



# Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

**TENTH ASSEMBLY**

**2 JUNE 2022**

[www.hansard.act.gov.au](http://www.hansard.act.gov.au)

## Thursday, 2 June 2022

Legislative Assembly—conduct (Statement by Speaker).....	1537
Petitions:	
Ngunnawal—traffic management—petition 9-22 .....	1538
Environment—kangaroo management—petition 17-22.....	1538
Advertising—public spaces and transport—petition 35-21	
(Ministerial response) .....	1539
Motion to take note of petitions .....	1543
Environment—kangaroo management—petition 17-22.....	1543
Advertising—public spaces and transport—petition 35-21 .....	1544
Environment—kangaroo management—petition 17-22.....	1547
Valedictory.....	1547
Legislative Assembly—conduct .....	1569
Education and Community Inclusion—Standing Committee.....	1569
Statute Law Amendment Bill 2022.....	1570
Standing order 113A—amendment .....	1572
Planning, Transport and City Services—Standing Committee.....	1573
Ministerial arrangements .....	1575
Questions without notice:	
Building—combustible cladding.....	1575
Fadden Hills Pond—play space upgrade.....	1576
Cultural Facilities Corporation—superannuation payments .....	1576
Health—alcohol and other drugs strategy .....	1577
Federal government—territory rights .....	1579
Government—land and property reports .....	1581
Dhulwa Mental Health Unit—safety .....	1581
Light rail—stage 2 .....	1582
Transport Canberra—fuel costs.....	1584
Crace Community Recreation Park—lighting.....	1585
LGBTIQ+ community—federal government.....	1586
Supplementary answers to questions without notice:	
Building—combustible cladding.....	1587
Government—land and property reports .....	1588
Health—alcohol and other drugs strategy .....	1588
ACT Health—nurses .....	1588
Sport—community wellbeing.....	1589
Paper .....	1589
ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee—annual report .....	1589
Leave of absence.....	1589
Freedom of Information Amendment Bill 2022 .....	1589
Housing—debt to commonwealth .....	1591
Building—combustible cladding .....	1606
Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety—report 5—	
government response (Ministerial statement) .....	1617
Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions investigative report—government response	
(Ministerial statement) .....	1620
Mental health—MindMap youth navigation portal (Ministerial statement).....	1624

Adjournment:

ACT Law Week.....	1626
Seniors—Silver is Gold Festival .....	1627
Small business—Rotary initiative .....	1628
Kurrajong electorate—footpaths .....	1629

Answers to questions:

Government—grants programs (Question No 587) .....	1631
Government—grants programs (Question Nos 595, 598, 605, 613, 617, 623) .....	1634
Schools—nurses (Question No 667) .....	1647
Florey—dryland oval (Question No 681).....	1648
Alexander Maconochie Centre—mental health staffing (Question No 689) .....	1649
Yerrabi Pond—water quality (Question No 703).....	1651
Suburban Land Agency—revenue (Question No 706).....	1652
ActewAGL—hydrogen (Question No 712) .....	1652
Suburban Land Agency—residential blocks (Question No 713) .....	1653
Suburban Land Agency—ballots (Question No 718).....	1653
Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 719).....	1654
Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 720).....	1655
Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 721).....	1656
Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 722).....	1656
Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 723).....	1657
Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 724).....	1658
Roads—Ngunnawal (Question No 726).....	1659
ACT Health—performance reports (Question No 736) .....	1660
Mental health—services (Question No 737) .....	1663
Mental health—primary school programs (Question No 740) .....	1669
ACT Corrective Services—spit hoods use (Question No 743) .....	1672
Alexander Maconochie Centre—security (Question No 746) .....	1673
West Belconnen tip—landfill capping (Question No 754) .....	1673
Waste—recycling (Question No 765) .....	1674
Planning—Taylor playing fields (Question No 767) .....	1675
Municipal services—spending (Question No 768) .....	1675
Health—walk-in centres (Question No 774) .....	1676
Municipal services—crematorium facilities (Question No 783).....	1677
Ginninderra electorate—stormwater drains (Question No 791).....	1678

Questions without notice taken on notice:

Alexander Maconochie Centre—detainee rehabilitation .....	1680
---	------

**Thursday, 2 June 2022**

**MADAM SPEAKER** (Ms Burch) (10.01): Members:

Dhawura nguna, dhawura Ngunnawal.  
Yanggu ngalawiri, dhunimanyin Ngunnawalwari dhawurawari.  
Nginggada Dindi dhawura Ngunnaawalbun yindjumaralidjinyin.

The words I have just spoken are in the language of the traditional custodians and translate to:

This is Ngunnawal Country.  
Today we are gathering on Ngunnawal Country.  
We always pay respect to Elders, female and male, and Ngunnawal Country.

Members, I ask you to stand in silence and pray or reflect on our responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

### **Legislative Assembly—conduct Statement by Speaker**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Members, I wish to make a statement about the conduct of Ms Lee, following her suspension from the Assembly on Wednesday, 1 June 2022. Members will recall that, following her numerous interjections and several warnings, I named Ms Lee in question time, under standing order 202, for persistently and wilfully disregarding the authority of the chair. Following the passage of the motion to suspend the member, Ms Lee was suspended for three sitting hours.

My attention has been drawn to a social media post from Ms Lee, which stated:

Today I was thrown out of the chamber during question time for continuing to hold the Labor-Greens government to account.

As set out at page 74 of the *Companion to the Standing Orders*, it is not in order to criticise or reflect on the actions of the chair, and the Speaker's actions can only be criticised by way of a substantive motion. That section of the *Companion* outlines several precedents where the Speaker has considered an accusation of partiality in the discharge of duties of the chair, both inside and outside the chamber, and has asked that the reflection be withdrawn.

Having considered Ms Lee's social media post, I am of the view that it implies that I suspended the Leader of the Opposition simply for holding the government to account, rather than for offending against the relevant standing order. This, to me, is a clear reflection on the actions of the chair. When Ms Lee finishes her suspension from the Assembly later this morning, I will ask Ms Lee to withdraw any reflection, on her return to the chamber, and to remove any post from social media by midday today.

## Petitions

*The following petitions were lodged for presentation:*

### **Ngunnawal—traffic management—petition 9-22**

*By Ms Castley, from 125 residents:*

#### **To the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory**

The following residents of the ACT draw to the attention of the Assembly that the current two-way system in the carpark at the Platypus centre in Ngunnawal creates traffic hazards for cars and pedestrians as it is too narrow for cars to safely pass each other or back out from a car park.

As traffic has increased in this centre, as more businesses have moved in, the safety issues have increased.

Your petitioners, therefore, request the Assembly to call upon the ACT Government to create a one-way car park system where vehicles enter from Paul Coe Crescent and exit on Riley Close.

### **Environment—kangaroo management—petition 17-22**

*By Mr Pettersson, from 853 residents:*

#### **SAVE CANBERRA’S KANGAROOS: PETITION**

##### **No monitoring of what goes on in the killing fields**

Since kangaroo culling began in Canberra in 2009, the ACT Government has funded the shooting and killing of **27,950** kangaroos. This does not include the thousands of pouch or ‘at foot’ joeys which are bludgeoned or decapitated.

Eastern Grey Kangaroos are under pressure across 29.9% of the ACT, due to agricultural activities including loss of habitat (pine plantations), culling on private rural leases and shooting in reserves. (*Ray Mjadwesch, ACAT, 2014*)

As at 2014, the Eastern Grey Kangaroo **is extinct from 26.6% of the ACT**, due to land use changes (city/urban areas, and heavily modified rural landscapes) (*ibid*).

The ACT’s Senior Ecologist, found in his Phd that local kangaroos lived **without damaging pasture or starving at densities of 5 per hectare**, yet he supported the ACT program that deems kangaroos at more than one per hectare to be in danger of starving and a threat to their own habitat. (Sheila Newman, Conference Paper, 2016)

In 2021-2022, Citizen Scientists have undertaken the most complete *direct count* of kangaroos in all 37 of Canberra’s accessible nature parks. They have found kangaroos are not “overabundant” and confirm, **there is no evidence that culling in Canberra is necessary.**

**We hereby petition the Members of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory to declare a moratorium on Kangaroo culling and conduct an independent review.**

*Pursuant to standing order 99A, the petition, having more than 500 signatories, was referred to the Standing Committee on Environment, Climate Change and Biodiversity.*

*The Clerk having announced that the terms of the petitions would be recorded in Hansard and referred to the appropriate ministers for response pursuant to standing order 100, the petitions were received.*

### **Ministerial response**

The following response to a petition has been lodged:

#### **Advertising—public spaces and transport—petition 35-21**

By **Mr Steel**, Minister for Transport and City Services, dated 31 May 2022, in response to a petition lodged by Ms Clay on 22 March 2022 concerning public space advertising.

*The response read as follows:*

Dear Mr Duncan

Thank you for your letter of 22 March 2022 regarding petition 35-21, lodged by Ms Jo Clay MLA. The petition seeks for the ACT Government to make and keep Canberra ad free – specifically to:

- direct Transport Canberra and Access Canberra to immediately remove all existing ‘illegal’ advertisements
- introduce specific offences for roadside advertising using parked vehicles
- remove public transport advertisements that block passengers’ ability to see outside
- review and update the rules for what advertising content is allowed on public transport and apply these rules to bus and tram shelters as well as vehicles
- end bus shelter ads by committing to not renewing the Adshel contract. The petitioners also requested that the Assembly undertake consultation on community support for replacing all public transport advertisements with locally commissioned artwork.

In Australia, advertising standards, including those related to outdoor advertising, are governed by a system of industry self-regulation. This is administered by the Australian Association of National Advertisers (AANA) and is underpinned by a set of voluntary codes that include the AANA Code of Ethics.

The ACT Government, through its various regulatory bodies, is responsible for administering relevant sign guidelines and codes of practice within the ACT. Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) regulates movable signage placed on Public Unleased Land, through its responsibility for administering the *Public Unleased Land ACT (PULA) 2013 (the Act)*.

The Act also establishes the *Public Unleased Land (Movable Signs) Code of Practice* (the Code) which outlines conditions for sign placement; sign construction and safety; sign content; number of signs; display time periods; and insurance requirements. The Code applies to movable signs such as business signs, real estate signs, community signs, and electoral advertising signs that are intended to be situated in a public place. In accordance with the Code, a 'public place' is any place that is unleased Territory Land which the public are entitled to use, or which is open to – or used by – the public. This includes every public road.

Similarly, section 11.7 of the *Territory Plan 2008 (ACT)*, (the *Signs General Code 2008 (ACT)*) regulates the design, content and positioning of signs in the ACT. The Signs General Code is effectively the document which development applications for signs are assessed against. It sets out requirements in relation to the types of signs permissible in certain development zones, the built form and construction of these signs, as well as the permissible environmental impact of these signs.

