Don College and participating extension schools; Hellyer College and participating extension schools; Guilford Young College; St Marys College; the Indie School Hobart; and the Launceston Christian School.

First doses are underway at: Newstead College and participating extension schools; the Hutchins School; and Southern Support School. Dates for first vaccinations are scheduled for: Marist Regional College; St Brendan-Shaw College; St Patrick's College; Calvin Christian School; Fahan School; St Michael's Collegiate; Southern Christian College; North West Christian School; One School Global Hobart; the Friends School; Scotch Oakburn College; Northwest Support School; Geneva Christian College; Northern Support School; Launceston Church Grammar School; Capstone College; One School Global Kings Meadows; Leighland Christian School; Ulverstone Secondary College; and Indie School Devonport.

The Department of Health discussed vaccinations with Circular Head Christian School and St Francis Flexible Learning Centre, and is exploring future options for these schools. Mountain High School and eSchool students are receiving correspondence in conjunction with the Department of Education about the best way for their school students to access vaccinations.

A further option for young people aged 12 and over are youth clinics which will be held on the following weekends: in Launceston - Saturday 2 and Sunday 3 October at the Door of Hope Centre in South Launceston; in Hobart - Saturday 16 and Sunday 17 October at PW1 on Hobart's waterfront; in Burnie - Saturday 9 October at the Burnie Arts and Function Centre; and in Devonport - Saturday 23 October at the Devonport Surf Life Saving Club.

Young people booking into a youth clinic attend on the day with their parent or guardian and encourage them to jointly complete their consent form on the day.

Finally, any students aged 12 and over can also continue to attend our community clinics. Community clinics continue to be rolled out across the state and members here in this House are asked to encourage all of their constituents who have not yet participated in the vaccination program to please make appointments and to do so.

### **Tasmanian Schools - Survey of PE Teachers**

**Mr WILLIE question to MINISTER for SPORT and RECREATION, Ms HOWLETT**

[2.41 a.m.]

My question is a follow-on from the debate this morning. In budget Estimates I asked for the survey of PE teachers regarding their regional sports coordinators. I am interested in

the answers not the questions. And if the minister might be able to take that on notice and provide those answers to me?

## **ANSWER**

Mr President, I thank the member for his question. I will seek some advice from the Education department from the minister and take that on notice.

### **Taxi Licences and Ubers**

#### **Ms ARMITAGE question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

Regarding the allocation and management of taxi licences in the state:

- (1) Does the Government acknowledge there are marked differences between the regulatory requirements on rideshare operators (for example Uber) compared to taxis licensed in Tasmania?
- (2) Can the Leader please advise the rationale behind the 24 taxi areas in this state?
- (3) Would the Government consider amalgamating the 24 taxi areas into, for example, a south, north and north-west scheme to minimise confusion and assist taxi drivers to operate?
- (4) To put taxis and rideshare operators on a more even playing field, would the Government consider requiring rideshare operators to operate with similar limitations to taxi drivers, such as confinement to certain areas and other similar regulatory matters?

## **ANSWER**

Mr President, I thank the member for her question.

- (1) In October 2021, the Tasmanian Parliament passed the On-Demand Passenger Transport Services (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2020. The act, when fully implemented, provides consumers with choice and levels the playing field between rideshare such as Uber and taxi operators regarding regulatory requirements.

The act provides a modern equitable framework that enables the safe, competitive and accessible operation of the on-demand passenger transport industry, including taxis and rideshare operators. It enables the streamlining of regulatory arrangements and will see administrative costs that have historically only been associated with the taxi and hire vehicle industry shared across all operators.

- (2) Separate taxi areas were established following the conversion of former cab licences to perpetual taxi licences in the 1990s, largely reflecting the operating area specified in those former licences. A small number of the former cab areas were amalgamated, resulting in the current 24 taxi areas.



The establishment of taxi areas was designed to ensure taxis were available in smaller regions, avoiding the situation where taxis would gravitate to areas of greater demand and licence purchase prices were established in consideration of that demand. Area restrictions are a relevant concern where there are limits on the issue of licences.

(3) and (4)

Some taxi operators suggest changed or amalgamated taxi areas; however, owner-operator taxi licences are valued differently in different taxi areas.

A Launceston owner-operator who, for example, has paid \$35 000 for their licence, would argue against opening their area to an operator from a different zone such as Perth, who has paid \$12 500 for their licence.

Three rounds of extensive consultation spanning 2016 to 2020 found, as a whole, the taxi industry overwhelmingly supported the retention of the existing taxi areas. The Government continues to be open to consolidating and amalgamating taxi areas and reducing regulatory burden. However, this will not occur without broad support from the taxi industry.

In the beginning of question (1), I said in October 2021 and it should be October 2020.

### **Tasmania Police - Leave Liability**

**Ms FORREST question to LEADER of the GOVERNMENT in the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, Mrs HISCUTT**

[2.45 p.m.]

With regard to the leave liability within the Police department please provide a breakdown of the leave liability of sworn police officers appointed under the Police Service Act 2003 over the last three years?

### **ANSWER**

Mr President, I thank the member for Murchison for her question. It is a very short answer but there are a lot of numbers involved so I may seek leave with your permission to table the answer and have it incorporated into *Hansard*.

**Leave granted.**

**See Appendix 4 for incorporated document (page 81).**

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2021 (No. 36)**

### **In Committee**

**Resumed from above.**

---

**Tabled Paper**  
**Answer to Question - Tasmanian Industrial Commission**

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Madam Chair, I seek leave to table an answer to a question placed on notice by the member for Hobart relating to Division 6, Output group 1.9, the Tasmanian Industrial Commission and have the answer incorporated into *Hansard*.

**Leave granted.**

**See Appendix 5 for incorporated document (page 82).**

---

**Output Group 4 - Regulatory and Other Services**

**Output 4.2 Tasmanian Planning Commission**

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I believe I had an answer to give to the member for Huon just before lunch. I would like to deliver that now. He was asking about formal requests. There have been no formal requests made or received by the current secretary.

**Dr SEIDEL** - Thank you, Leader, but I did not ask about formal requests. I asked about any requests: whether any requests have been made formally or informally by the TPC to the minister for financial assistance or support in order to prepare the State of the Environment report formally or informally?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I missed out the important words that said 'or otherwise'. There is no formal request, or otherwise, that has been made to the current secretary.

**Item agreed to.**

**Output 4.3 Planning Policy and Reform**

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Corrections**

**Operating Services**

**Output Group 3 - Corrections and Enforcement**

**Output 3.1 Prison Services**

**Output 3.2 Community Corrective Services**

**Items agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

**Capital Investment Program**

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Workplace Safety and Consumer Affairs**  
Operating Services

**Output Group 4 - Regulatory and Other Services**

Output 4.1 WorkSafe Tasmania

Output 4.4 Consumer, Building and Occupational Services

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 6 is agreed to without request and without amendment.**

**Division 7**

**Ministerial and Parliamentary Support**

**Premier**

Operating Services

**Output Group 1 - Support for Members of Parliament**

Output 1.1 Support for Ministers and certain Parliamentary Office Holders

Output 1.2 Support for Members of the House of Assembly

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 7 agreed to without request.**

**Division 8**

**Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management**

**Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management**

Operating Services

**Output Group 1 - Public Safety**

Output 1.1 Support to the Community

**Output Group 2 - Crime**

Output 2.1 Investigation of Crime

Output 2.2 Poppy Security

Output 2.3 Fisheries Security

Output 2.4 Support to Judicial Services

**Output Group 3 - Traffic Policing**

Output 3.1 Traffic Policing

**Output Group 4 - Emergency Management**

Output 4.1 State Emergency Services

Output 4.2 State Security and Rescue Operations

**Items agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 8 agreed to without request and without amendment.**

**Division 9 - Department of Premier and Cabinet**

**Premier**

Operating Services

**Output Group 1 - Support for Executive Decision Making**

Output 1.1 Strategic Policy and Advice

**Item agreed to.**

**Output Group 2 - Government Processes and Services**

Output 2.1 Management of Executive Government Processes

**Ms WEBB** - I will briefly follow up on that. In relation to the RSS feed, the answer provided was that a security risk was identified and being the reason that the RSS feed for the *Gazette* notifications was shut down. This indicates that there is now a review of other options that might be able to provide email notifications because the RSS feed has been resumed but not the email notification service. Do you have a time line on when a new notification service might be available? What process is being used to identify that?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am advised that a review is being undertaken and will be done within about two months. So it is underway as we speak.

**Ms WEBB** - For the record, at any point in the initial identification of this security risk and the decision to take down the RSS feed and stop the email notifications, was any thought ever given to notifying the people who are signed up to that email notification service that it was about to be shut down? If not, why not?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, we are of the opinion an email was sent to everybody who was involved in that but there was no read receipt so we cannot be sure that it was received.

**Ms WEBB** - For the record, I was signed up to that and I did not receive an email. I know of at least one other person signed up for it who also did not receive an email. I suggest that you did not send emails out to the people who are signed up to that service and that was a fairly neglectful way to proceed with that process, just for the record.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I will seek some advice.

**Ms Webb** - Perhaps you could forward me the email now.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We have sent texts to the appropriate people. I think we need to wait on that to come so if you are happy for that to be provided when that comes.

**Item agreed to.**

Output 2.2 Principal and subordinate Legislation

Output 2.3 Tasmanian Government Courier

Output 2.4 Corporate Support to Ministerial and Parliamentary Offices and the Office of the Governor

**Items agreed to.**

**Output Group 3 - Electronic Services for Government Agencies and the Community**

Output 3.2 Management and Ongoing Development of Service Tasmania

**Output Group 4 - State Service Management**

Output 4.1 State Service Employment and Management

**Output Group 5 - Security and Emergency Management**

Output 5.1 Security and Emergency Management

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.4. Regionally-based Model for Coordinating the Recovery from COVID-19

**Items agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program.

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Local Government and Planning**

Operating Services

**Output Group 6 - Local Government**

Output 6.1 Local Government

**Ms FORREST** - One of the key budget matters covered in this line item is the proposed reform of local government, something that I have been vocal about in the past, with regard to a structure to proceed, even before PESRAC made their recommendation.

PESRAC has recommended an independent process to look at local government reform. The member for Mersey raised this initially in the Estimates hearings about the process and who was involved in that. PESRAC made it very clear that it was to be the parliament that needed to be engaged in this for it to be effective and I could not agree more.