Where a permanent sign is to be installed on public land, unless it meets an exemption provision outlined in Table 1.5.2 of the *Planning and Development Regulation 2008*, a *Planning and Development Act 2007* Development Application is required, and a section 303 Planning and Development Act licence must be obtained.

There is no specific law regulating advertising on vehicles. It is the responsibility of motorists to ensure they park their vehicle responsibly and legally. Parking on nature strips or grassed medians is not permitted in the ACT. Illegally parked vehicles on public land, including nature strips, can cause serious damage to community assets including grass, street trees, underground services and the environment. Illegal parking can also cause line of sight obstruction issues and pose a serious risk to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.

In accordance with the Australian Road Rules and the associated Guidelines, the parking of vehicles on a nature strips or median strips is generally prohibited. Access Canberra Parking Operations is the primary regulator responsible for parking compliance in the Territory. Parking Operations inspectors make regular compliance patrols throughout Canberra, as well as responding to specific complaints about illegally parked vehicles. Parking inspectors also patrol and enforce dangerous and illegal parking on nature strips and road related areas. The infringement notice penalty for this offence is currently \$123.

As part of their duties, authorised TCCS officers pro-actively target municipal non-compliance issues, including unauthorised public land use. The infringement notice penalty for this offence is currently \$440. In line with the Licensing and Compliance Accountability Commitment, officers try to encourage compliance through engagement and education. However, where officers identify a blatant disregard for the law, repetitious offending or conduct that has, or is likely, to

cause harm to consumers, business, the community or the environment, officers take escalating enforcement action.

Transport Canberra has arrangements for advertising on buses, light rail vehicles and selected light rail stops that are managed through third party agencies. These follow Australian Advertising Standards and the ACT Government Advertising Guidelines.

Advertising at light rail stops and onboard light rail vehicles commenced with the introduction of light rail. Light rail advertising revenue is reinvested in safety initiatives and operational improvements. These include rail safety wraps to provide a better customer experience, such as services for special events.

Safety and passenger comfort is maintained on externally wrapped light rail vehicles through the following measures:

- the wraps do not cover LRV doors, ensuring full driver and passenger visibility at these locations;
- advertising uses a perforated window film stock which enables passengers to see out the windows with minimal interference. The wraps have undergone rigorous independent testing for light transference and ability to see in and out of the cabin;
- wraps conform with Australian design standards and relevant legislation;
- emergency exit functionality is not affected by the wrap film, and the wraps do not cover any emergency exit signage. In the event that the emergency exit window needs to be broken, the panel falls away in a single piece with no restriction; and
- wrap product has been specifically chosen for the local climate including temperature extremes.

Of the 14 Canberra light rail vehicles, nine are reserved for commercial and government advertising, two are reserved for safety messaging, two are reserved exclusively for ACT Government supported information and awareness campaigns, and one remains unwrapped for media opportunities.

All advertising on Transport Canberra vehicles must meet the Australian Advertising Standards ([www.adstandards.com.au](http://www.adstandards.com.au)) as well as the ACT Government guidelines for advertising on vehicles. These state that advertisements must not represent, portray, or promote:

- a) a contravention of any Act of Parliament or regulation made under any Act;
- b) tobacco or tobacco products;
- c) political or religious advertising. Advertising materials that are political party based are not permitted. Advertising materials that are political in nature but are related to a specific subject or issue must be referred to the Territory;
- d) weapons;
- e) junk food, or food providers determined by the Territory, from time to time, not to meet requirements under the Territory's healthy food and drink initiatives. The ACT Healthy Food and Drink Marketing Criteria



and Guideline, or any other health policy put forward by the Territory (from such time that they take effect), and as varied from time to time, must be adhered to. The Territory requests that any advertisements that potentially fall under the 'fast food' category be referred to the Territory for approval;

- f) gambling;
- g) alcohol;
- h) fossil fuels;
- i) a message that demeans or discourages the use of public transport;
- j) a message that demeans public transport users;
- k) a message that promotes unacceptable behaviour to or on the transport vehicle;
- l) a message that poses either a danger or confusion to traffic, or a risk to the health or safety of the public generally;
- m) a message that can be deemed offensive or demeaning to specific Community Groups (i.e. religious, ethnic, women, etc.); and/or
- n) other matters which may be determined by the Territory during the term of the Contract and advised to the Contractor in writing.

The ACT Government acknowledges concerns about some current advertisements which may comply with the letter of the ACT Government and Australian advertising standards, but are nevertheless out of step with community values. We will clarify these standards as they relate to payday lending institutions in the ACT Government guidelines. This will include no longer accepting advertisements for this industry on public transport beyond the end of any current contracts and exploring opportunities to achieve an equivalent outcome through the advertising sites on bus stops managed by the private contractor Adshel.

We also acknowledge that concerns have been raised about visibility for passengers when bus and light rail windows are wrapped with permeable advertising material. Transport Canberra will explore the implications of updating public transport advertising practices, such that some or all windows are generally kept clear.

In relation to advertising displayed on bus and light rail shelters across Canberra, this is currently contracted with an external provider until 2027. The contract includes the establishment of one non-advertising shelter for every shelter featuring installed. The contract also covers maintenance and cleaning of bus stop assets for the life of the contract. Gifted assets – being bus shelters, concrete pads, paths and signs – are then handed over to the ACT Government at the end of the contract. We will review the current approach to contracting out bus shelter locations for advertising, including considering both the value generated for the ACT community and concerns about advertising in public spaces – at the end of the current contract period.

TCCS is currently exploring options to introduce specific controls to manage roadside electoral advertising through a targeted review of the PULA legislation. This explores options available to Government to meet the commitment set out

in Appendix 2 paragraph 18 of the Parliamentary and Governing Agreement of the 10th Legislative Assembly (PAGA). This commits the government to further restrict roadside electoral advertising, including stronger regulation of roadside corflutes and the introduction of specific offences for roadside advertising using illegally parked or idling vehicles for commercial or political purposes. This work is closely aligned to work currently underway in response to the Justice and Community Safety Standing Committee Inquiry into the 2020 ACT Election and the Electoral Act. It will be progressed as part of the broader package of electoral law reforms arising from that inquiry.

TCCS actively engages the community and industry on issues regarding illegal signage. For example, directorate representatives recently met with the Real Estate Industry regarding non-compliant signage installed on public unleased land. The team uses an educate first approach to ensure that the community is informed and aware of the requirements and regulations that control signage with relation to size, construction, time in place and any prohibited actions.

In relation to the petitioners' request for increased presentation of locally commissioned artworks in public spaces, in March 2022 the ACT Government ran Canberra's inaugural *Surface* urban art festival. During the festival 35 local and interstate artists worked across 30 walls and structures transforming the built environment with street art, graffiti, portraits, stencils, Indigenous art, geometric and abstract art. This has resulted in 30 new public artworks being added to Canberra's City Centre, Braddon and surrounds, which will remain in place well beyond the festival.

Transport Canberra and City Services also runs an ongoing street art program which supports the delivery of large - scale murals and commissioned public art in locations which may otherwise be subject to illegal graffiti. This initiative has added dozens of colourful commissioned artworks to depots, local shops, toilet blocks and other public buildings across Canberra's suburbs in recent years.

Balanced and well-regulated use of outdoor advertising – including on public transport – can support public and community information campaigns and promote economic activity through promotion of local businesses. The ACT Government will continue to enforce existing restrictions on public outdoor advertising, to ensure public amenity is maintained.

I trust this information is of assistance.

### **Motion to take note of petitions**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Pursuant to standing order 98A, I propose the question:

That the petitions and responses so lodged be noted.

### **Environment—kangaroo management—petition 17-22**

**MR PETTERSSON** (Yerrabi) (10.05): I rise today very briefly to present this petition on behalf of the community activists who have worked so hard to gather these signatures. The petition calls for a moratorium on the kangaroo cull and an independent review. Whilst I do not share the same view as the petitioners, I will always support community involvement in our democratic processes.

It is important in our democracy that all members of the community, including those who disagree with the government, are able to voice their concerns and opinions, which is why I am today presenting this petition on their behalf. This petition is the culmination of a significant body of work from many citizen scientists and concerned community activists who have dedicated their time to a cause they are deeply concerned about. I wish them well in their continued advocacy.

### **Advertising—public spaces and transport—petition 35-21**

**MS CLAY** (Ginninderra) (10.06): I would like to talk briefly about the public space advertising petition response. I want to thank the minister for responding to that, for outlining some of the existing regulations and enforcement practices around public space advertising in Canberra and for committing TCCS to exploring options to keep our bus windows clear from advertising. I know that this type of ad, in particular, upsets a lot of people. It literally makes people sick, and I do not think there is any place for it on our fleet or in our city. I am really, really pleased to hear that the minister will review the Adshel contract, in light of the concerns raised.

I want to remind everyone of the long-running community campaign to keep Canberra ad free. A lot of people will be keen to see that review: 523 petitioners signed this petition, and in 2017 we had a record number of Canberrans coming out against billboards and other forms of public advertising. These Canberrans have drawn the attention of the ACT government to the fact that public space advertising is socially, economically and environmentally destructive.

Petitioners have also noted that advertising is unpopular in the ACT. We have had sustained community campaigns trying to protect our ad-free status, but we are still seeing ads creeping into more and more of our public spaces. I am sure these people will welcome Minister Steel's compliance action, outlined in the response, but Canberrans are still regularly reporting illegal ads. Some of the examples we have seen are billboards on community buildings and in Civic, as well as commercial corflutes on roadsides. I am really looking forward to further conversations about how our current laws will be consistently enforced and I am interested in discussing further ways and reasons why we have a warning system in this instance but we do not seem to use a warning system in other instances.

We are also seeing a proliferation of ads that are not actually illegal but that maybe should be. There are many ads that are not banned but that run against public policy and public sentiment, and sometimes against government policy too. A particularly egregious example was an ad in my electorate, in Jamison, on a bus stop. It showed a picture of a young person eating fries. The ad suggested that people should use payday lending to go out and buy more fries. The ad literally encouraged our youth to go into debt to buy junk food.

It is not a good idea to run this kind of advertising. We have got consumer experts all around the country calling to rein in this kind of predatory lending, but we are endorsing it on government property. I find it deeply worrying. I understand how hard it must be for government to understand which are good ads and which are bad ads,

and I think that is why a lot of people have simply said, “Why don’t we have no ads on public property? That would be an easier way to solve that problem.”

I was also really, really interested to read the government response. We do get income revenue from this advertising. It is actually a tiny percentage; it is 0.6 per cent of our public transport budget. It is so small that it is almost irrelevant. I do not say that lightly. I used to run businesses and blogs, and I used to run an e-commerce company, and getting ad revenue is actually a really, really common way to run a lot of businesses and operations. But what you quickly find is that you are trading your professional reputation, you are trading your credibility, for less than one per cent of your revenue or of your turnover, and it usually is not worth that kind of deal.

We also know that public transport is really important. We are doing a lot to encourage greater uptake and we know that a lot of people do not like this kind of advertising. I think there is a real tension here in doing something that people do not like, doing something that is encouraging behaviour that the government does not want to encourage and doing that in order to take a really, really small amount of revenue.

On the other hand, we know that for every dollar we invest in the arts we get a much, much greater return. We get a return to our economy. It is a really, really high return. And we get something that people love, that makes them feel happy and that actually does not play on their fears and their anxieties and does not encourage them to go out and buy things they do not need or to engage in practices that really, frankly, are not very helpful. I am looking forward to continuing this conversation about public advertising. I am really, really pleased to have seen the petition and to have seen the government response.

**MR STEEL** (Murrumbidgee—Minister for Skills, Minister for Transport and City Services and Special Minister of State) (10.10): I am pleased to table the government’s response to the petition on outdoor and public transport advertising in Canberra and to make a few observations about the government’s current approach. In Australia our advertising standards, including those related to outdoor advertising, are governed by a system of industry self-regulation. This is administered by the Australian Association of National Advertisers and underpinned by a set of voluntary codes that includes the AANA code of ethics.

The ACT government, through its various regulatory bodies, is responsible for administering relevant sign guidelines and codes of practice within the ACT. Transport Canberra and City Services regulates removable signage under the Public Unleased Land Act. The act also establishes the code of practice, which outlines conditions for sign placement, sign construction, safety content and the number of signs, as well as display time periods and insurance requirements. The government’s response provides an amount of detail about what the code allows and how this intercepts with other regulations like the Territory Plan to regulate the design content and positioning of signs in the ACT. I will not go into that in too much detail.

In relation to advertising on public transport, there is a very long established and accepted practice in the territory to have public transport advertising, just as there is in

other cities around the world. Transport Canberra has arrangements for advertising on buses, light rail vehicles and selected light rail stops. These are managed by third-party agencies and they follow those AANA standards and the ACT government's advertising guidelines. The advertising on public transport must not represent, portray or promote a range of different things, such as gambling, alcohol, fossil fuels and a range of other things that are outlined in those guidelines. It is a very long list, and it shows the lengths we go to in order to ensure that advertising on public transport is in line with the community's standards and expectations.

We do acknowledge concerns about some of the current advertisements which may comply with the letter of ACT government and Australian advertising standards but which nevertheless are out of step with community values. We will explore opportunities to clarify these standards as they relate to payday lending institutions in particular. This will include no longer accepting advertisements for this industry on public transport beyond the end of any current contracts and exploring opportunities to achieve an equivalent outcome through advertising sites on bus stops managed by the private contractor, Adshel.

We acknowledge that concerns have also been raised about the visibility of passengers when bus and light rail windows are wrapped with permeable advertising material, and we will explore the implications of that, as put by the petitioners. In relation to advertising displayed on public bus and light rail shelters, there is a current contract in place and we will review that once that contract comes to its end.

The ACT community concerns about advertising in public spaces are valid, but I am concerned about the call for the removal of all advertising from all public transport. I want to make it really clear that Labor does not support cutting public transport. The revenue raised through public transport advertising is reinvested in services and infrastructure across our public transport network. I think that Canberrans understand the very clear distinction between public transport advertising and private advertising. The money from public transport advertising goes back into a public good: better public transport. The revenue from public transport advertising is roughly equivalent to running the flexible bus service, which is a service that we want to enhance, not cut.

We want to keep on making public transport even better so that more Canberrans choose to use it. We want to invest in electric buses. We want to continue to explore opportunities to enhance our flexible bus service to an on-demand model. There are no free lunches here. Removing public advertising from public transport would mean removing the revenue available to invest in public transport, and I strongly believe that cutting public transport is out of touch. I do not think it is what the majority of Canberrans want to see, and it is not what I intend to do as the public transport minister.

In relation to the petitioners' request for increased representation for locally commissioned artworks in public spaces, of course we are doing this. We have had the Surface Festival, which was absolutely fantastic, and we will look at what opportunities there are to provide more public art in locations around Canberra, including on our buses. We have got some fantastic Aboriginal artworks already displayed on our buses. We recognise that outdoor advertising needs to be balanced

and well regulated, including in public transport, and we will continue to enforce our existing restrictions.

### **Environment—kangaroo management—petition 17-22**

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (10.15): I rise to speak very briefly on the petition tabled by Mr Pettersson today. Like many members here, I am sure you have received emails and messages from various members of the Canberra community concerned about kangaroo culls. I know that my Canberra Liberals colleagues certainly have. It is important that we recognise that these concerns come from a genuine and caring place. The people that raise these concerns care about kangaroos and all animals here in the ACT. It is a highly emotive issue, and I appreciate that there are many conflicting views on the culls. It is important that we ensure that, if they are carried out, the culls are done in the most humane way possible. I look forward to the government response to the petition.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

### **Valedictory**

**MRS JONES** (Murrumbidgee) (10.16), by leave: I was elected to this place in 2012 at 32 with four children. Who the heck does that? And now I am resigning from this place at 42 with six children. Not many do that, either!

In my maiden speech I said that I wanted a family, a career and to have a say in our governance. All of those here today know that I have done that. I have had many achievements in this place, not all of them visible. I think the most memorable were the changes to the breastfeeding and breast pumping facilities in ACT government buildings that ensured comfort and privacy for women. Those present when I brought out the breast pump are probably still feeling uncomfortable about it today!

As shadow minister for police and emergency services, I pushed the government to look after our frontline workers better—police, ambos, firies, corrections officers. I helped to improve firies' pay and equipment. When I called the government out, however, on not meeting its own minimum ambulance crewing requirements, Mr Gentleman, in classic Jack Lang Labor "whatever it takes" style, did away with the measure for minimum crewing. I am still a bit annoyed about that one. Our police work so hard for our community, and ACT Policing are the most under-resourced police in our nation.

Over the years we have talked about territory rights in this place, and I agree that over time the territory should be free to legislate on the same range of issues as the states. Currently, however, the ACT is not able to raise its own police force. We must rely on MOUs with the commonwealth for our community policing, which means we do not control pay, culture or conditions, all of which are lagging. If we are serious about territory rights, we should be serious about removing outdated restrictions on our right to ensure our community here in Canberra is safe and that the police have the resources to better respond to and investigate crimes affecting our community. The

Northern Territory has its own police force. Tasmania has its own police force. There is no reason why we should not have our own police force.

Our firies, nurses and ambos should not be abused, bashed or worse while serving our community. I am glad that the government worked with me and we legislated for the offences against frontline serving officers. I consider that a great achievement, and I have seen it used a few times already.

What I learnt as shadow minister for police and emergency services during the 2020 bushfires and the hailstorm prepared me for being shadow minister for health during the global pandemic. I knew my role was to ease distress and keep the government on their toes, especially during the lockdown. I spent many days in this building—the only person on the first floor—furiously emailing Cath, in the minister’s office, about someone who needed help. I also stood by and called on our government to work better for our healthcare workers.

I have been multicultural shadow minister twice in this place. It is a gruelling but rewarding portfolio, as Tara well knows. There are so many events, but every event to me is like visiting with family. There are so many letters to write to federal members in support of visa applications and changes to people’s status.

There was the food relief that we did during the COVID-19 pandemic. To get culturally appropriate food in large quantities to large families in lockdown was such a team effort. It was just phenomenal. I thank everyone who was involved in that. Well done to you all.

When I was first elected and I raised the issue of children’s playgrounds, I was practically laughed out of this place! I was asked weird questions at the lift about what the heck I was talking about. I am really glad to see that the discussion goes on, especially about a few playgrounds being fully, safely fenced. A fence is a safety feature to keep kids safe from running away. I know with two children on the autism spectrum that kids can run very fast, and when they have an underdeveloped sense of fear, this can be deadly. As someone who has sat miserably at a small park behind my house with my oldest kids when they were very little, distressed and anxious, I hope I have made life easier for other new mums as well as those who are soldiering on.

There is one line I must call out, however, from both Mr Steel and Mr Rattenbury, when discussing fenced playgrounds. It has bothered me for many years. I have been completely appalled to see in the debates about playgrounds the constant reference that somehow wanting a fenced playground meant that parents were not willing to, keen to or interested in watching their children properly. The suggestion is that they are lazy or neglectful. It hurts. It cuts me very deeply. The assertion is unedifying, and it goes to show how little some ministers in this parliament who do not have any children understand what parenting is actually like on a day-to-day basis. Please stop accusing parents who want a fenced playground of being in any way lazy. In our playground discussions statements have been made, “Parents still need to watch their kids.” That is what I am referring to. It has happened more than once in this place. It is so far from the exhausted truth that we live.

This morning I released an exposure draft of a bill that would enhance the treatment of our frontline workers who incur mental injuries, such as post-traumatic stress injury, in the course of their work. This is some unfinished work for me in this place. I have been working on the bill for over a year. Ideally, I would propose a bill that would flip the onus of proof, so that if you serve in our city in a traumatising frontline job and incur a mental injury, it is assumed that you have been traumatised by work. This is what has recently been done in the Queensland legislation and in the Australian Defence Force.

Here in the ACT it is not possible because the ACT holds a self-insurance licence under the commonwealth's Comcare scheme. Despite the territory being able to administer its own workers compensation scheme since 1994, the territory has chosen to engage EML as its claims manager. This is the same claims manager that was embroiled in the icare debacle in New South Wales.

My bill would therefore require the minister to impose, on the territory's claims manager, in law, transparent expectations about how the claims manager deals with certain aspects of claims management, including claims for PTSI by frontline workers. It would also require an independent review to be conducted periodically to ensure that claims for mental injury are being managed appropriately.

I suspect that the ACT's self-insurance licence was a great idea for protecting the finances of the territory. My bill would also go some way to making sure that it is also brilliant for the injured workers. I ask all of you in this place to take carriage of this issue for our frontline workers, some of whom are here today, and to make sure that it, or something like it, is implemented.

Another much-needed reform is the reform of the administration of this Assembly. Specifically, I believe that clerks must be term limited. It is not right that a kingdom is built here that lasts longer than the longest-serving government. I am not aware of any other parliament in Australia in which the Clerk's appointment is now not for a finite term. That should be something that this place works on, for the culture in this place and for all our sakes.

More broadly, I would like to offer a reflection about all of us here, and please note that this is not actually a partisan comment. I have been in this chamber for almost a decade. I am speaking to all sides, all parties, when I say that we are not serving the people of Canberra as well as they could or should be served. Canberra is the national capital, yet the territory lags behind the rest of the country in virtually every independent measure of service provision. Whether it is waiting lists in hospitals, the culture in our health system, education, the availability of rental accommodation, the cost of housing or police numbers, we underperform.