The comments I have made previously were related to some independent bodies such as the Electoral Commission or some other suitably independent body to undertake such a review with appropriate terms of reference and the like.

It was pleasing to see PESRAC's recommendation, but then to find that the minister had started a process of engaging with what he said was the parliament in the process. I will reiterate some of his comments before I pose the question. He told us that there had been two first meetings and there was an agenda for the third and acknowledged that member for Braddon Anita Dow, as the local member representative on the Opposition downstairs, had recommended that Legislative Council be engaged in this.

He also included in those meetings, the Independent member for Clark, who is not a party member either. It was pretty clear that there had been two meetings.

We had to ask a number of times for a copy of the agendas, not the minutes, only the agendas of the meetings that had occurred and I was hoping to get the agenda for the third meeting coming up, but that is not available as yet. We were provided with those after we had basically closed off this session. There was no opportunity to ask further questions at that point, so they will be asked now.

The minister, Mr Jaensch, said he was trying to play as straight a bat as he could and to get the other parties in the process on an equal basis. Very admirable to get the parties of the parliament on equal process. He also said, 'if we are faithful to PESRAC's recommendation that if you can't get cross-party support, don't do it. Cross-party support is the thing. Cross-party support is a key to parliament support'.

He was suggesting that the only way to get cross-party support was to engage lower House members of the Opposition, the Greens and the Independent member for Clark. I am not sure when it dawned on him that the Legislative Council is part of the parliament, but it appears not to have occurred yet.

With regard to the topics covered. The first meeting was 1 July, welcome, introduction, PESRAC recommendations overview. Third topic, Project scope; fourth topic, Project strategy; fifth topic, Project governance; and sixth, Engagement with the Legislative Council. That was the first meeting. The next meeting, and meeting frequency and business.

Meeting two which was held on 1 September, welcome introduction, second point for discussion was the draft terms of reference discussion. So, there was an intention to consider the draft terms of reference before item three, engagement with the Legislative Council.

To my knowledge, there has been no communication with the President of this House who would be able to say, 'what is the process we want to undertake in this place to engage the Legislative Council?' Nor have there been any communication with any Independent member of this House. Certainly, not with me, and there are Independent members of our committee and I am seeing shakes of heads from other Independent members in this place. How disrespectful.

For the minister to say that there is no point progressing blah, blah, blah if you do not have the support of other parties, does that mean that we are completely irrelevant in his mind? If you get the Labor Party and the Greens signed up, then whacko we are away - and let's do it, regardless of the view any Independent member of the upper House may have.

There is great expertise in the upper House in terms of local government. I am not one of those, but I bring a different approach. My question to the Leader is, when will the minister engage with the Legislative Council, as a part of parliament, as per PESRAC's recommendation? He says he is abiding by that, but he is not; and he is being entirely disrespectful to this House and every member in it.

**Madam DEPUTY CHAIR** - Are you seeking advice, Leader?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, but I do have an answer to the member for Nelson's emails.

**Madam DEPUTY CHAIR** - Can we finish this question first, Leader, before we go back to that one, otherwise it will become untidy.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We have the third meeting agenda for 16 September. Do you wish that to be tabled?

**Ms Forrest** - When was it?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Last week.

**Ms FORREST** - Last week. Fabulous. I would love to see that.

**Ms Webb** - It was one of my questions.

**Ms Forrest** - Read it out; that will be enough to know where we stand.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Okay.

Meeting agenda - Cross-Party Working Group, Local Government Reform,  
Thursday, 16 September 2021, 1.00 p.m.  
Committee Room 2 Parliament House  
Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and introduction
2. Draft expert panel terms of reference/discussion
3. Engagement with Legislative Council
4. Draft working group terms of reference - discussion
5. Reform road map - discussion
6. Next meeting
7. Any other business

The process is owned collectively by the members of the working group. It is a matter for the working group collectively to engage with the Legislative Council.

**Ms FORREST** - How are members of the working group appointed? Who made the decision? When was that decision made? This is an important part of the whole structure of local government. Local government reform is a key line item in the Budget. I ask that you provide the minutes of those meetings. I am happy to have them tabled later in the day, but I want to see the minutes of the meetings. I also want to know how far down the track the draft terms of reference have been progressed, without any input from any member of this House nor, I understand, from LGAT, who were promised they would also be given the opportunity to sit at the table. Has LGAT been written to, and invited to participate? If they were, when were they? If they have not been written to or invited, why not?

If you want a process to fail, this is exactly the way to do it. If the Government does not want this to proceed they are heading in the right way, which I consider would be a terrible, wasted opportunity. I find that staggering, ahead of engagement with the Legislative Council, which was on the agenda but I do not believe anyone has been notified. I certainly have not, and the President would have passed that message on pronto if he had it. These meetings by the Cross-Party Working Group still proceed, despite the message during Estimates that Ms Dow and Ms O'Connor or Dr Woodruff - it might have been both of them - and Ms Johnston were happy for the Legislative Council to be provided with these documents, because they believed it was important that the Legislative Council be at that table.

For them to decide who is going to represent the Legislative Council would be fundamentally wrong. Everyone here has a right, particularly those who are not in parties. We could well have the shadow minister for local government in this area. We do not; but if we did, would that have changed it? Would we have had a token Legislative Councillor then?

**Mr Duigan** - What about the shadow?

**Ms FORREST** - They are not the parliament. The PESRAC recommendation said, 'The parliament'. The parliament is both Houses, despite what the Premier and others sometimes say when they finish up for the end of the year and we are still working. The media seem to fall into that little trap as well, as I mentioned.

I hope the Leader has answers to those questions about engagement, copies of the minutes of all three meetings and LGAT participation and representation.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am advised that the minister wrote to the then acting Leader of the Labor Party, the Greens Party and the Independent member for Clark to seek a representative to participate. These matters are for the working group and the Government cannot comment without their agreement. I am advised there is still a heck of a lot of work to be done and I do not believe that the working group has even got to first base yet.

**Ms FORREST** - There is a lot of work to be done. The PESRAC recommendation says that you need the support of the parliament to make this work and to make it likely to succeed, and I absolutely agree with PESRAC on that. The minister, by his own words, would suggest the same thing. How can you possibly develop terms of reference with the working group - a working group that has asked for the engagement of the Legislative Council. Maybe they did not have time to get to that item on the agenda. Maybe that is the problem, because it is at the bottom, and it was under the discussion of the development of the terms of reference.

When will the Legislative Council be invited to participate in this process to ensure that the parliament has some oversight and some input into the terms of reference? I specifically seek a date. We do not need to wait to get to so-called first base before engagement with the Legislative Council commences. Also, Leader, you did not talk about LGAT and their engagement - when were they asked; if they have not been asked, why not; and when will they be asked? LGAT is another important stakeholder; not part of parliament but obviously a key stakeholder, in terms of determining the scope and the terms of reference.

To say that a lot of work needs to be done - surely this is when you need the people of this House involved in the process, determining the scope, determining the terms of reference, determining who is the most appropriate body to undertake such a body of work. To not engage us denies the skill, knowledge and experience in this House to give guidance to all of those things. You are relying on members of one House of this parliament, denying all other members in this House who have an interest, experience, expertise, or any sort of stake in this. All of us have a stake in that process.

To make it clear, the questions are: when specifically will the Legislative Council be engaged? I have already raised the questions related to LGAT, a couple of times. How will the Legislative Council be invited; because if we are not invited prior to any further meetings, I consider that much of the work that needs to be done will be almost set in stone and will be



very difficult to change. Why not have members there at the outset, as PESRAC intended, and as the Government says they agreed with and supported?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am advised that the Government, on behalf of the working group, is seeking advice on how best to engage with the Legislative Council. The engagement with LGAT is a matter for the working group. I will just draw your attention to the fact that it is still draft terms of reference but I now - can we take your questions on notice and provide an answer later from the minister?

**Ms Forrest** - Which ones are you specifically wanting to take on notice?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The engagement with the Legislative Council.

**Ms Forrest** - How, when and -

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The how, what, where, when and why, and see what the minister himself has to say?

**Ms Forrest** - I thought he was given a very clear indication of how he could do it quite effectively and appropriately across the table so I hoped he would have an answer today for that. I am happy to wait for it; there are other members who have calls on this.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We will push for an answer for that for today. Now that we have finished that, if that is okay with you, will we come back to the member for Nelson's answer?

**Madam DEPUTY CHAIR** - We had not finished this particular area.

**Ms WEBB** - I want to pick up on a couple of things for extra clarity. You have just mentioned that advice is being sought on how best to engage with the Legislative Council. Who is that advice being sought from? And what is the time line on it?

The other thing I want to reiterate because it did not get picked up and repeated there, the member for Murchison requested the minutes of the meeting. I second that request. Will we receive those today? I particularly want to know, regardless of whether we receive the full minutes of those meetings, in relation to the third meeting, did that meeting reach the agenda item that relates to engaging with the Legislative Council? It sounds like it was the third agenda item.

We were told that in the first and second meetings - although being on the agenda - discussion did not reach that item relating to the Legislative Council. I would like to know if that was the case for the third meeting. Did it even get discussed? If part of the minister's weaselling-out of answering these questions is to say that it must be considered by the whole working party and yet they never reach that item on the agenda, I would suggest that the Government commit here and now to moving that agenda item to item number one for the next working group meeting. Will the Government commit to doing that? So that it becomes the first matter dealt with rather than the one kicked down the road continually.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am advised that the department is preparing the advice as soon as possible. The documents and communiques are owned by the working group and not solely

by the minister. With regard to the agenda, I am also advised that the Government will prioritise the matter of engagement with the Legislative Council at any future meetings.

**Madam CHAIR** - That is what they said last time.

**Ms Webb** - Just to clarify does that mean it will be above the agenda item of draft terms of reference at the next meeting?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, it is up to the working group but the Government will propose that to the working group for that to happen.

**Ms Webb** - To clarify, the Government sets the agenda for these meetings, so the Government can choose the order of the agenda items?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, we propose an agenda and then seek advice that it is in the order that they want and we will do as you request.

**Ms Webb** - To clarify, the commitment is that when the Government drafts an agenda for the next meeting it will propose that the first agenda item before considering draft terms of reference, for example, above that, will be consideration of how to engage and when to engage the Legislative Council as the first agenda item. In the draft agenda it puts to the working group.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It appears we will commit to in any future draft agendas that will happen.

**Ms RATTRAY** - I was pleased to see that this line item was left open when I had a look at what was to be discussed today. As a preamble, I was driving to St Helens early on Friday morning and heard the interview with the minister. My focus left the road a little bit a couple of times when I heard what the minister was saying. When I arrived at St Helens and was speaking to members of local government, they were also surprised that there had been some engagement with the parliament but it was only with the Assembly members and not the Legislative Council.

I am interested in what commitment has been given to LGAT? As the member for Murchison has indicated, my understanding is that LGAT were told that they would be part of preparing the terms of reference. Did I misunderstand that or has there been a commitment given to local government about being part of preparing the terms of reference? I support the request that has come from the member for Murchison and the member for Nelson in having the minutes of those meetings.

As an aside, but an important aside, I actually represent six local government areas. Not only having an interest in local government, but I have a strong interest in those six local government areas that I represent. I am really interested in that question.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am advised the matter of engagement with the stakeholders, including LGAT is a matter for the working group. I need to reinforce this process is in the very early stages. I am also advised the Director of Local Government has discussed the PESRAC reform regularly with the CEO of LGAT.

**Ms RATTRAY** - As a response to the member for Murchison, there was a suggestion or an indication there had been discussion by the working group regarding the draft terms of reference. Can I have some indication of what sort of discussions the working group had on the draft terms of reference and whether part of those discussions included engaging with the Legislative Council members and also LGAT itself?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am advised the draft terms of reference conversation was about how the working group would sign up to the PESRAC recommendations. The draft was needed to facilitate the discussion as a starting point.

**Madam CHAIR** - The minutes might help elucidate that further.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Was there was any discussion in Government in relation to local government reform as to the role the Legislative Council should play? I will say it now: I actually do not agree with my members here because with a House of review, I do not see how we can actually play a part if we are to review it properly. We have not had that debate, but I am after -

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I thank the member for his question, it is an interesting discussion amongst ourselves. It is a matter for the working group, collectively, to engage with the Legislative Council and we need to obtain an agreement from all parties in the working group before proceeding with a PESRAC recommendation, so we are in very early stages.

**Mr VALENTINE** - With respect, PESRAC can provide whatever guidance they like. It does not necessarily mean it is right. That is why I asked the question.

**Madam CHAIR** - I will take it as a comment. Any requests?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - What about the answer we had on hold?

**Madam CHAIR** - On this question?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - About when the email was sent out?

**Madam CHAIR** - We will take the vote on this and then we will come back to that. Any requests?

**Item agreed to.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We have a response from the department. There was evidently an email they believe was sent on the 17 June 2020 and it read:

As a current subscriber to the *Tasmanian Government Gazette* we are writing to notify you that as of xxx the *Gazette* RSS feed service will no longer be available. This will mean that you will no longer receive an email notification whenever a new edition of the *Gazette* or State Service notice is published. We have reviewed the service as part of our ongoing security assessment and whilst there have been no breaches to date the service has been identified as at risk.

As part of discontinuing the service your registration, your registered contact details will be removed from the data base. You can continue to access the *Tasmanian Government Gazette* from [www.gazette.tas.gov.au](http://www.gazette.tas.gov.au).

## **Division 9**

### **Minister for Science and Technology**

Operating Services

### **Output Group 3 - Electronic Services for Government Agencies and the Community**

Output 3.1 Information, Technology and Digital Services Strategy and Policy Development

**Item agreed to.**

### **Capital Services**

Capital Investment program

**Item agreed to.**

## **Minister for Climate Change**

### **Output Group 1 - Support for Executive Decision Making**

Output 1.2 Climate Change

**Ms WEBB** - I believe the response to the question on notice was we could not be provided with this information from the Government - perhaps for the record here, a rationale for why? Perhaps I should have clarified what it was.

**Madam CHAIR** - It might help if you read the question.

**Ms WEBB** - I will read the question out to you so it is clear. The question taken on notice was, please provide a breakdown of the 10 largest emitters of greenhouse gas emissions in Tasmania and the proportion of greenhouse gas emissions they are responsible for?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It is Australian government data and some is publicly available and some in confidence. I have been advised the Clean Energy Regulator also administers the Emissions Reduction Fund safeguard mechanism which requires all designated large facilities with emissions over 100 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per year to report under the Commonwealth National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act 2007. The Clean Energy Regulator has publicly reported data for 2019-20 for a number of Tasmanian facilities covered by the ERF safeguard mechanism. This data can be found online at [www.cleanenergyregulator.gov.au](http://www.cleanenergyregulator.gov.au).

**Ms WEBB** - Would those listed at that source be regarded as Tasmania's largest emitters of greenhouse gas emissions? To clarify, does the Tasmanian Government have the information available to it on who are the 10 largest emitters of greenhouse gas emissions in the state? Are they just not prepared to release it? If there are sensitivities about that, why?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The Tasmanian Government does not have the data. We only have the data provided by the Australian Government and I have provided the website where that can be found.

**Dr SEIDEL** - Again, the data you are referring to as the Government is really according to industries. That is available on the website of the Clean Energy Regulator. It is not

individual business entities. Are you advising us that the state Government is not aware who the 10 biggest emitters are in terms of business entities?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The data reported by the Australian Government is individual business emitters and I have given you the website to go through for that.

**Dr SEIDEL** - Again, I look at the website now. It is according to industries. For Tasmania the biggest emitters, non-metallic mineral product manufacturing, primary metal and metal product manufacturing, pulp, paper and converted paper product manufacturing. It does not list individual business entities. Unless you have further information that is not available on the website or I have been misdirected on the website I am accessing now.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - There are various breakdowns including by industry and business facility entity available for those entities covered by the ERF safeguard mechanisms.

**Ms WEBB** - I come back to clarify categorically, at a time that we are reviewing our climate change act and developing a climate change strategy for our state, is it a fact that the state Government does not know the 10 largest greenhouse gas emitters in the state? Or are you just saying the Government does not collect data on it? Can the Government name the 10 largest greenhouse gas emitters in this state at this time that we're developing a strategy about climate change and are reviewing our climate change act?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We focus on the five sectors and no, we cannot.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Does the Government not want to reveal the company's names?

**Ms Webb** - Does not want to know.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I do not think I have anything more to add. I do not think the Government has anything more to add.

**Mr Valentine** - That says it all.

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 9 is agreed to without request and without amendment.**

## **Division 10**

**Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment**

**Minister for Primary Industries and Water**

Operating Services

### **Output Group 2 - Primary Industries**

Output 2.1 AgriGrowth Tasmania

Output 2.2 Marine Resources

Output 2.3 Supervision of Poppy and Hemp Crops

### **Output Group 3 - Natural and Cultural Heritage**

Output 3.1 Resource Management and Conservation

**Output Group 4 - Water Resources**

Output 4.1 Water Resource Management

**Output Group 6 - Biosecurity Tasmania**

Output 6.1 Biosecurity

Output 6.2 Product Integrity

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.2 Seafood Industry Growth and Recovery

Output 90.6 Agricultural Workforce Resilience

**Items agreed to.**

**Grants and Subsidies**

**Items agreed to.**

**Capital services**

Capital investment program

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Environment**

Operating Services

**Output Group 3 - Natural and Cultural Heritage**

Output 3.5 Threatened Species

**Output Group 7 - Environment Protection and analytical Services**

Output 7.1 Environmental Management and Pollution Control

Output 7.2 Analytical Services

**Items agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Items agreed to.**

**Minister for Aboriginal Affairs**

Operating Services

**Output Group 3 - Natural and Cultural Heritage**

Output 3.3 Aboriginal Heritage and Land

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Heritage**

Operating Services

## **Output Group 3 - Natural and Cultural Heritage**

### **Output 3.2 Historic Heritage Services**

**Mr GAFFNEY** - The answer I received to one of my questions goes along the lines: the Government continues to monitor -

**Madam CHAIR** - Please read the question first, so they know which question you are referring to.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Why do we have an act of parliament for the National Trust; how did we come to have it; does the act need to be revisited? The answer we received was that the Government continues to monitor the appropriateness and effectiveness of the National Trust Act 2006 and will consider legislative changes should circumstances require. Minister, could you inform the Chamber what those circumstances might be for it to be required to be changed?

The response goes on to say that the aim was to support the long-term goal of the Trust becoming self-sustaining to be independent of government. The second question is, if it is still the aim of the current Government for the Trust to be self-sustaining, could the Government provide a table of funds received by the National Trust board since 2006, on a yearly basis?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Regarding what circumstances might wind up the Trust, that would be a policy decision based on anything that might be relevant on the day. We have agreed to take your request for a table of funds on notice, and provide it at a later date, hopefully by the end of tomorrow at the latest.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you. When I asked what legislative changes should circumstance require, I was not asking whether the Trust should wind up. My concern is, if the aim in 2006 was the Trust becoming self-sustainable, to be independent of government, if the government of the day has always maintained financial resources to the Trust, does the legislative change have to acknowledge financial independence is not now one of the aims? My concern is whether what we are doing reflects what is in the 2006 act. I do not believe it is. Thank you for the table; it will help me consider those matters further.

**Item agreed to.**

### **Grants and Subsidies.**

**Item agreed to.**

## **Minister for Parks**

### **Output Group 1 - Land Tasmania**

#### **Output 1.1 Land Titles, Survey and Mapping Services**

#### **Output 1.2 Valuation Services**

### **Output Group 3 - Natural and cultural heritage**

#### **Output 3.4 Royal Tasmanian Botanical Gardens**

### **Output Group 8 - Parks and Wildlife Management**

#### **Output 8.1 Parks and Wildlife Management**

Output 8.2 Crown land services

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.5 Improving Crown Lands Transaction Turnaround Time

**Items agreed to.**

**Grants and Subsidies.**

**Item agreed to.**

**Capital Services**

Capital Investment Program

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Racing**

Operating Services

**Output Group 5- Racing Regulation and Policy**

Output 5.1. Racing Regulation and Policy

**Item agreed to.**

**Grants and Subsidies.**

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 10 is agreed to without request and without amendment.**

**Division 11**

**Department of State Growth**

**Minister for Infrastructure and Transport**

**Output Group 2 - Infrastructure and Transport Services**

Output 2.1 Infrastructure Tasmania

Output 2.2 Road User Services

Output 2.3 Passenger Transport

**Output Group 6 - Subsidies and Concessions**

Output 6.1 Shipping and Ferry Subsidies

Output 6.2 General Access Services

Output 6.3 School Bus Services

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.15 Essential Air Freight Services Bass Strait

Output 90.16 International Air Freight Assistance

Output 90.23 Waratah-Wynyard Coastal Pathway

Output 90.28 Airport Infrastructure



## **Items agreed to.**

### **Grants and Subsidies.**

## **Item agreed to.**

### **Capital Services.**

#### Capital Investment Program

**Mr GAFFNEY** - For the benefit of Committee B, when we got to this line item, I provided the minister with a range of questions that I was not able to ask on the Floor of the House. There are not many questions here, but they relate to the questions and responses received. According to sources, since the warning signs were installed three years ago on the Leith/Bass Highway intersection, there have been no crashes in that time. As the school buses have not used the right hand turn at the intersection for three years, negating that as a safety concern, the following Budget related questions need to be addressed:

The correspondence supplied indicated that all options for the Bass Highway and Leith junctions are still on the table. It was also stated in the correspondence that the overpass options with ramps has a cost estimate of \$15.746 million.