Despite this, I believe we have become too comfortable in here. We need to be striving harder for the people of Canberra. The starting salary for an MLA is a senior executive service wage for the average Canberran in the public service. The federal bureaucracy makes us a company town, with the company being the biggest economic entity in Australia, and one that can practically never go bust. But Canberrans accept,



fatalistically, it seems, that services are poor and costly and that many things in the ACT do not work properly. Just ask comedian Jimmy Rees who, in his recent send-up of Canberra, said, “And everything will cost 20 per cent more, because it’s Canberra.”

Our public finances are not well understood, and I suspect that there are structural problems that will come home to roost one day. I believe that ministers very often let others do the thinking for them. There are powerful directorates, and ministers do not appear to want to have the fight and stamp themselves on their directorates. Have the fight. Demand more. Don’t be comfortable.

I also feel that we are all in this Assembly increasingly seen and treated as merely a necessary appendage that has to be entertained, not feared or respected, by a bureaucratic administration that largely does what it wants. I tried to get Calvary to appear at estimates, but I never even received a response to my letter from the committee. You each have this power; use it. I am aware of a federal official who begrudgingly came “down to the village”, as he wrote to his colleagues, to explain their statutory role in our estimates process.

We need to push harder because our power must be demonstrated to be credible. We all need to refocus on this place. Make it dynamic and effective; make sure that, whatever government we have in this city, it delivers as well as it can for the people of Canberra.

We the opposition, both in the Assembly and outside, can also do better in holding the government to account. Indeed that should be the opposition’s main job. For a change in government to occur, which really would be healthy for us all, the opposition must be more than “nice people” deliberating on the government’s agenda from the margins in this place. We need to be seen and heard often, as we rigorously hold the government to account, call out every single failure with energy, and engage closer with the media, whilst demonstrating an alternative vision for Canberra and its people. We all need to exit our comfort zones. That is the end of my lecture.

To my electorate, I say thank you. Thank you especially to the quiet people who chat to me in the supermarket, who let me know that they are grateful for my service here. It boosts me to know that we are appreciated by many. It has been my honour to represent you.

Together we have fixed hundreds of problems around the electorate. From the very first small victory, a fence at the end of Hindmarsh Drive to stop the doughys and the rubbish dumping there—thanks, Mr Rattenbury—to the mums, dads and grands that I have worked with to see improvements to playgrounds, roads, footpaths and signage, I thank you. It has been an honour and a privilege to serve you.

During my committee service, there were two reports of which I am particularly proud—the JACS committee’s report into the current police arrangements, and the review of ACT emergency services responses to the bushfire season of 2019-20. Both were released, sadly, during the 2020 election, because we worked so hard on them, but they were pivotal reports from my perspective. I learned a lot while chairing the committee for those inquiries.

There are so many advocates, activists and passionate people across the city who have assisted me in this place over the last decade—some in the not-for-profit sector, some in unions and some worked for government. Advice, information and insights, at times activism on issues, were often only ever a phone call away. I will not name you, mostly because you do your best work without being targeted, but to those who have helped me, taught me, advocated positions for me, shared private and tragic experiences with me and got things done with me: thank you. You were often the grease that kept my parliamentary wheels turning.

Now to all of you, my esteemed colleagues, first to the other side of the chamber—Mr Barr. It is not easy to get behind the hard exterior, and no-one could accuse Mr Barr of being too soft, but there is a heart in there. I think that the most shocking thing I ever did to Mr Barr was to get him a glass of water when he was choking. Maybe we are harsh in debate at times, but I do not think I have ever seen him so grateful or shocked. Thank you for your service to this city, Chief Minister, especially on the hard days. We do have some very different views, but, for the service you have rendered, thank you.

Ms Berry, the long-term cabinet mum: no other long-term member of cabinet knows what it is really like for us who blend hard work and family and all that entails. As Yvette herself commented once, it surprises you sometimes in life, the people that you become friends with, and I count Yvette as a friend. She first said g'day after being elected in 2012, at the ABC studios on Northbourne Avenue—and hasn't it been a ride since?

Ms Stephen-Smith, I have got to give it to you; the pandemic was harsh on you, and you kept turning up and doing your job day after day. Hindsight is a strange thing, and I am sure there are things we would all do differently, but the sheer volume of work that you and your staff did very few will ever know. Thanks also for staying on the phone when we were having one of my chats about a new restriction or something and a very disturbed individual was screaming at me on the footpath late one night outside my home about how Mr Barr and I had ruined his life. That was a hard night, and I was grateful that you did not hang up. I will never forget thinking, as he took off down the street, shouting, "You and Mr Barr can go and eff each other," that this man was clearly not well researched, or he would have known I am not really Mr Barr's type!

The most surprising moment of my tenure here was Mr Gentleman answering my emails during the bushfires. As shadow emergency services, during the 2020 summer fires, I had a lot of work to do with you, and I am still amazed that the minister with whom no-one can ever get an appointment actually replied to my emails directly. Well done, Mick; keep it up.

Mr Steel, unflatteringly referred to as the "mini Barr": you can be heartless in debate. But I have to give it to you: after many failing to act before you—and possibly out of pure self-interest—you have done more for playgrounds than anyone else in the city services portfolio has done in decades.

Ms Cheyne, it has not been an easy ride, has it? Idealistic to the nth degree, I will not miss Tara's lectures at events about how bad we are as a nation, but I will miss her commitment. I remember Tara coming to multicultural events after her worst summer break of all time, with her leg in a cast. Not since Nicola Roxon savaged the press, with her leg in plaster, for filming her in the federal parliament in an electric scooter, has anyone ever demonstrated greater dedication to the role.

Mr Pettersson, as a young MLA, you have copped a lot from our side, and you do always make it rather satisfying when you bite back! I think it was Mark who unkindly referred to you as a "dull headache", but I will always remember your kindness to me when you supplied me with many long nights worth of newspapers to roll up and smoke, if I was ever in need of something bad for my health and juvenile to cope with this job! Thanks for that. As a good Liberal, I have gone more for the prescription options to deal with the stress of this place, but thank you.

Dr Paterson, who unhelpfully, is seated next to Mr Pettersson: I know that you are watching online. Haven't we had some interesting meetings over the last couple of years, with constituents who are keen to work with both of us? I will buy you a medal if you ever get the city services minister to allow some much-desired community gardening at the Duffy shops. I have been trying for 10 years. It has been good to chat about the things that we, as Murrumbidgee mums, have experienced in raising our kids in the creek. Thank you for your sincerity.

Ms Orr, the most organised whip in my time here—the friendliest and most considerate whip, too. Thanks for all of the chats about, "Where are our members now?" and the occasional shared eye-roll. I will follow Portia the cat's adventures keenly on Facebook.

Madam Speaker, thanks for all of the help with the commonwealth women parliamentary events. I really do hope they have helped some young women to consider the work that we do. I know that my side have been brutal at times. I was on the receiving end of some of Mr Doszpot's rage from time to time, and Ms Lawder will recall that I needed some help and guidance through all of that, too. However, when I was experiencing trolling a few years back, and I was really falling apart a bit, thank you, Joy, for taking that seriously. It still means a lot to me.

On to the Greens: Mr Rattenbury, I still maintain that you are a very capable person hindered by political catchphrases about keeping people out of prison. You could do so much more. But I thank you for taking my calls when I shadowed you last term, even though I am sure there were literally a million things that you would rather have been doing. I hope you have not finished your running; and, if you ever want to take the tour I offered you of playgrounds in Weston Creek, I am still willing. I think I really must have driven you insane for you to be so obsessed by my choice to stop driving for three months. I suppose I will never know exactly how you did know so much detail about my driving record.

It was no doubt hard for Ms Vassarotti to be a minister as soon as being elected. It is a fact that Ms Vassarotti probably does not know that I used to empty her bin and

vacuum her office, as a night cleaner in the CPA building, as I scraped together enough to keep my family going to stand in the 2012 election.

Ms Davidson, it might be hard to know if you are happy or sad, at times, across the chamber from here, but you got the cabinet over the line on Coolo park—the only Greens member to stand up to Labor publicly in a generation in this place! Long may Coolo park stay as a cool oasis for our little part of the world. I propose—and this is a serious statement—that it should be renamed the Gina Coulthard memorial park, after she lost her life to cancer during the pandemic, an illness that cannot have been helped by the distress she and her neighbours lived through, fighting to keep their bedroom windows free of car fumes in their little piece of suburbia. Well done, Emma. Now get the same result on Coombs peninsula! This government is too greedy for every inch of land for profit, and you, and I and many in this city know it.

I am sorry, Mr Davis, that the fact that you were once in nappies was used against you in this place. Not our finest moment in opposition, but you have surely brought colour to our days—every colour of the rainbow. Do not forget that you started out blue, and we gave you the first experience in a political office at a young age, as we have done for so many. So we cannot be all that bad!

Ms Clay, with the ever-thoughtful critique, I am sorry that I do not share in your panic for the end times, but I know you practise what you preach, and I respect you for that. But I am optimistic by nature, and I just cannot let that go.

Mr Braddock, a man after my own heart—a Green who knows that the end times are not nigh. Kermit the frog once said, “It’s not easy being green,” and I think some of the astounding backflips you have had to engage in here must still be hurting today. You have followed in the steps of Mr Rattenbury, who has become positively Gumby-like in his ability to bend, stretch and flip principled positions when the need to retain power calls for it.

Now to my own team. Ms Lee, I have been proud to serve as your deputy. People underestimate you, and you have more capacity and grit than all the men in this game put together. I wish you the best in the uphill fight that opposition faces in this place. You will succeed in your own way.

Mr Hanson: ah, what can I say, Jezza? A trained military fighter has seen and worked in the danger zone more than most people here would care to imagine; he has seen things none of us will ever have to face, to fight for our freedoms, like the freedom to come and disagree in here. If he is occasionally a bit harsh, and thoroughly masculine in his approach, he is well trained in the infantry, after all. It only took me four years here before we were able to be more like friends than trench enemies. But I got there in the end. I know he would visit me in hospital if I were dying and when no-one else might. Thanks, Jezza; you will miss me out there in the wilds of Murrumbidgee.

Ms Lawder: never one to get too excited, Nicole, the stateswoman of our shadow cabinet, famously once stood up for all the women in the shadow cabinet, completely changing the discussion, when she said, “I don’t know about the other women here,

but I'm not a girl." Thanks, Nicole. You helped this parliament with the hard change from majority macho to majority women. It has not always been plain sailing.

Mr Parton, ever the comedian, but Mark has a heart like no other; a very open human—sometimes too open. But no-one can make a minister stress like him when they hear the words, "Mark has made a video about you again." Keep shining a light, Mark. I deeply appreciate Mark pointing out that those of us rather attached to the traditional definition of marriage were not all bigots. That means a lot during a time that was hard for many here.

Mr Milligan, often misunderstood; James has a big heart and is always open to a chat. He does not pretend that people are perfect and is willing to see what needs to change. James helped me a lot, many years ago, when we were both just starting out. I spent many days sitting on his couch discussing the finer details of design of product. His tenacity has kept him here; he just keeps on going. Keep on going, James; you have earned your place here.