If that is the case, could the minister provide the Committee with a cost estimate of the following options:

- (1) Speed limit signs and installation for reduced speed at Leith in the vicinity of the existing junctions of the Bass Highway;
- (2) A roundabout constructed in the vicinity of the Leith Road/Braddons Lookout Road junction with the Bass Highway;
- (3) Upgrade to existing junctions including overhead lighting at the Leith and the Bass Highway junctions; and
- (4) Right turn bans at the existing Leith and the Bass Highway junctions.

For members of Committee B, the understanding was that those were the five options that were identified and the answers that we received. We have the budget allocation for one of the options, but not the budget allocations for the other four.

Does the estimated cost of \$15.746 million include the cost of the warning signs currently installed at both sides of the Leith junctions?

What is the breakdown and the apportionment amount of the approximately \$800 000 that has already been spent to date?

Also, in the past five years there have been four accidents along the Leith section of the Bass Highway, three described as property damage and one fatality. The unfortunate fatality is listed as a cyclist error in the police report. At the Turners Beach consultations on 23 and 24 July, the Department of State Growth frequently answered questions confirmed that

this fatality was in the vicinity of the Braddon Lookout Road intersection and is not attributable to the intersection where the overpass is being proposed as an option.

The question here is, as the current warning signs have proven to be successful on this section of highway, does the minister believe a \$15.7 million overpass is necessary or warranted when other less expensive options could be utilised; and does the minister see advantages in adopting less expensive strategies to address the safety issues which are now not obvious or necessary?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We do not have cost estimates here, of course. We could say something like the roundabout would be the most expensive if you put them in order. Maybe the cheapest would be the road signs, so you could work it from the cheapest to most expensive. Overhead lighting would be more expensive than the speed signs to slow down but less expensive than the roundabout.

All options are still open and the Government has not received the breakdown of the public consultations that have been had from the Department of State Growth and it is hard to say what will come out of that. But at the minute, there are road safety issues State Growth is looking at and what will happen is what will be determined by public consultation. I am sorry, that is a book yet to be opened.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - I am a little bit concerned that in the answer I received there were five options clearly identified by the Government. The Government could give me the cost of one option being \$15.746 million and they cannot give me a breakdown of the other four options they identified in the response to me and they are letting me try and work out from cheapest to largest. There used to be a TV program that used to do that, from least expensive to most expensive and I do not think that is above board. They need to go away and come back with an indicative figure.

The second thing, in 2015, the Government said there were no safety concerns with that area of road in a report to the *Advocate* and no need to review. Then there was an accident which was not at the place where they were considering putting the overpass for \$15.746 million. Respectfully, at budget process, I am not going to go away and guess which one is the most expensive and which one is the least expensive. That would be up to the people who are undertaking this process.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The reason a price was put on an overpass is because it was budgeted for in the budget, I think it was last year and imagine it is still there. We can provide indicative prices for the others but they were not budgeted for, so, there is not a price put on those things yet. The Government does not accept there are no road safety issues there.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you. I did not mean to make light of the fact. We know there are road safety issues everywhere. What we are asking is that when the Government comes back to the people with the task force, they have identified each of the options, how much they have cost and whether that particular overpass, which is not in the place where the recent fatality has been is worth \$15.7 million of tax payers money. Could that money be better utilised somewhere else? Especially, in the last three years there have been no crash statistics at that place because they have introduced warning signs and there are other options they can look at. There will be many people out there waiting for this report to come back, showing the costings and safety benefits of each of those options.

**Mrs HISCUTT**- The comment is noted.

**Item agreed to.**

## **Minister for Energy and Emissions Reduction**

### **Output Group 3 - Energy and Emissions Reduction Policy and Advice**

#### **3.1 Energy and Emissions Reduction Policy and Advice**

### **Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

#### **90.18 Small Business Energy Support Grant Program**

**Item agreed to.**

## **Minister for State Growth**

### **Output Group 1 - Industry, Skills Development and Business Growth**

#### **1.1 Office of the Coordinator-General**

**Ms FORREST** - One of the functions within the Coordinator-General's Office is the red tape reduction and reports produced detailing the red tape reduction that has been undertaken by the Government. But there is also a regulatory reform report prepared called the Tasmanian regulatory reform report which is put together through consultation with relevant stakeholders and bodies, including local government. I have spoken to a number of people who have a great interest in this report because they have provided advice and comment about potential red tape reduction areas. It is of interest across the board, because everyone complains about it and everyone wants to do something about it. It is quite welcome when the people operating in all areas where there is regulation, have their voices heard.

In our committee we asked for a copy of this report because this will no doubt guide future decisions around what areas of red tape there is. No doubt at some stage government will act, either by regulatory reform through the regulations, maybe legislative reform or a policy change. Not everything requires legislative change to give effect to red tape reduction.

Mr Jaensch, when questioned about this by the member for Nelson, said, 'this information that was commissioned for us for use by the Government'. Many documents have been published on relevant websites. When you go for consultation you get the information back and then make decisions through legislation as a result of that. We are seeing that all the time in various areas of government. There seem to be some particular confidentiality around this one which I and other members of the committee could not understand. The member for Nelson asked what was your reason for not putting that report into the public domain. Mr Jaensch said - 'it is a matter of information that is provided to the Government and to Cabinet for consideration of its policy directions'. It was provided to the Government and it naturally then went to Cabinet to look at whether there should be policy change or whatever, as all those reports prepared for Government do.

We are keen to see this report as it is relevant and there are many people who would like to see whether their suggestions have been taken up and what the Government might actually do with them. That information may not necessarily be in the report, but a collation of the information provided certainly would be. The minister said - 'the Government commissioned

that information for its red tape reduction agenda and sought a range of views'. This is what I have been saying and I have been talking to members of my community that confirm it. Anything we have chosen to change laws for or to change the operation of business of Government, we bring this through the fully public process in parliament.

We asked him for a copy of it and he declined to provide that. The member for Nelson asked if she put an RTI in would it be possible? He said he does not make RTI decisions. It is irrelevant regardless to a parliamentary committee. A parliamentary committee can ask for any of these such documents and should receive them. I pushed him on that and he said he was advised that the report is cabinet-in-confidence.

How can a report such as this, that has sought feedback from a range of stakeholders, local government, people in business, people in agriculture, people everywhere in Tasmania be suddenly deemed cabinet-in-confidence when it is this report to the Government that may lead to further policy change, legislative change or regulatory change?

I asked, on what basis do you make the claim that this document meets the cabinet-in-confidence requirements? He took that question on notice. I thought he would have known the answer to that but he did not. We went on talking about other matters and then the minister came back to this some time later after we had dealt with this question. In relation to a report that was previously discussed - I think at this point we had closed off on this line item, I am not sure but it was after some other further discussion, he said:

In relation to the report that was previously discussed, the report was confidential advice to Cabinet. It formed part of Cabinet deliberations as part of the red tape reduction reform program. This occurred under the stewardship of the previous minister. As the document formed part of those confidential Cabinet deliberations, it therefore attracts cabinet-in-confidence designation and isn't able to be released on that basis as per accepted conventions.

I asked the minister, 'Can you talk about what 'Cabinet deliberations' actually means?' If he has read the report of this House - which he has not and he should - the Production of Documents committee report - I advise everyone in Government to read it so they understand what we are talking about here. In my mind, it is not possible for a document such as the one we are talking about to reveal the deliberations of Cabinet. If you are going to reveal the deliberations of Cabinet, the Cabinet have to meet, have a discussion and then decide on something. It may be with advice from that report, or from other reports from the Coordinator-General's office itself.

To me, that is a most unsatisfactory answer that it reveals the deliberations of Cabinet and it is on that basis that the report is not provided. I ask the Leader to table a copy of this report because clearly, the response we got from the minister about this was that - and this goes to the second question that I had on the questions that we had on notice about providing a copy of the report and how the report actually revealed the deliberations of Cabinet. How could it possibly?

There was no satisfactory answer to that, it was basically silent on that point. As was requested in our follow-up letters, I would like the Leader to table a copy of that report, noting that it was a report prepared for government to consider red tape reduction. They proudly publish a report on red tape reduction that they have done every year that includes every other

year they have ever done it. It is a massive report, which is great, but surely this would have no more confidentiality attached to it than that report?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The report is designated cabinet-in-confidence. The report was confidential advice to Cabinet and it formed part of Cabinet deliberations as part of the red tape reduction reform program which occurred under the stewardship of the previous minister. As the document formed part of confidential Cabinet deliberations, it therefore attracts cabinet-in-confidence designation and cannot be released on that basis, as per the accepted convention.

**Ms FORREST** - I will repeat my question. How does the report reveal the deliberations of Cabinet? I am not asking what the deliberations were, I am asking how it does? How does this report that was prepared well outside the Cabinet process, actually reveal the deliberations of Cabinet? That is what the minister said it did.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The report captures a range of confidential stakeholder's opinions, feedback and thoughts on their subjective experiences in engaging with the regulatory system, which crosses over a range of ministerial portfolios. The views of stakeholders are not necessarily the views of government and are not government policy until considered and endorsed by the Cabinet. Compromising the in-confidence nature of the report would reasonably lead to a reduction in participation in similar processes in the future, either in terms of the forthrightness of the views offered or willingness to be involved at all. The report forms part of Cabinet deliberations as part of the red tape reduction reform program which occurred under the stewardship of a previous minister. Disclosure of the report would reveal deliberations of the Cabinet.

**Ms FORREST** - Okay, we have changed the excuse slightly. We are now saying that it contained confidential input from stakeholders. That does not attract immunity under cabinet-in-confidence immunity. That may be commercially sensitive information, potentially, but why would someone wanting to get rid of red tape reveal their confidential business information? They would not, they are talking about some of the barriers that are there. I think the minister has dug himself such a deep hole here, he is just going to keep digging and he will be that far down that he will not be able to climb out.

**Ms Webb** - He could redact that anyway.

**Ms FORREST** - Well, he did it across the table. That is not a reason to not provide a report to a parliamentary committee and there are many mechanisms for providing a report. If there was commercially sensitive information in there, it can be provided to a committee in camera.

This is a parliamentary committee. This is not some organisation outside that wants to check on their competition. This is a parliamentary committee. Asking for a document that is relevant to this area within the Budget, where we see red tape reduction - there is a whole line item on the funding of the Coordinator-General's office and includes funding for the Red Tape Reduction Coordinator. Then to say that that very report goes on to reveal deliberations of Cabinet beggars belief - that the minister and the Leader - you are the one who is having to deliver the message here - to say that that would reveal a deliberation of Cabinet when it is provided to government; it has not even gone to Cabinet.

It is provided to the Government as a process relating to red tape reduction and here we are, we are being told it is revealing the deliberations of Cabinet. Minutes reveal the deliberations of Cabinet. I have not asked for those. We spent weeks and months looking into this. We wrote a whole report about this and this completely flies in the face of all the available evidence about what open, transparent and responsible government looks like. This is not open. It is not transparent and it is certainly is not responsible. It is pure obfuscation. It is putting up a shield claiming revealing Cabinet deliberations and then adding in perhaps some commercial sensitivity to try to sweeten it, which does not apply.

I will ask the Leader, again, to provide a copy of it. I will not hold up this process while waiting because there are other mechanisms this House can use and may consider using to push the point that this is an important report that many people have an interest in.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I can assure the member that your comments have been heard and are being heard as we speak; however, the outcome is still the same. The Government considers the report to be cabinet-in-confidence. I understand the release of the report was raised during debates on both omnibus bills and during previous Estimates hearings. The Government has always maintained the report is cabinet-in-confidence as per the longstanding convention. but I can assure you, member for Murchison, your comments have been noted.

#### **Item agreed to.**

#### **Output 1.2 Industry and Business Development**

**Ms FORREST** - Madam Deputy Chair, I thought I would have one more go. In our scrutiny, we actually asked for some information regarding the breakdown of the Macquarie Point line item. There was quite a degree of information given during the Estimates process. We were provided with high level information regarding the funding provided to for the Macquarie Point Development Corporation. What was not there and I would actually like to have is further detail regarding the numbers of employees within the organisation and the salary bands on which each of those employees are employed to make up that total figure.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The operating expenses for the corporation are as follows: salaries and wages including on costs are \$2.05 million in 2021-22. \$2.09 million in 2022-23; and \$2.13 million in 2023-24.

Board and panel meetings costs are: \$160 000 in 2021-22; \$163 200 in 2022-23; \$166 464 in 2023-24.

Property costs which cover power, water and sewerage, rates, cleaning, security, waste management and insurance are: \$235 thousand 2021-22; \$239 700 in 2022-23; \$244 494 in 2023-24.

**Ms Forrest** - If I might interrupt this was all provided to us. I was actually asking for a breakdown of the first line item, the salaries and wages including on costs, how many staff, what were the rates, what bands were they employed at? That is the question, all the other information was provided.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The corporation has an employment profile consistent with the site development and active projects. The staff of 14.8 FTEs are on short-term contracts that allow flexibility with site development and all salaries are aligned with the State Service Act. Rather

than duplicate teams such as IT, HR and Legal, the corporation has entered into a service level agreement with the Department of State Growth to provide these administrative services. In addition, the corporation adheres to all government policies and procedures such as right to information, the public service code of conduct, public disclosure and is committed to upholding the aims and objectives of the Integrity Commission Act. Is that what the member was looking for?

**Ms FORREST** - No. The information you were reading out initially was all provided. This purpose is for asking further questions based on the information we get when it is not clear all the information is there.

What I asked for, is the salaries and wages, the salary bands of what you tell me is 14.8 FTEs, but you also said that excludes people like HR, IT and payroll that are done through State Growth. There are 14.8 employees who do the operating and I would like to know what each of the job titles are. It is a lot of people, if you are taking out HR, IT, payroll and a range of other things outsourced to State Growth, and what salary bands each of those 14.8 FTEs are on.

I am interested in the number of board/panel meetings? Is there a board and panel? Who is on the board and who are on the panel, because we are talking about \$160 000 per annum for the operating of that aspect as well as the over \$2 million for only the salary and wages.

Do you have that, Leader?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The board expenses, salaries and superannuation are as follows:

The Chair, Scullin - \$47 000  
Director Morris - \$26 000  
Director Berkhout - \$26 000  
Director Eslake - \$26 000, and  
Director Hogg - \$26 000

**Ms Forrest** - What are the panels then?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - There is something like a risk and audit committee but they do not get paid.

**Ms Forrest** - They are members of the board that make up a subcommittee?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, that is correct.

**Ms Forrest** - What are the panels?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - They are there for the procurement of land or other things like that. With the 14.5 FTEs, we will seek further advice on their breakdown which we hope to provide by the end of tomorrow. Can we put a bit more of an extensive list there, of what panels do?

**Ms Forrest** - Yes. The questions that are outstanding are, I want positions and salary band of each of the 14.8 you said, not 14.5 FTEs.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We have not got that here. We have 1.2 which is recommended enclosed. We do not have what you are asking.

**Ms Forrest** - When you read out your first answer, not read the answers we already had but you said there were 14.8 FTEs.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, sorry, 14.8 FTEs.

**Ms Forrest** - I want the 14.8 FTEs, each position, title and salary band of each of those, including on costs. You have given the members of the board, that is fine. And who the panel members are and what they are for.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Okay. Yes, we can provide that, but not here and now. Hopefully, by the end of tomorrow. I notice on my list we do not have those particular follow-up questions.

**Ms Forrest** - With all due respect Madam Deputy Chair, the line item was left open.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, but there was no particular question that was put forward. Is that correct? It asked for a full breakdown of expenses.

I have Industry and Business Development - 1.2. I have that recommended here. We have it on hand now and have made an undertaking.

#### **Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.3 Business Support Loan Scheme - Interest Costs

**Item agreed to.**

#### **Minister for Resources**

Operating Services

#### **Output Group 4 - Resources Policy and Regulatory Services**

Output 4.1 Forestry Policy and Reform

Output 4.2 Mineral Resources

**Items agreed to.**

#### **Grants and Subsidies**

**Item agreed to.**

#### **Minister for the Arts**

Operating Services

#### **Output Group 5 - Cultural and Tourism Development**

Output 5.1 Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery

Output 5.2 Arts Industry Development

Output 5.3 Screen Industry Development

**Items agreed to.**



## **Grants and Subsidies**

### **Item agreed to.**

#### **Minister for Small Business**

Operating Services

#### **Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.22 Peak Body Support Fund

Output 90.24 Small Business sustainability and Recovery Assistance Package

### **Items agreed to.**

#### **Minister for Hospitality and Events**

Operating Services

#### **Output group 5 - Cultural and Tourism Development**

Output 5.4 Events and Hospitality

---

### **Tabled Paper**

#### **Estimates Committee B - Additional Information**

**Ms RATTRAY** (by leave) - Madam Chair, I table the additional information provided by the Minister for Hospitality and Events in relation to Output group 5.4 to be included as part of the report of Estimates Committee B. By way of explanation, this information was provided after the committee finalised its report and therefore the relevant output group was left open for further debate.

**Ms RATTRAY** - I will use a call on this, Madam Chair. In the interests of being open, transparent and responsible and a footy lover, I think it is important to note how much, and the question was asked - provide information regarding the additional AFL games in relation to the rationale and costings per game?

The Government made the following payments to the AFL for hosting the additional games during the 2021 season, and I hope I am not stealing the member for Elwick's thunder. I will read them out and you can do your bit.

Hawthorn Football Club versus the Bombers, 20 June 2021 - \$500 000; Hawthorn Football Club versus the Brisbane Lions, 1 August 2021 - \$400 000; Sydney versus the Giants, 28 August 2021 - \$500 000; Bulldogs versus the Bombers, 29 August 2021 - \$500 000; North Melbourne Football Club versus the Brisbane Lions, 19 June 2021 - \$545 455; St Kilda versus the Dockers, 22 August 2021 - \$200 000.

The total for those six games is \$2.65 million, almost, for football -

**Madam CHAIR** - Ah, but the return.

**Ms RATTRAY** - The return. I want to add this extra bit here. The cost agreed for the additional games was negotiated directly with the AFL and with consideration of the per game

cost built into the existing contracts with the Hawthorn Football Club, as well as factors that were linked to the COVID-19 environment. I expect that it was relating to the fact that some of the teams stayed in Tasmania in quarantine. I know one of the teams stayed at Barnbougle and completely took over the Barnbougle facility.

**Mr Willie** - I saw them training on the polo field.

**Ms RATTRAY** - Yes. Of course, the staff were rostered on - half the staff on and half the staff off - because when they left the staff who were on duty had to go into quarantine. It is a considerable amount of money on top of the money provided through the arrangements we have in place through the TT-Line and the Hawthorn Football Club. The message I have for government - and this is not a question - is that when members ask on behalf of their communities for consideration, for support in the future, do not tell me there is no money.

I hope I did not steal your thunder.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, member for McIntyre. I wasn't in the Chamber so you gave me a chance to get here and ask these questions. As I did in Estimates and the member for McIntyre knows this, I will declare I went to two of these games. I went to the Sydney v Giants' final and it was great. My wife goes for Sydney so the result was not great, losing by a point, but it was a good game and you could see the economic activity, given it was a final and people were coming from all over the state. It was sold out in no time at all.

**Ms Rattray** - There was no issue travelling to the north of the state?

**Mr WILLIE** - No. We had accommodation.

**Mr Valentine** - Only the potholes on the way back.

**Mr WILLIE** - I am building up to my point. That one was \$500 000 and then you look at North Melbourne Football Club v the Lions on 19 June and that was \$545 455 so probably not generating the same sort of activity or interest.