Mrs Kikkert, you have given so much to be here. You have looked roaring lions in the mouth and refused to give up on your calling. As a mum, and as a representative of those who do not have a voice, I meant it when I said that people need you here. You, my friend, I would choose to have nearby me if I were ever to fall off a cliff. You do not seek glory or fame, but to serve, and that is the highest honour of all. Well done, faithful sister.

Ms Castley, once you asked me, "Could I do it? Could I be an MLA?" I said, "Of course, you could be, and why should it be someone else?" You keep doing you. You are an asset to your city and your community. For all of the nights we sat together going over the finer points of federal Liberal policy and media management, you are worth it, my friend.

Finally, Mr Cain, no-one can outwork you in event attendance. I have it on good authority that you have already been to four million events this year! Keep going, Peter. Like Forrest Gump, keep on going; you will make your mark here.

To the Clerk's office, the attendants, the Clerk, Hansard, the committee office, library, IT and HR—I know it is not a comprehensive list—but thank you all. I have never believed that my staff should have to clock in and clock out like factory workers. The time sheets in this parliament are pretty demeaning to the professionals who work here. No other parliament has them. In my experience—and I have worked in three other state parliaments—they should go.

Despite all of that, thank you to the people who have worked for me over the last decade, despite the demands of this team calling. I thank my current staff: Daniel Tedeschi, Sean O'Dea, Ciaran O'Dea, David Turnbull, Elli Williams, Daniel Weight, and Mina Zaki. I thank my previous staff: Peter Hosking, Nathan Mullins, Martin Ross, Marianne Chaston, Josh Bryant, Gus McManus, Danielle Young, Amber Gale, Samantha Young, Kacey Lam, Gerrard Williams, Greg Hosking, James Richards, Brendan O'Dea, Paul Monagle, Liam Develin, Zoe Bingley, Susannah Edwards, Richard Howard, Louise English, Gillian Belcher, Isabella Dunne, Emma Growling,

Patrick O'Dea, Gerard O'Dea and Brittany Jackson. You have served my electorate alongside me and you have done a fantastic job.

Next to my husband and children. This is actually the first, and it will be the only, time that my whole family has attended here in the gallery, for obvious reasons. Bernard, you are my rock. We hear a lot about men with problems, and what can go wrong in relationships, but today I am here to tell a very different story. We dreamed of a faithful and life-giving relationship. For being the guy up at 5 am folding the washing and getting home most nights for the past 10 years to get dinner on, I salute you.

I kept the home going while you served in Indonesia after the 2004 Boxing Day tsunami, and I, and your mum, Granny Crystal, who is in the chamber and who has been one of my greatest champions in our family, kept the home going while you were in Iraq and Afghanistan in 2008 and 2009. You have done the same, and more, for me, willing me to succeed through election campaigns, political kicks in the guts, the satisfaction of small changes achieved and the highs of other victories for common sense for the people of this city. Thanks, babe; we are a great team together.

To my children. Felix, my right-hand man—sometimes child wrangler, sometimes voice of encouragement to me—thanks, mate. I am proud of you and I know I can rely on you in this family teamwork we are engaged in.

Leo the lion: I will tell you a short story about Leo. Leo and I were at the Cooleman Court shops during an election campaign some years ago, and Leo went missing, as Leo sometimes was wont to do. We found him half an hour later, coming up the ramp at Cooleman Court, and he said, "Don't worry, mum; I told them." I said, "What did you tell them, and who did you tell?" He said, "I told Labor they're wrong, in some detail." That was a good moment. Leo is always keen to engage, and I am really proud of you starting out your journey in the trades with your little part-time job at the butchers.

Nicolina, my creative genius, amazes me every day. You have a great brain. It sometimes annoys you, but you will find a way through. You have a golden heart, especially with your younger siblings. I cannot wait to see where life takes you, and what you will do with your talents, especially your sewing. Since you first started creating on Grandma Nicolina's sewing machine during last year's lockdown, it has been amazing to watch you come to life.

Ambrose, the quiet achiever of the family, thanks for being amazing at your jobs. You are dependable, and sometimes quite funny. Well done on starting piano and in drawing some of the most disturbing pictures of monsters and zombies that I have ever seen. Some would call you stubborn, but I say that you have staying power.

Maximus: sorry, mate, you will go down in history as the guy who was breastfed in the parliament! You and I were a team through some tough days in this place and your company gives me great hope for the future. You really have inherited the family's emotional genes, but you are lively, sensitive and have more energy than most people

put together. You can run fast, and you keep me on my toes. We are looking forward to seeing you grow into who you will be, with your very clever mind.

To my baby Lilianna, the pregnancy with you was one of the hardest things I have ever done. I was afraid and in a bit of a bad mood, but you have brought so much joy to our lives; you are a delight. You, me and Nicolina are the girls' team in our home. We might be outnumbered but we more than make up for that with our passionate opinions and personalities. Thanks for all of the hugs; you make me smile so often.

Family is a process of co-formation; you have made me who I am, and I look forward to playing an even bigger role in your day-to-day lives now that I am leaving the parliament.

To Elizabeth Lee, Jeremy, Nicole, Mark, James, Elizabeth Kikkert, Peter and Leanne, to Alistair, Candice, Vicki and Andrew, and to Steve, Val and Brendan, it has been my honour to serve with you all; thank you.

To those opposite, across from me, we do not always agree, but we do want so much for this city, and for it to thrive. We each bring a different recipe. But I have appreciated each of you on different occasions. I have growing respect for many of you, despite our differences. Thanks for working with me to get things done, Rachel, Yvette, Emma and even Chris.

Now, after asking more than 550 questions, raising over 100 points of order and submitting 267 questions on notice, it is time for the John Hargreaves memorial drinks cabinet, which has been the centre of so much fun in my office, to be returned to the Assembly basement to await its next custodian. This is not the end of my advocacy and it is not the end of my political involvement, but it is the end of my tenure as an MLA.

I thank Canberra, the electors of Murrumbidgee and, in particular, the Liberal Party for allowing me the honour to serve you all. I thank God for inspiring me to do much with the gifts he has given me. I hope I have demonstrated family as a strength and not just an impediment. I look forward to my future and my next form of service to our city and our nation. I have given it my absolute best. Farewell.

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Climate Action, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism) (10.51), by leave: The Leader of the Opposition still being in the sin-bin, I will step up to respond, Mrs Jones. You are one of a kind; there is no doubting that. Right up to your final speech, you have brushed with controversy. You have prompted those on this side of the chamber to reflect upon why we are here and why we seek to contribute to a better Canberra and a better society.

I do not think we have agreed on much, frankly, in 10 years; I think that is fair to observe. There is much in what I have just heard from you that I do not agree with, either. But I acknowledge that you have always put forward your view passionately. I have never been in any doubt as to where you stand on issues. I know many of my

colleagues who have been the minister that you have shadowed have certainly recognised your passion for many different areas of public policy.

I note that, in your long list of shadow portfolios, and as Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you were never my shadow minister, so I have not had the benefit of late-night phone calls with you—on any topic, I hasten to add. Some of my colleagues will respond to many of your kind and generous remarks in the subsequent elements of this debate.

What I would observe is that you have been a passionate advocate for your side of politics. You have navigated your way through what seems like the incredibly complex world of the Canberra Liberals with aplomb, to rise to the position of deputy leader. Taking a leadership role in a political party is indeed a challenge. I know the amount of time and commitment that that requires. I want to acknowledge that very significant contribution that you have made to your side of politics, and indeed to this chamber.

I would observe that you seem happy and content with a decision that you have made after nearly 10 years of service. You have done a lot for your community and for your side of politics. I think you have earned the right to leave on your own terms, to be happy and to spend more time with your wonderful family, who are here today.

I wish you all the very best for what comes next. I am sure we will see and hear from you in our city and in our nation. On behalf of my colleagues who will not be speaking today, we wish you all the very best. Other colleagues do want to take the opportunity to thank you specifically in a number of areas, so I will defer to them to say more in the coming moments. All the very best for the future; thank you.

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong—Leader of the Opposition) (10.54), by leave: Today we say farewell and thank you to one of the giants in ACT politics. Anyone who knows Mrs Jones, anyone who has worked with Mrs Jones, anyone who has been the beneficiary of Mrs Jones's fierce advocacy, will know that she is a woman of conviction in what she has phrased as modern conservative values.

I first met Giulia when we became running mates in the 2012 ACT election in the former electorate of Molonglo. She was already a seasoned campaigner, and she was, and is, not afraid of blood, sweat and tears to achieve her goals. She was committed to supporting new candidates, as she knew so well the ups and downs, the joys and tears, that come with an election campaign. She was successfully elected in 2012. She always made an effort to keep in touch with other candidates who had missed out, including me in that election. She saw herself as a mentor and was always willing to provide advice and support for good Liberals that she could see had a future in politics. Throughout her time as an elected member in this Assembly, she never wavered in her ferocious support for Liberal candidates, including in the most recent federal election.

Family and faith are very important to Giulia. They play a huge role in who she is today. I pay tribute to Giulia's husband, Bernard, and her six children—Felix, Leo, Ambrose, Maximus, Nicolina and Liliana—who have been through all the ups and downs of life in politics with their loving mum. It takes extraordinary patience and



love to support what each of us does every day. Giulia's family no doubt will be very grateful to be able to spend more time with her.

I am sure that everyone in this chamber will agree that this place will be a much quieter place without Mrs Jones. I know that certainly the party room will be. With a personality as big as her heart, Giulia has never been afraid of speaking her mind, even when it has been tough and even when it has been challenging. She has never been afraid to wear her heart on her sleeve, and she has never shied away from her commitment to her faith and the community.

When Giulia first entered the Assembly, she spoke about her commitment to, and I quote from her inaugural speech:

... first-class services, accessible health care, an outstanding education system, a return to strong and effective law and order, ample supplies of homes for young couples on reasonably sized housing blocks, a local shop and a park for our kids to play in.

A decade on, I think we can all agree that Giulia has been absolutely steadfast in her commitment to those issues—the same issues that continue to be out of reach for so many Canberrans after more than 20 years of this Labor-Greens government.

Giulia's time in this place will be remembered for many achievements—from her energetic and deep engagement with Canberra's multicultural community, especially her support for vulnerable families who were doing it really tough during the COVID lockdown, to her staunch lobbying for her local community, whether it be for safe playgrounds, a local shop or to save local green spaces.

I think Giulia will be remembered most for being a strong role model for working mums. After the 2020 ACT election, it was a proud moment for the Canberra Liberals, for Giulia and me, to be given the incredible privilege by our colleagues to become the first female leadership team in the ACT. We achieved a lot in our time together. I know how committed Giulia was to her community, to her parliament and to her colleagues. I know that it would have been an incredibly difficult decision to step down to focus on her family and her health. It takes courage to do so and a lot of heart as well.