**Madam CHAIR** - I do not know. The Roos were pretty good.

**Mr WILLIE** - I do not want to offend North Melbourne supporters or Lions supporters but I would assume that game did not sell out and it was not attended by people from around the state, yet the state paid more for it. Also, the St Kilda game, and I am a St Kilda supporter and we went to that game. I think we won by 65 points or something.

The environment at that time was that Melbourne was in disarray because of COVID and we still paid \$200 000 when the AFL was probably desperate to find somewhere to play that game. I am interested in whether the Government's starting position was we will host the game but we are not paying for it. We will provide a venue for you and you can come here and play an AFL game and we will provide the public health requirements for that.

My first question is, was that the Government's starting position? How did we end up at \$200 000? I can tell you from attending that game there was not the same sort of economic activity for that game as maybe the finals. I am interested in why there is a discrepancy between

all of these games? How did the Government approach those negotiations? Some of it does not make sense to me.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It costs us an average of \$500 000 per game as it is so you can see that the St Kilda versus Dockers' game was a bargain for Tasmania.

**Mr WILLIE** - My question is that the AFL was desperate to find a venue at that time. Why would we pay for it?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It was negotiated and that is what was agreed.

**Dr Seidel** - It was not a negotiation, it was a giveaway.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - It is about maintaining a strong relationship with the AFL, that we are an interested state.

**Mr Willie** - An ongoing commission or something like that?

**Madam CHAIR** - Any requests? Honourable member for Elwick.

**Mr WILLIE** - I don't want anyone to get me wrong, I love football and I love having AFL content in this state. I welcome the additional games that we had this year. However, my question concerns value for money. At the time of that St Kilda game, the AFL was desperate to find a venue - yet we were dishing out \$200 000 of taxpayers' money to host it. We could potentially have hosted it for nothing and achieved the same outcome - football content in the state - without taxpayers' money going towards it. My other question relates to that North Melbourne versus Lions game, and why we paid more for that. We hosted two finals games in Launceston which were sellouts and generated economic activity; yet we paid more for a game that probably had less interest.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I hear what the member is saying but these games were negotiated in good faith with the AFL and it is to show that Tasmania has an ongoing interest in AFL and we are keen to progress what the Premier started. I do not have much more to add, other than they were negotiated and that was what the arrangement came to.

**Mr WILLIE** - You mentioned the Premier, so I could not let that go. The Premier has talked a big game around no more deals for the AFL until we have a time line, and a lot of Tasmanians support a Tasmanian team and want to see that progressed. It seems as though there are ongoing deals with the AFL in the language you are using.

**Mrs Hiscutt** - I do not mean to mislead anybody. There are no -

**Mr WILLIE** - You are talking about maintaining an ongoing relationship, and it sounds like an arrangement and there are deals involved - and yet, the Premier is saying no more deals.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I dare not speak on behalf of the Premier. If you are trying to suggest that there is something going on there - there is not. This is just to show good faith that Tasmania is an AFL state and we are keen to progress that, and these prices that you have here have been negotiated with the AFL.

**Item agreed to.**

**Minister for Tourism**

Operating services

**Output Group 5 - Cultural and Tourism Development**

Output 5.5 Visitor Economy Support

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.21 Make Yourself at Home Travel Vouchers

**Items agreed to.**

**Minister for Skills, Training and Workforce Growth**

**Output Group 1 - Industry, Skills Development and Business Growth**

Output 1.3 Skills and Workforce Development

**Output Group 90 - COVID-19 Response and Recovery**

Output 90.2 Rapid Response Skills Initiative

Output 90.4 Targeted Small Business Grants Program for Apprentices and Trainees

Output 90.25 Priority Industry Skills Funding - More Teachers at TasTAFE

Output 90.26 Expansion of the Apprentices and Trainees Small Business Grant

Output 90.27 Funding of Key VET Courses (JobTrainer)

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 11 is agreed to without request or amendment.**

**Division 12**

**Tourism Tasmania**

**Minister for Tourism**

**Output group 1 - Tourism**

1.1 Tourism

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 12 is agreed to without request or amendment.**

**Division 13**

**Department of Treasury and Finance**

**Treasurer**

**Output Group 1 - Financial and Resource Management Services**

Output 1.1 Budget Development and Management

Output 1.2 Financial Management and Accounting Services

Output 1.3 Shareholder Advice on Government Businesses

**Output Group 2 - Economic and Fiscal Policy Advice**

Output 2.1 Economic Policy Advice

Output 2.3 Intergovernmental Financial Matters

Output 2.4 Renewables, Climate and Future Industries Tasmania

**Output Group 3 - Revenue, Superannuation and Regulatory Management Services**

Output 3.5 Administration of Grants, Subsidies and Concessions

**Output Group 4 - Community Assistance**

Output 4.1 Public Trustee Community Service Obligation

**Items agreed to.**

**Minister for Finance**

**Output Group 1 - Financial and Resource Management Services**

Output 1.4 Government Property and Accommodation Services

**Item agreed to.**

Output 1.5 Government Procurement Services

**Ms LOVELL** - A follow-on question from the answer to the question on notice in relation to the buy local policy. The question was: under the Tasmanian Government's buy local policy it is mandatory for all procurements with a value of more than \$5 million to have a TIPP. For procurements with a value greater than \$2 million a TIPP may be required at the discretion of the procuring agency. Is there any mechanism to track which procurements between \$2 million and \$5 million required or produced a TIPP? What percentage of projects in this category were required to have a TIPP?

The response we received from the minister was that there is no central mechanism; it is at the agency's discretion. There is a requirement in the policy for contracts between \$2 million and \$5 million to have a TIPP at the discretion of the agency. Under what circumstances are those plans required? Under what circumstances are they not required? Who is monitoring that; because if you say there is a requirement but it is at the discretion of the agency, what is stopping every agency from just saying, well, we do not require it so we are not going to request them? I will leave it at that for now.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I will seek advice on that. To be clear, your question is, who is monitoring the do, or the do not, at that point?

**Ms Lovell** - The response from the minister is that there is no central monitoring of that, so I take it that the agencies are monitoring themselves. Under what circumstances would a plan be required and under what circumstances would it not be required?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am advised that the head of the agency - the secretary - makes that call and it can be monitored by the Auditor-General at some stage; but the secretary of the department takes responsibility for that.

**Ms LOVELL** - To clarify, it may be monitored by the Auditor-General at some stage; that would be if the Auditor-General decided there might be something worth looking at or there was a reference to the Auditor-General to look into that. That is the only way this is ever monitored or tracked?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - For the over \$5 million the approved Tasmanian Industry Participation Plan must be provided to the Department of Treasury and Finance within 10 days of the execution of the contract agreement of grant deeds. I think we are agreed on that, other than that it is up to the secretary, the head of the agency and they have to look at the objectives of the policy value for money and all that sort of stuff. Ultimately, the head or the secretary is accountable to the minister of the day. As you have said, at times this can be referred to the Auditor-General and he/she can have a look at that whenever they like, but the cut-off point is the \$5 million.

**Item agreed to.**

## **Output Group 2 - Economic and Fiscal Policy Advice**

### **2.2 Regulatory Policy**

**Item agreed to.**

## **Output Group 3 - Revenue, Superannuation and Regulatory Management Services**

### **3.1 Tax Administration and Revenue Collection**

**Ms WEBB** - I have a range of questions to follow up on matters taken on notice and the answers provided. I will make my way through those and put them to you as a series of questions in my first call and then we can follow up if necessary with further calls.

The first one is a question taken on notice, which was to please provide the modelling done by the department in regard to the taxation revenue expected to be collected under the Future Gaming Market reforms. The answer received indicates Treasury has done modelling and indicates it expects to receive additional revenue of \$8.5 million per year. I did not ask for that information regarding the \$8.5 million per year which was provided during Estimates. I asked for the modelling to be provided, the detail of the modelling, so we could see how that figure was actually arrived at. I will reiterate my request or perhaps it is something you would need to provide in tabled form rather than verbally, but I would like the modelling provided that shows how we arrive at the \$8.5 million.

A question taken on notice was, please provide a list of the groups been involved in targeted consultation process in relation to the Community Support Levy distribution under the Future Gaming Market reforms and the criteria on which they were selected. We have received a reply and I would like to pick up on some further detail from that because I do not believe it has answered the question effectively. In the answer provided, it is indicated there have been public consultation processes. It says as part of the Future Gaming Market implementation a combination of targeted and public consultation processes have been and are continuing to be undertaken. It indicates two stages of public consultation, which identify changes to the Community Support Levy and outlines the intention of changes to the expenditure arrangements that have been undertaken.

In the first instance, I would like that to be corrected on the record, that the Government acknowledge neither of those two stages of public consultation, firstly in February last year on elements of the implementation framework and the second one being the consultation recently undertaken this year on the draft bill, specifically invited input or provided any detail of a suggested future model for the Community Support Levy. Those two public consultation processes were not in relation to the Community Support Levy per se and certainly, not any

proposed changes or new model for the distribution of that levy. Therefore, they were not public consultations on the matter this question is about. I would like that acknowledged.

What the Government seems to be suggesting is because some submissions made in those two separate different public consultation processes mentioned the Community Support Levy, they somehow constituted public consultation on it, which I would dispute. If any of the submissions made in those two consultation rounds did in fact mention the Community Support Levy that was at the choice of the submitters, not at the invitation of the Government in those consultation rounds. I would like the Government to acknowledge that.

The Government, further in its answer to this question, talks about the targeted consultation recently undertaken in which the views of a cross-section of interested parties was sought, some of whom were selected given their interest in the issue, identified through responses to the public consultation processes.

I am taking that to mean, those previously mentioned two public consultation processes on the implementation framework and the draft bill - not the Community Support Levy - had some submissions that mentioned the Community Support Levy and in some instances those submitters were taken to have an interest in this and were included in the targeted consultation.

My question, going back to the question taken on notice, was the criteria on which this targeted consultation selected people, entities or groups to be involved? How was it determined who would be included in this targeted consultation? That has not been answered yet and I would like an answer to it.

The reason I would like an answer to it, is if part of that criteria was that they mentioned the Community Support Levy in submissions to previous consultation on other aspects of this policy, I want to understand why, for example, in the recent consultation on the draft bill, of the submitters there, the Tailrace Community Church were chosen to be then part of this targeted support levy consultation because they mentioned Community Support Levy in their submission.