Whilst Giulia will be, of course, a big loss for us here in the Assembly, in ACT politics and in our party room, it will be a gain for her family and for her friends. Giulia's tenacity, grit and work ethic will hold her in good stead for whatever comes next. I have no doubt that her family, her faith and her sense of duty to continue to play a significant role in her ongoing engagement with the community will hold her in good stead for whatever comes next.

Giulia, on behalf of the Canberra Liberals, thank you for your service to our party, to our parliament and to our community. You will be missed. On behalf of Mr Hanson—unfortunately, the cold has taken our military man down—I know that he very much wanted to be here to share his thoughts with you, as a long-term running mate. I know that you and Jeremy spent a lot of time together out in the electorate, and I know that

he will miss you—all of the colourful array of the relationship that you had together in the very long time that you have spent together in politics.

Giulia, thank you for your service to the people of, first, Molonglo and then Murrumbidgee. Thank you for what you have done for our party and for our movement. Best wishes with everything.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (11.00), by leave: This morning, on behalf of the ACT Greens, I rise to acknowledge Mrs Jones on the occasion of her resignation from the Assembly.

Let me start by acknowledging the difficulty of that decision. Mrs Jones was first elected in October 2012 for what was then the seat of Molonglo, later contesting the seat of Murrumbidgee, around her home area of Weston Creek, when the Assembly moved to five electorates in 2016.

She has now been elected to this place three times, which is, in and of itself, a significant accomplishment. In that context, the decision to resign partway through a term is undoubtedly a very difficult one. My impression has always been that Mrs Jones was deeply committed to her role in the Assembly, bringing a passion to her work that underlines that this is not a decision she will have made lightly.

Let me touch on a few examples of the things I have appreciated about Mrs Jones during her time in the Assembly. One matter that has always motivated me is something that Mrs Jones and I have in common. We both passionately believe in protecting, caring for and creating the best possible future for the upcoming generation. Mrs Jones has sought to bring issues to this place that reflect that conviction.

I appreciate the way that Mrs Jones spoke out about the right to breastfeed in public, about the challenges faced by women in the AMC and about the importance of celebrating our multicultural society and catering for everyone, no matter their cultural background. I appreciate Mrs Jones's pride in her own heritage and the fact that she has shown photographic evidence of that pride in this chamber—her childhood self, dancing at a festival in Italian ethnic dress. I appreciate that she has channelled her pride into building relationships across so many of Canberra's different multicultural communities, attending so many different events—possibly not as many as Mr Cain, but certainly a great number.

My colleagues also appreciated her advocacy as a member for Murrumbidgee, in particular being able to work together with her in the multiparty effort to save Coolo park.

To my best knowledge, Mrs Jones is the only member of this place to feature in a RiotACT calendar. No doubt members will recall that Mrs Jones has landed some pretty colourful descriptions of various members over the years. The thing I have always reflected on, as those barbs were delivered, is that in those moments I appreciate that Mrs Jones brings real passion to this place. It is hard to know whether to be insulted or amused when you are being referred to as “anti-family”, “anti-mum”,

with a “mung-bean, soy-latte-sipping vision of a Utopian society where inner city yuppies can catch a tram to work”!

Nevertheless Mrs Jones’s voice will be remembered in this Assembly as being filled with conviction. The opportunity to come into this place and stand up for those issues that you feel strongly about is indeed a privilege, and one that I am sure that Mrs Jones will miss, even if the things that pull her away are, rightly, the things she must attend to instead.

We wish Mrs Jones and her family the best for the future, without the time and work pressures that being an elected representative of our community can bring.

**MS BERRY** (Ginninderra—Deputy Chief Minister, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Women) (11.03), by leave: I am very happy to talk about Mrs Jones today and the contributions that she has made to this place, as well as about our friendship that has developed over the last 10 years. I feel that we have wasted a lot of that time, and we could have known a lot more about each other if it had not been for the artificial barriers that this place sometimes creates to learning more about people and finding the things that you have in common. I think we found that probably in the last couple of years.

We were elected here at the same time, from very different sides of the block, with Mrs Jones being quite conservative, and very committed to her faith and her family, and me as a single mum from west Belconnen. We definitely brought a different perspective into this place. Somehow we found a camaraderie, even during some of the most difficult times.

One of my favourite memories of working with Mrs Jones was when we were new to this place, working on committees with Mr Doszpot, and what I can only describe as the bickering that would occur between Mr Doszpot and Mrs Jones. Mr Doszpot would get particularly upset when I was defending vulnerable people and the working class, and Mrs Jones would say, “Don’t worry about it, Doszie; don’t worry about it. That’s just who Yvette is. Just move on.”

One of the things with Mrs Jones was that you knew where she was. She wore her politics on her sleeve—very pragmatic, and no shifting or shadow work there. We all know what you stand for and who you are. I have always appreciated that honesty coming from you.

More recently we have confided to each other about private matters within our own lives and our professional lives, and that has helped us to form an even closer relationship. Particularly, I feel that I know your family even more. Even though I have not seen them in person very much, it is lovely to see them in person here today.

It has been quite a journey for both of us at various times, and we have been able to speak honestly to each other about some of the challenges that this place and our families have brought to us. Having that on different sides of politics has been really refreshing, Mrs Jones, so thank you for that.

I did find that we have more in common than people know. We do have chickens. We have shared ways to keep them alive. I know that, Bernard, those are your particular passion as well—and old cars as well. Perhaps, Bernard, you will get a chance to properly refurbish that old VW, with Mrs Jones not spending as much time in this place.

I know that your commitment is to your family, first and foremost. I hope that after today and this week passes, we will catch up for a coffee and that we will be able to stand over the kitchen counter together and cook up a feed for our families, and maybe catch up together again.

Thank you for your friendship and for everything in this place. I have learned so much from you about your part of the world. I hope that sharing my life and my part of the world with you will be taken with you wherever you go in the future and whatever you decide to do. Thank you again for your friendship, Giulia. You will be well missed.

**MR MILLIGAN** (Yerrabi) (11.07), by leave: I want to take this opportunity, obviously, to acknowledge the outstanding work that Mrs Jones has done in this Assembly. I first met Mrs Jones back in 2007, when I first joined the Liberal Party. I think that at that time she was president of the Gungahlin interest branch, and she certainly made that experience and that first opportunity for me really welcoming. She was very compassionate and still is compassionate. She loved that branch, she loved her members, and she made everyone feel really welcome.

As a result of that, I wanted to get behind her to show support, to help her out in her endeavours to become an MLA, and in 2008 she put her hand up to run for the seat of Molonglo. That was the very first time that I was introduced to what I think they call a “media stunt”. We ended up dragging an office desk across the paddock in the middle of Gungahlin. We set it up in the middle of the paddock there—the desk and a computer. Mrs Jones was campaigning on the desk about a desperate need for local employment in the Gungahlin region. This is the extent to which Mrs Jones was going to go to get some media and to bring the issue to attention. And it was quite successful. I think she actually did get some media out of it, and it was good to be a part of.

Eventually, Mrs Jones was elected in 2012. We both ran in the seat of Molonglo, and she was elected in 2012. But before that, in 2010, we both ran in the federal election, in Canberra and Fenner. That was certainly a tough task flying the Liberal flag, but she represented those traditional core Liberal values and brings them to this place. She does not forget that, and she has represented them in the electorate as well. She does not forget about the people who support her and who voted for her, ensuring that those core Liberal values are represented in this place.

There is a lot that Mrs Jones has done in this Assembly, just recently in the shadow health portfolio. During the pandemic she worked tirelessly—of course working with Ms Stephen-Smith—in that area to try and get better outcomes for the community and to highlight the issues that she had with restrictions and everything. I know that she has done tremendous work, so I congratulate her on that. I am sure the community

really appreciates that. Even during that time, she campaigned for the community sector by putting together food hampers and support for the community. She was out there doing that from the kindness of her own heart because she saw that there was a desperate need to support this particular sector of the community. Congratulations on that.

To Bernard: I know Bernard has been a great support of yours, Mrs Jones. I have known Bernard for a long time, as well. Yes, he has an interest in old cars, but he also has an interest in coins. I know that there was an incident where the coins were lost, so hopefully they can get that passion back and start the interest up again. But, Mrs Jones, I really just wanted to thank you for your service to Molonglo and Murrumbidgee. Thank you for the support and the mentorship that you have given me over the years. I know that wherever you go from now, you will succeed in whatever you choose to do. I wish you all the best, and hopefully we still see you around the traps.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Families and Community Services and Minister for Health) (11.11), by leave: It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to recognise Mrs Jones's service in this place for the people of Canberra, especially the women and the mothers, and her constituents. There is no doubt that Mrs Jones has sometimes played it hard in this place and has been the loudest voice—even when Mr Hanson has been in the chamber! Opposition, particularly a long-term opposition, does grow frustration, and we do understand that. I think that sometimes those opposite goad one another into a level of aggression and personal attacks that do not actually reflect the way that they would prefer to behave, and the way that we sometimes see them in private.

But, at the same time, we have seen many times that Mrs Jones's passion is driven by a genuine concern for people. Looking back at Mrs Jones's correspondence to my office through the pandemic, that is the common theme that shines through. When it came to advocating for individuals who were doing it tough, it was not about the political win; it was about getting something done for that person or that group.

And I valued Mrs Jones's recognition, privately at least, that I could not actually always fix everything, and that that did not mean that I did not care, or that my office did not care, or that officials did not care. Mrs Jones is a thoughtful person. When we went into lockdown, she knew that I and my office staff would be working flat out, as she has talked about, and she delivered a basket of snacks—some healthy, some not so healthy—to keep us going. That really spoke to the way Mrs Jones does think about others and to her motherly nature. As she has talked about, and as others have mentioned, when Mrs Jones became aware of the impact of COVID on particular communities and families, she pitched in, in a really practical way, helping to deliver food, particularly to large families who were doing it really tough in isolation and quarantine, during the peak of the delta wave.

In briefings, Mrs Jones engaged personally and sensibly. She was, I have to say, much better informed and less ideological than her predecessor in those conversations. She knew about some of the very sensitive matters that we had to work through, and some

of the complex considerations and decisions that were being made. And, again, she did not play politics with those; she sought to engage constructively on those matters, whilst still holding the government to account when she and the Liberal opposition did not agree with the decisions that were being made.

The night Mrs Jones talked about, when we were on the phone and there was a man outside her house, yelling at her, I did point out to her the perils of having wrapped vehicles parked in your driveway—something the Canberra Liberals are fond of. Bernard was not at home that evening, and Mrs Jones was there with her children, who were otherwise engaged, with their headphones in. She bravely went out the door and tried to engage sensibly with this constituent and to find out what his concern was. She genuinely wanted to know if there was something that she could do to help this person, despite his aggression towards her. And I thought that spoke volumes about your character, Giulia.

It is, of course, the role of the opposition to hold the government to account, and Mrs Jones has steadfastly stood up for workers' health and safety throughout, in her many roles as shadow minister, whether it was for fires, ambos, corrections workers, nurses or junior medical officers. Again, we might not always agree, but that comes from a genuine place of caring about people and caring about those workers. Giulia is someone who regularly reminds us of her union background, and, in that frame, I would say there is also, of course, no-one in this place who wears red better than Mrs Jones!

For my final words I got in touch with Bec Cody, because I know that she and Mrs Jones had been close, and I asked her if she wanted to pass on any messages. Bec sent me a message:

Dear Mrs Jones,

Thank you for all the support and friendship you have shown to me, and many other women, both while we were colleagues and since my leaving the Assembly. I wish you every happiness and success in your future endeavours.

I am sure we all join with Bec in that sentiment. Thank you, Mrs Jones, for your service, and all the best for the future.

**MR STEEL** (Murrumbidgee—Minister for Skills, Minister for Transport and City Services and Special Minister of State) (11.16), by leave: I also wanted to pass on my best wishes to Giulia Jones and her family on her resignation from the Assembly. As a fellow member for Murrumbidgee, I have seen Giulia out and about a lot, and I have always appreciated her sense of common decency, her personable nature, particularly on the campaign trail, when it is a difficult period of time.

We have stopped for the odd selfie and had a chat about local issues. I have appreciated her pragmatism. I have not just received brick bats in the messages sent to me at 11 pm at night, I have also received a few bouquets when we got things done that were important for the community of Murrumbidgee. I really appreciate that, Giulia.

I probably had more to do with Mrs Jones when I was on the back bench, but certainly, on the trips that we have taken for committees and the like, I found out a little bit about her, including her former affiliation to the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association. Her pragmatic nature has led me to think that, in a different world, in a different state—perhaps in her former state of Tasmania—and perhaps in a different decade, she might have been a member of the Labor Party.

I have really appreciated working with you, Giulia, in Murrumbidgee. I know that you have always had a focus on family, and I hope you have an opportunity to spend more time with them. Thanks.

**MR DAVIS** (Brindabella) (11.18), by leave: I will be quick, Mrs Jones, because we have not had the privilege of working together for very long, but there are a couple of reflections that I feel almost compelled to make. As someone only newly elected to this place, I did my homework before I came to work here, and I had a pretty good idea about who was who in the zoo, and what they stood for. I drew some conclusions from that, about what those people might be like to work with. And I want it on record that there is probably nobody that I got it more wrong about than you. I do not share your conservative politics, particularly your social conservatism, which involves strongly held values that I respect, though I do not share.

My conclusion from outside this place, prior to my election, was that those differences of opinion and those differences in values, may make our personal relationship challenging, maybe even make it difficult to work together, but you have been incredibly kind to me with that mothering spirit that others have mentioned, and you never had to be. I have my own Greens contingent, and my own team in the office; you never had to go out of your way to drop into the office and see how I was adjusting and how we were doing. One of the really nice things that I want to reflect on, Mrs Jones, which I think really speaks to your character, is the kindness I observed that you would offer my staff, not just to me.

And I think that is reflected in the interactions I have seen with people who work in all of the offices in this building. It really speaks to Mrs Jones's character and the way that she conducted yourself in this place, that she did not treat her colleagues, as MLAs, one way, and the staff who work with us and serve our electorates a different way. She has been so kind to the people in my office.

I make these reflections because I know that there are people who would vote for me, and vote for my colleagues, and support my side of politics who, equally, would not share her opinions. Everybody is an armchair critic and maybe they would have unkind things to say about her—just as, I am sure, some of her most loyal supporters, the people who put your signs up on the side of the road, might in their quietest moments as armchair critics have unkind things to say about me and my colleagues. I want it on record, in spite of our differences, that Mrs Jones is an incredibly good person and an incredibly kind person. She has been very generous to a new young MLA in the time that I have spent here. I am not sad to see the politics that she represents lose a passionate advocate in this place, but I am very glad that her friends and family will get to spend more time with the good person that I have come to know in the short time I have been here.

**MRS KIKKERT** (Ginninderra) (11.20), by leave: I must admit that that, by far, has been the best speech that you have given in the chamber. Mrs Jones knows exactly how I feel about politics, and for her to stand up and say nice things about every single person in this chamber is quite refreshing, and I love it. I think we should do more of that. So I thank her for raising the bar.

I have known Giulia for many years now. I have known her before politics, and she has become a great source of mentorship and comfort to me. I remember one time when I was campaigning back in 2016 and she messaged me and called me continuously. She said, “Elizabeth, when you go out into the electorate, you will face adversity. You will face other people who will hate you, not only because of who you are, but because of the party that you belong to.” And I was like, “Yes, I will be fine, Giulia.” Little did I know that, as soon as I hit the shops and somebody saw the blue sign, there would be swearing and spitting. And I thought, “Wow, Giulia was right.” And so I stood there, and I was shedding a few tears. I remember messaging Giulia that evening, because I received a message from her after she had campaigned all day long and was looking after her kids. She was still very thoughtful about others. She messaged me and said, “How did today go?”

And I just poured out my soul about politics, that I hated politics: “I do not even know why I am doing this.” But Giulia provided words of comfort, love, inspiration and courage to move forward, and she has not changed one bit; she still continues to do the same thing. Even when I got into office, in the first year it was very difficult for me to adjust from being a full-time mum of five kids—from the kitchen to the parliament. It was a completely different environment. Giulia made sure that I felt comfortable in this space and that I knew what to do next. Forever I will be grateful for that—for her mentorship and also for her friendship. I will always be grateful for that.

As a local member I have admired the amount of work that she has diligently provided to her constituents. I have admired her diligence in listening to them and coming into this chamber to be a voice for them. I have admired her strength to tackle the opposition every time that there was a very robust debate. I have always admired her strength and her ability to stand up for other people as well as for herself. That is one thing that I will always carry, and I am very grateful for that example. On top of that, we have been hearing about her kindness towards everybody and I think she has just raised the bar even more. We need to show more kindness to each other, no matter what politics we belong to, what side we belong to, or what policy we may disagree with. Showing kindness to each, as well as to the staff of MLAs, is ever so important.

I thank the member for pointing that out, because that is a great legacy to leave behind in the ACT Legislative Assembly, and it has been quite refreshing to hear all of the back work that Mrs Jones has done with her constituents, but also the kindness that she has shown to everybody in this room. I did not know about that, but I am not surprised that she has done that, because that is who she is. She is an angel in disguise in this place, and I will forever be grateful for that.



Life as a politician and raising a family is extremely difficult, and to see Giulia Jones juggling her work and family commitments has been quite refreshing for me, as a full-time mum, to know that I could do both. I just want to say to Giulia's family: thank you so much for lending your mum to those here in the Assembly, her local constituents, as well as all of Canberra. You have sacrificed your time with your mum in order for her to come out and serve the people of Canberra, your neighbours, your school friends and your school friends' parents. That is magnificent and it is very much a courageous and humble moment from the kids to be able to see that. I know that there is no other service in this world that a parent could offer to their kids than to fulfil their own dreams. I know that Giulia Jones is fulfilling her dream from now onwards into the future and I know that her family will be there to support her.

As I watched you deliver your valedictory, Giulia, I saw the reaction from the people in the gallery, and how tearful they were when you brought forward the draft. I could not help but shed tears as well, because what she portrayed today was for the constituent or the frontline worker. I am sorry, but I was watching her reaction to Mrs Jones's speech, and she was crying. That is a reflection of how much Giulia Jones has put herself forward and sacrificed her time to make sure that constituents' needs are met, that their voices are heard, that they have a place here and that somebody is listening. Giulia Jones is doing that for them.

I can honestly say that the work that you have done today, Giulia, with regard to the frontline workers is echoing across Canberra for the many people that you have served in the past. Some people may think that becoming a politician is the ultimate goal in one's career, but I can honestly say that it is not; there is more to life than being a politician. I know full well that Giulia Jones has used the last couple of years in this chamber as a platform to propel her to something greater. I know that God has something in store for her in the future, and I am super excited to find out what that is. I know that He has her best interests at heart and her family's best interests at heart, and I know that great things will come along for you in the near future. I am super excited to see where that will lead you and your family. So, from the bottom of my heart and soul, I thank you for your friendship and I thank you for your mentorship throughout the many years. You are a great example of everything. Thank you.

**MR PARTON** (Brindabella) (11.29), by leave: I promise I will be brief. I want to congratulate Mrs Jones for getting so deep into her valedictory speech before shedding the first tear, because I reckon if SportsBet had run a market on the point at which the waterworks would start, the favourite would have been the first 10 minutes! It would have been a dollar to two. So I think she did exceptionally well.

So many people have spoken about the passion of Giulia Jones today. Can I say that Italians and Colombians are very similar in the way that they go about many things in life. I am married to a Colombian; I understand Mrs Jones more than most people in this place. I think Yvette really nailed it when she talked about the fact that Mrs Jones wears her heart on her sleeve, and that you always know where she is coming from, you always know what her position is, and you always feel that passion.

I would just reflect that, with respect to today's discussion, we are having it pretty much as friends. We do not often do that, and if we all wore our hearts on our

sleeves—if we were all as emotionally open and passionate as Mrs Jones is—we could probably arrive at our conclusions a hell of a lot sooner than we do normally.

I can safely say there will never be another Giulia Jones. She is absolutely one of a kind, and I have learnt so much from her. I have learnt much more from her than she thinks I have learnt. She has inspired so many people. She genuinely mentored me in so many ways, and I will miss her. I will miss her greatly.

I have had a message from someone who is watching online. This valedictory has become the new Depp-Heard. Now that that event has finished, this is the most watched event online; there is no question about it! And I had a message from Ms Castley. “I am watching online. It has been quite the valedictory,” she says, with attached emojis. She continues, “If you do pop up to speak, can you please pass on my thanks to Giulia for her relentless encouragement to me during both of my campaigns, and also during my time as an MLA.” Giulia Jones, thanks for everything.

**MS DAVIDSON** (Murrumbidgee) (11.32), by leave: I would just like to say a few words of thanks to a fellow Murrumbidgee MLA, Mrs Jones. Ten years is such a commitment and such a long time. And, given that the last couple of years have been during the pandemic, where one year feels like 10 years, it probably actually feels like 30 years in total!

**Mrs Jones:** Yes, sometimes.

**MS DAVIDSON:** Yes. I want to thank her for her support and ability to work across party lines to do the right thing for her local community. To work with her on saving Coolo Park really meant a lot. I could see the influence she had on her own party and on making good policy decisions, when I went to a Western Creek Community Council meeting some months back. Mr Hanson stood up and said that if there were to be some effort to rezone that block he would support it so that it could be protected. That was definitely Mrs Jones’s influence at work, so I thank her.