In the same consultation process, the Religious Society of Friends, the Quakers in Australia, who made a submission and who also mention the Community Support Levy, were not included in the targeted consultation on the Community Support Levy. The National Council of Women Tasmania, who in their submission to the draft legislation mentioned the Community Support Levy and made comments about it, were not included in the targeted consultation that subsequently has occurred on the Community Support Levy and the new way it will be disbursed.

I want to understand the full rationale and criteria applied as to who would be included in that targeted list and who would be excluded or not invited, so we can understand, for example, how inclusion of the ones I have mentioned came about.

I would like an explanation with regard to the answer provided which gives us a dot point list of the groups that received the survey as part of this targeted consultation on the Community Support Levy. Looking at this dot point list, there are some peak body groups and some others that are probably quite understandable usual suspects. I wonder why the Tasmanian Hospitality Association is included and what its direct relevance is to how the Community Support Levy is disbursed and the model by which it is disbursed. Where is their relevance to this?

This levy is collected from the use of poker machines within venues the THA is the peak body for, but it and those venues have no role in deciding the model by which we disburse that hypothecated tax. It is a state tax, it is hypothecated into that CSL bucket. They have no role in determining the model by which we disburse that bucket of state tax. They have no insight to provide into how we direct that to the entities described in the disbursement model. Why are they on the targeted list at this point in time?

In relation to that list and the targeted consultation, how many from that list who have received the survey as per this answer, have actually returned the survey? How many responses have been received to date? Will all received survey responses be made publicly available, for example, on the Treasury and Finance website or another public sphere? If so, when?

The final part of this question which relates to the answers provided to the question on notice about the Community Support Levy distribution, is that in our Estimates hearing, Mr Ferguson, when asked about whether there was an intention to have a broad and open public consultation on the future model of disbursing the Community Support Levy, said that he would say to the committee that, 'the Government will keep an open mind in terms of that process and not make any commitment here today'. He repeated further, 'we will keep that option open, I think, is what I am saying today'. That was two weeks ago during our Estimates hearings. I note also the Premier on a WIN news report on 16 September when asked about this matter to do with the CSL model, said, 'what we will do is ensure that we consult closely with the community on how best to target those additional funds'.

Given the minister's statement that he would keep an open mind and an open option on this and given the Premier's statement that you would be consulting closely with the community on the Community Support Levy new model of disbursement, is the Government prepared to commit today to including in this process - subsequent to the targeted process that has already occurred - an open public consultation on the new model proposed for the distribution of the Community Support Levy funds under Future Gaming Market policy?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - This is a summary of the current and future modelling based on the 2018-19 actuals. The total for hotel and club currently was \$31 476 323 and the future modelling is \$44 419 670. The difference there is \$12 943 347 so total keno modelling currently is \$1 945 241. The future is \$7 219 022 and the change is \$5 273 781.

**Ms Webb** - Why would this not be tabled for an answer so that we could refer to it when it was asked for?

**Madam CHAIR** - That is a matter for the Government.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am sorry, I cannot table this document because there is other material on that. I only have one more to read out.

Total casino current is \$21 247 80 and the future is \$11 524 928. The change there is a negative number, minus \$9 722 152.

I am sorry I cannot table this as it has other stuff on it.

**Ms Webb** - You could put a clean copy in and table that.



**Mrs HISCUTT** - I will seek some more information.

With regard to the public consultation process, the CSL was detailed in the consultation package and there was no modelling at that stage, so they could talk about what they preferred. The primary selection was that peak bodies were selected and there were some additions. As to why some were in and some were out, we would have to look at that further.

**Ms WEBB** - I asked for that information. That was the question on notice. I will just repeat. Please provide a list of the groups that have been involved in the targeted consultation in relation to the CSL distribution under the future of gaming reforms and the criteria on which they were selected. This is what you were asked in Estimates two weeks ago.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The reason some were selected was because they provided additional information. But as to why they were not selected, we did not look at that or we selected the ones that we thought could put the most input in and there probably would be a reason but we are not aware of it here and now.

**Ms Webb** - Oh, my goodness.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The THA made comments on the CSL in their first submission; that is why they were selected. How many responses were there? I think you have that provided. Do you want me to read them out? TasCOSS, Anglicare?

**Ms Webb** - Excuse me, just to clarify. The list of dot points that was received, under groups that received the survey? Is that also the list of the surveys that were received back?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes. We received a response from everybody on that list. When will the responses be publicly available? Yes, they will be made publicly available, that is, there will be an effort and hopefully that will be done next week or very soon in the week after.

There is one more question. Will there be further consultation? The minister is yet to receive advice on this consultation. He needs to receive that report first and determine whether he needs to go for another round of consultation. So, I cannot answer that question yet.

**Ms WEBB** - Just to come back to the targeted consultation and to clarify a few things about that. What you have said to me is that peak bodies were included and some additional, and that there probably was a reason but we are not aware of it here and now, in terms of how those other groups were included. Correct?

I am interested because you have been specifically asked for the criteria on which these groups were selected back during Estimates, on the day. Here you are, two weeks later, and it remains unanswered. It remains an open question. For example, I want to know as I just read out earlier, why was the Tailrace Community Church included but not say, the Religious Society of Friends, the Quakers? Why not the National Council of Women? If the THA is in there, as you have just told me, by virtue of the fact that they happened to mention it in their submission, why were not the other groups who happened to mention it in their submissions also all included? What was the cut-off?

That is not even asking you about the individuals who mentioned it in their submissions who were also excluded from the targeted process, even though most individuals that you

received submissions from did mention the CSL? Let us just stick to the groups that put submissions in and answer me that. I want to know who decided the criteria by which these selections would be made and who made the final decisions on who would and would not be included in that targeted consultation? When was that decision made?

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The project team within Treasury makes those decisions and it is not unusual for them to have - or for any group - to have targeted consultation. The purpose of selecting those groups was to refine the modelling as it came out.

**Ms Webb** - That does not answer my question at all.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - The Deputy Secretary, the project team within Treasury, looked at who to put in according to the criteria they wanted or needed as opposed to who to leave out. I have been assured that they can have a look at some of those that were left out to try to work out why they were left out as opposed to being put in. Are you happy for the department to take that on notice and provide that later? They would have to look at those submissions and see why they were out as opposed to in.

**Ms Webb** - If that answers the question that has now been put numerous times of the criteria involved in the selection of those, whether it is to put them in or out, yes, I will take that information if you are going to be providing it. Particularly given the examples I have provided to you today from submissions.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I reckon these four examples you have provided us today will be -

**Ms Webb** - That is just illustrative but I want to understand the basis of the decision.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Are you asking the department to go through every submission or just the peak ones?

**Ms Webb** - There are not that many.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - We do not know how many were left out.

**Ms Webb** - I am looking at the list on the website of who made submissions to the two processes. There are not that many. The thing I am interested in is not a personal explanation for each of them, just the criteria, so I can understand why some were left in and some were left out.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - I am being assured that is something that can be provided. I cannot guarantee it will be by tomorrow afternoon but I can say it will be provided.

**Madam CHAIR** - You are clear on the question?

**Ms Webb** - You have had two weeks to answer this.

**Madam CHAIR** - Order. The question as I understand it from the Chair is you are asking, what is the criteria on which people were selected? The criteria is what is being asked for.

**Mrs HISCUTT** - Yes, who was selected and why those were not selected. We can provide that.

**Madam CHAIR** - There must have been selection criteria. Any requests?

**Item agreed to.**

Output 3.2 Regulation and Administration of Liquor and Gaming  
Output 3.4 Office of the Superannuation Commission

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 13 agreed to without request or amendment.**

**The Schedule agreed to without request or amendment.**

**Postponed clause 4 -**

**Clause agreed to.**

**Postponed clause 5 -**

**Clause agreed to.**

**Title agreed to.**

**Bill reported without request and without amendment.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the third reading of the bill be made an order of the day for tomorrow.

**Motion agreed to.**

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) 2021 (No. 37)**

### **Second Reading**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move that -

The bill be now read the second time.

**Bill read the second time.**

## **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) 2021 (No. 37)**

### **In Committee**

**Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.**

**Clause 4 postponed.**

**Clause 5 postponed.**

**Clause 6 agreed to.**

### **Schedule 1**

#### **Division 1**

##### **House of Assembly**

##### **Operating Services**

#### **Output Group 1 - House of Assembly Support Services**

Output 1.1 House of Assembly Support Services

Output 1.2 Select Committee Support Services

Output 1.3 Investigatory Committee Support Services

#### **Output Group 2 - Payments Administered by the House of Assembly**

Output 2.1 Payments Administered by the House of Assembly

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 1 agreed to without request.**

#### **Division 2**

##### **Integrity Commission**

##### **Operating Services**

#### **Output Group 1 - Integrity Commission**

Output 1.1 Integrity Commission

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 2 is agreed to without request.**

#### **Division 3**

##### **Legislative Council**

##### **Operating Services**

#### **Output Group 1 - Legislative Council Support Services**

Output 1.1 Legislative Council Support Services

Output 1.2 Committee Support Services

## **Output Group 2 - Payments Administered by the Legislative Council**

Output 2.1 Payments Administered by the Legislative Council

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 3 agreed to without request.**

## **Division 4**

### **Legislature-General**

Operating Services

## **Output Group 1 - Parliamentary Reporting Service**

Output 1.1 Production and Printing of Parliamentary Reports

## **Output Group 2 - Parliamentary Library Service**

Output 2.1 Parliamentary Library Service

## **Output Group 3 - Parliamentary Printing and Systems**

Output 3.1 Parliamentary Printing

Output 3.2 Parliamentary Systems

## **Output Group 4 - Joint Services**

Output 4.1 Building and Operations Management

Output 4.2 Joint Management Services

Output 4.3 Services to Members

Output 4.4 Corporate Services for Parliamentary Agencies

**Items agreed to.**

**Division 4 agreed to without request.**

## **Division 5**

### **Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions**

## **Output Group 1 - The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions**

Output 1.1 The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 5 agreed to without request.**

## **Division 6**

### **Office of the Governor**

## **Output Group 1 - The Office of the Governor**

Output 1.1 Support for the Governor

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 6 agreed to without request.**

**Division 7**  
**Office of the Ombudsman**

**Output Group 1 - The Office of the Ombudsman**

Output 1.1 Decisions on Complaints Referred to the Ombudsman and Health Complaints Commissioner and Right to Information

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 7 agreed to without request.**

**Division 8**  
**Tasmanian Audit Office**

**Output Group 1 - Public Sector Performance and Accountability**

Output 1.1 Public Sector Performance and Accountability

**Item agreed to.**

**Division 8 agreed to without request.**

**Schedule agreed to without request.**

**Postponed Clause 4 agreed to.**

**Postponed Clause 5 agreed to.**

**Title agreed to.**

**Bill reported without request and without amendment.**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That the third reading of the bill be made an order of the day for tomorrow.

**Motion agreed to.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I move -

That at its rising the Council adjourn until 11 a.m. Wednesday  
22 September 2021.

**Mrs HISCUTT** (Montgomery - Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council) -  
Mr President, I remind members of the briefings tomorrow morning starting at 9.30 a.m. in

Committee Room 2 with the Children, Young Persons and their Families Amendment Bill, followed by the Defamation Amendment Bill.

**The Council adjourned at 5.15 p.m.**

## Appendix 1

School	Description	Capital Costs	Minor Works	Schedule	Year
Goulburn Street PS		N/A			
	Soundproofing		\$ 35,000.00		2015-16
	Toilet Upgrade		\$ 220,000.00		2017-18
	Fire Upgrade			\$ 3,000.00	2019-20
	Fire Upgrade			\$ 4,000.00	2021-21
	Painting			\$ 50,000.00	2021-22
		N/A			
			\$ 255,000.00	\$ 57,000.00	
Campbell Street PS	Driveway Repairs		\$ 5,000.00		2016-16
	Switchboard Upgrade			\$ 29,000.00	2021-22
			\$ 5,000.00	\$ 29,000.00	
Albura Street PS					
		N/A	N/A	N/A	
South Hobart PS	Refurbishment and construction of general learning areas, administration, library, multipurpose area and amenities	\$ 3,600,000.00			2015-16
	Storm Mitigation Works		\$ 738,000.00		2019-20
	Storm Mitigation Works		\$ 31,000.00		2017-18
	Capacity Works		\$ 62,000.00		2020-21
	Stormwater Upgrade - Child Care		\$ 30,000.00		2020-21
	Roofing			\$ 43,000.00	2019-20
	Switchboard Upgrade			\$ 10,000.00	2021-22
	Fire Upgrade			\$ 8,000.00	2021-21
		\$ 3,600,000.00	\$ 861,000.00	\$ 81,000.00	

Total across all schools \$ 3,600,000.00 \$ 1,121,000.00 \$ 147,000.00

### Notes:

1	Each year the Department runs a Capital Works Submission process where all public schools can lodge a capital works submission. This is a high level process focusing on the medium to long term capital needs of the school. The process is open from March to May annually and Facility Services is available to assist schools in this process.
2	Albura Street PS, Goulburn Street PS and South Hobart PS have all submitted and are part of the current assessment process. Campbell Street PS has not submitted.
3	Goulburn Street PS is a priority 4 site. Albura Street PS is a priority 2 site.

*JKatt.*

Tabled  
21-9-21  
L. Hicutt

tabled and  
incorporated  
into Mansard  
capital investment  
program information  
display spreadsheet.



## Appendix 2

**Capital Works Review Process - 2021 Priority List**

School Name	Latest Priority Rating
Cambridge Primary School	1
Campbell Town District High School	1
Clarence High School	1
Deloraine High School	1
Godges Ferry Primary School	1
East Derwent Primary School	1
Easter High School	1
Glen Dhu Primary School	1
Havenview Primary School	1
Lauderdale Primary School	1
Lillydale District School	1
Montello Primary School	1
Mowbray Heights Primary School	1
Ogden High School	1
Port Dalrymple School	1
Princes Street Primary School	1
Ringarooma Primary School	1
Radon Vale Primary School	1
Roxette Primary School	1
School of Special Education North West	1
South George Town Primary School	1
South Hobart Primary School	1
Taroona High School	1
Taroona Primary School	1
Albion Street Primary School	2
Bagdad Primary School	2
Bellerive Primary School	2
Burnie Primary School	2
Franklin Primary School	2
Glenora District School	2
Hellyer College	2
Howrah Primary School	2
Huonville High School	2
JRLF Senior School	2
Lindisfarne North Primary School	2
Moonah Primary School	2
Mount Nelson Primary School	2
New Town High School	2
Norwood Primary School	2
Punchbowl Primary School	2
Queechy High School	2
Richmond Primary School	2
Waverley Primary School	2
Blackmans Bay Primary School	3
Chigwell Child & Family Centre	3
Cygnets Primary School	3
Devonport Primary School	3
Forest Primary School	3
Glen Huon Primary School	3
Longford Primary School	3
Nixon Street Primary School	3
Plunarra Derwent Valley Child & Family Centre	3
Scottsdale High School	3
Trevallyn Primary School	3
Ulverstone Secondary College	3
Elizabeth College	4
Glenorchy Primary School	4
Goulburn Street Primary School	4
Illawarra Primary School	4
Newstead College	4
Rokeby Primary School	4
Rose Bay High School	4
Roxy College	4
Southern Support School	4
St Marys District School	4
Tasman District School	4
Yolla District High School	4

Table  
at hand.  
school infrastructure  
priority list  
tabled and  
incorporated into  
Hansard  
L. Hiscott  
21/9/2021

adher  
copy sent

School Name	Latest Priority Rating
Bayview Secondary College	5
Beaconsfield Primary School	5
Bridport Primary School	5
Bruny Island District School	5
Claremont College	5
Cressy District High School	5
Don College	5
Dover District School	5
Hobart College	5
Invermay Primary School	5
Kingston High School	5
Launceston College	5
Oatlands District High School	5
Perth Primary School	5
Ravenswood Heights Primary School	5
Sandy Bay Infant School	5
Sheffield School	5
St Helens District High School	5
Triabunna District School	5
Waimea Heights Primary School	5
Warrane Primary School	5
West Launceston Primary School	5
West Ulverstone Primary School	5
Woodbridge School	5
Wynyard High School	5

## Appendix 3

WITS No.: - 123081

Tabled and incorporated  
into Hansard  
L. Hiscott

21 Sept 2021

Widens deputy clerk.

*L. Hiscott* ✓

### Questions without Notice

**Name:** Hon Ruth Forrest MLC

#### Questions:

With regard to availability of ventilators and staff required to care for ventilated patients in Intensive Care Units (ICU's) in Tasmania's three major hospitals:

- 1 How many ventilators are available in each ICU at;
  - a. RHH
  - b. LGH
  - c. NWRH
- 2 How many qualified and experienced staff are available to provide care for ventilated patients at;
  - a. RHH
  - b. LGH
  - d. NWRH
- 3 How many staff are needed per ventilated patient to provide 24 hour care?

**Answered by:** Hon Leonie Hiscott MLC  
Leader of Government in Legislative Council

#### Answers:

- 1 Ventilators available in each ICU are as follows:
  - a. Royal Hobart Hospital – 23 Intensive Care Unit standard ventilators
  - b. Launceston General Hospital - 19 Intensive Care Unit standard ventilators
  - c. North West Regional Hospital - 17 ventilators Intensive Care Unit standard ventilators.

In addition to these 59 Intensive Care Unit standard ventilators located at the RHH, LGH and NWRH, there are a further 112 intensive care ventilators in the state pandemic stockpile and in the private sector, making a total of 171 intensive care ventilators available in Tasmania.

In addition to the 171 intensive care ventilators there are also 96 transport ventilators for emergency and short term ventilation use, making a total of 267 ventilators available in Tasmania.


We are also expecting a further 100 emergency ventilators to arrive soon, taking the total number of ventilators for Tasmania to 367 (171 intensive care ventilators and 196 emergency/ short term ventilators).

2

- a. Royal Hobart Hospital - 175 qualified and experienced nursing staff
- b. Launceston General Hospital - 95 qualified and experienced nursing staff
- c. North West Regional Hospital - 33 qualified and experienced nursing staff

In addition to these nursing staff, there are other health professionals who possess transferable skills in ventilation if needed, in areas such as the emergency department, theatre/anaesthetic, recovery, and retrieval.

- 3 In accordance with the Workforce Standards for Critical Care Nursing, published by the Australian College of Critical Care Nurses, all critically ill patients (including those requiring mechanical ventilation) require one Registered Nurse per patient per shift. The Standards also include other roles recommended to support the provision of critical care.



Jeremy Rockliff MP  
**Minister for Health**

## Appendix 4

### ADVANCE NOTICE TO THE LEADER

tabled incorporated  
into Hansard  
L. HISCOTT 21 SEPT 2021  
Table.  
Hiscott

OF

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### Question to be asked by Hon. Ruth Forrest MLC

With regard to the leave liability within the Police Department:

1. Please provide a breakdown of the leave liability of sworn police officers appointed under the Police Service Act 2003 over the last three years?

#### Answer:

Tasmania Police officers receive 6 weeks annual leave in accordance with the Police Award.

#### Recreation leave

Year	Cost	Police FTE as at 30 June each year	Total days
2020-21	\$22,555,182	1360.75	39,233
2019-20	\$20,529,033	1332.89	36,282
2018-19	\$18,832,981	1294.34	33,583

#### Long Service Leave

Year	Cost	Police FTE as at 30 June each year	Total days
2020-21	\$39,320,928	1360.75	61,938
2019-20	\$38,019,447	1332.89	60,841
2018-19	\$34,418,655	1294.34	59,714

APPROVED/NOT APPROVED



Hon Jacquie Petrusma MP  
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Management

Date: 21 September 2021

## Appendix 5

Division 6  
Department of Justice  
Output 1.9 Tasmanian  
Industrial Commission  
Estimates Items for Further Debate

Tabled & incorporated  
into Hansard  
L. Hiscutt  
21 Sept 2021

### DIVISION 6 – 1.9 Industrial Commission

To provide the further clarity sought by the Member for Hobart, I can advise that the following breakdown between the number of cases finalised by the Industrial Commission –

- within 3 months as:
  - o Industrial Relations Act 1984 = 47
  - o State Service Act 2000 = 37
  - o TOTAL = 84
- Within 6 months as:
  - o Industrial Relations Act 1984 = 4
  - o State Service Act 2000 = 11
  - o TOTAL = 15

The aggregate of these figures are the numbers provided to Members in the table within the Question on Notice, since the question asked by the Member for Hobart only requested the 6 month total figure.