One of my most enjoyable moments, Mrs Jones, was one night at the Woden Community Council when we were talking about how we—you, Marisa and I—could work across party lines to do better things for Woden. You turned to me and said, “So, Emma, do you use WhatsApp?” This was in April last year. It was in that moment that I realised that you do not read the Saturday paper. We had some great conversations in that WhatsApp group about how we could work together to do good things locally for the Woden area. So I thank you for that.

There are so many things that we were working on that we will not be able to complete together, but I hope that your colleagues will have taken on some of those issues and that whoever replaces you will be someone who is equally committed. If ever I have to chain myself to a bulldozer to continue protecting Coolo Park, I will be very glad that you gave your phone number to me for WhatsApp, because you might be the person that I call to bail me out. So, thank you.

**MR CAIN** (Ginninderra) (11.34), by leave: To Giulia, I want to say that as one of the baby MLAs in the house—I do not know if other newbies considered themselves in

the same way!—I certainly consider myself on a massive learning curve, learning from stumbles and occasional achievements and learning from being engaged.

When I joined the party in late 2016, Mrs Jones was one of the first and few people that I had considerable engagement with, in terms of how to cope with this world. For me, despite my years of experience in many forums, it was probably the newest world I had entered for quite a while. I want to thank Mrs Jones for the discussions we had in her home about practical things like how to build an A-frame and, very seriously, how as a fellow person of faith, I would deal with issues, conflicts and messaging of what is important to Canberra from my perspective—how I could make a contribution on that. And it has been a delight for Claire and me to be in your home and to share a meal with your family. As fellow large-family communities, it has been interesting to pick each other's brains, as well.

I came into the Liberal Party and entered politics with my large family as well. Our seven kids were largely all grown up children. I think our youngest was in their mid-20s. So bravo to Mrs Jones, and to anyone with a young family entering this world—I do not think I could have done it—and thank you. As I entered into shadow portfolios, it has been a pleasure to babysit her multicultural affairs portfolio and, through my own direct engagement with the community over the last few months, to see how highly regarded she is. So, with everyone here I wish Giulia, Bernard and the children the very best and every success. We look forward to seeing her prosper and thrive in years to come. Thank you so much.

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (11.36), by leave: And I am really proud to say a few words about “Giulia with a G”, as she was so well known throughout the electorate. I first met Giulia in about 2010, when I was considering standing in the federal election. I was sent to visit Giulia for some advice. She basically said to me, “Put down the nomination form and back away from the table, because this is my spot.” And I did. And it was all good!

And then we both ran in the 2012 territory election, and Giulia was elected. When I came in to fill a casual vacancy in 2013, she was always full of support, encouragement and advice. And I really appreciated that. Throughout that time we have shared a number of election campaigns, childbirth—her not me—and many, many, ups and downs. No-one could ever say that Giulia is not passionate. No-one could ever say that Giulia is not committed. And no one could ever say that Giulia is not compassionate. She is very values based. She has conviction, and she really works with the strength of her conviction, but she is also practical and pragmatic and can have a debate about something and come to a landing point, an agreement, at the end.

Over the years that I have been in the Assembly with her I have seen her grow in skills and in confidence. She has always done what she thinks is right. She has always promoted the argument of what she thinks is right, but she has been able to have a discussion about it. So we have shared a lot of laughter; we have shared a few tears along the way, as well.

I know that Giulia was the subject of some terrible trolling on social media some years ago, which really took its toll on her, as it can and does on any of us. But

I would like to thank her for the memories. In her role as a shadow in various portfolios, she has had a number of notable achievements, of which she can be rightly proud. She was the first to breastfeed in the chamber, and she got the standing orders changed to allow a child being breastfed to be present in the chamber. She fought, for example, for toilets for women firefighters on the fire grounds. She fought for fenced playgrounds all around Canberra; as she outlined, herself, this is an important thing for families.

In the health portfolio she prosecuted many points which were raised to us all the time during the hardest times of the pandemic. We did not raise these points, and Mrs Jones did not raise these points, to be difficult. She raised them because they are concerns that people in the community, or professionals or organisations, came to her with. She was trying to get the best possible result for the ACT community by raising those points.

I would also like to pay tribute to her family for supporting her, and for allowing her and giving her the time to represent her community. It is something that you cannot do without the support of your family or your closest friends, so all the best to them, as well. Giulia and Bernard have a sense of service. They give back to their community in a range of different ways, and I would like to thank them once again for that; I know it will continue. I would like to say to Giulia, “Thank you for your service.”

**MS BURCH** (Brindabella) (11.40), by leave: I would like to say, just very briefly before we get through the rest of the business, that when Giulia rang me and suggested that she would be having a valedictory but promised that she would not bring the breast pump, I was very anxious about what prop she would bring. So I am quietly relieved that that did not happen.

As I said, everyone knew when Giulia was talking with passion. Those sitting in the chair were very aware when Giulia was speaking with passion, but she always came back to order, which was always appreciated. On behalf of everybody: enjoy the next steps of your journey, Mrs Jones.

## **Legislative Assembly—conduct**

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong—Leader of the Opposition) (11.41), by leave: Madam Speaker, in reference to the statement that you made at the beginning of the sitting, I withdraw.

## **Education and Community Inclusion—Standing Committee** **Statement by chair**

**MR PETTERSSON** (Yerrabi) (11.43): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Education and Community Inclusion. On 8 February 2022 a petition relating to access to services and information in Auslan in the ACT was tabled in the Assembly. The petition notes the importance of Auslan as a key method of communication for the ACT deaf community and states that the availability of services and information in Auslan in the ACT is inadequate, disadvantaging deaf Canberrans.

Signatories to the petition called for the Assembly to commission an inquiry into disadvantage and discrimination faced by deaf people in the ACT due to lack of access to services and information in Auslan. At its meeting on 26 April 2022 the committee resolved to inquire into this matter.

The inquiry will focus on challenges faced by the ACT's deaf community due to lack of services and information in Auslan; options to improve access to services and information in Auslan; and mechanisms to monitor and report on progress. Recognising the value of lived experience, the committee will take steps to ensure that the inquiry is as accessible as possible. These will include providing for Auslan interpreters at committee hearings and encouraging submissions in a variety of formats.

The terms of reference for the inquiry are available on the committee's website. Submissions for the inquiry opened on Tuesday, 31 May 2022 and will close on 15 July 2022. Hearing dates will be advised in due course. The committee will report to the Assembly before the last sitting day of 2022.

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (11.45), by leave: As a member of the Legislative Assembly, I commend this inquiry to the Assembly and to the ECI committee. As someone with a longstanding interest in matters that affect the deaf community, I would like to hope that this is a great opportunity for us to examine any of the barriers that members of our deaf community in the ACT face. I say this as a member of the Assembly, not as a member of the committee: I will look forward to hearing the evidence that is presented. I do know, from my previous work, that there are many barriers. I look forward to exploring those and seeing whether the committee is able to come up with suggestions. It is a work in progress and I am really looking forward to what may come of it.

## **Statute Law Amendment Bill 2022**

**Mr Rattenbury**, pursuant to notice, presented the bill, its explanatory statement and a Human Rights Act compatibility statement.

Title read by Clerk.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong-Attorney-General, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Gaming and Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction) (11.49): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

The Statute Law Amendment Bill 2022 makes statute law revision amendments to ACT legislation under guidelines for the technical amendments program approved by the government. The program provides for amendments that are minor or technical and not controversial. They are generally insufficiently important to justify the presentation of separate legislation in each case and are generally inappropriate to make as editorial amendments in the process of republishing legislation under the Legislation Act 2001.

Statute law amendment bills serve the important purpose of improving the overall quality of the ACT statute book so that our laws are kept up to date and are easier to find, read and understand. A well-maintained statute book greatly enhances access to ACT legislation. While it sounds trite to say that comprehensible and cohesive legislation is key for our community to be able to rely on it, we should not take for granted the diligence of our Parliamentary Counsel's Office in keeping up with this regular program of amendments.

The bill contains a number of minor amendments, with detailed explanatory notes, so it is not useful for me to go through each and every one of them. However, I would like to take the opportunity to highlight a few matters. I would ordinarily run through these highlights in order, but I wish to highlight schedule 3, in particular, of this bill. Schedule 3 contains a series of amendments to remove gendered language from multiple acts and regulations.

Consistent with the recognition of gender diverse people, the use of personal pronouns in the masculine or feminine is no longer appropriate drafting practice in the ACT. Multiple amendments in schedule 3 update the statute book with gender neutral language—that is, language that avoids bias towards a particular sex or social gender. Instances of “he or she”, “his or her”, “him or her” and “himself or herself” are replaced with “they”, “their”, “them”, “themselves” or the noun that is the subject of the sentence.

As I have said before in this place, language is powerful. When our legislation is unnecessarily gendered it sends a message of erasure and exclusion. That is not the kind of community that Canberra is, so we must adapt our legislation to accord with our values. I am very pleased to be bringing forward these inclusive amendments today.

Moving to the other matters contained in this bill, schedule 1 will make a minor amendment to the Territory Records Act 2002, section 36(e). The paragraph provides that the minister may end the appointment of the director of territory records “if the director is absent from duty for 14 consecutive days, or for 28 days in any 12 months, except on leave given by the minister”. The words “except on leave given by the minister” inadvertently create a requirement for the minister to approve the director's leave if the director intends to be on leave for longer than 14 consecutive days or for 28 days in any 12-month period.

While the director's appointment to the position of director of territory records is made under the Territory Records Act 2002, part 4, the director is employed as a senior executive service member of the ACT public service under the Public Sector Management Act 1994. The bill replaces the words “except on leave given by the minister” with “other than on approved leave” so that it is clear that there is no requirement for the minister to approve the director's leave.

Schedule 2 of the bill is reserved for minor, non-controversial amendments of the Legislation Act 2001 initiated by the Parliamentary Counsel's Office. The bill does not provide for such amendments to the Legislation Act but retains the schedule heading to preserve the usual numbering of schedule 3.

Finally, schedule 3 of the bill includes amendments of acts and regulations that have been reviewed as part of an ongoing program of updating and improving the language and form of legislation. These amendments are explained in the explanatory notes and are routine technical matters, such as the correction of minor errors, including typographical errors and outdated cross-references, updating language, updating and omitting notes, removing redundant provisions and omitting and renumbering paragraphs.

The bill, while minor and technical in nature, is another important building block in the development of a modern and accessible ACT statute book that is at the forefront in Australia. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Debate (on motion by **Mr Cain**) adjourned to the next sitting.

### **Standing order 113A—amendment**

Debate resumed from 16 September 2021, on motion by **Mr Hanson**:

That standing order 113A be amended by omitting “all non-Executive Members seeking to speak have asked at least one question” and substituting “nine original questions have been asked by any Opposition Member, and other non-Executive Members seeking to speak have asked at least one question.”.

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.54): We have had a long history with this motion in the Assembly. It has been agreed that, rather than continuing to have a long discussion about this motion in the Assembly, we will deal with this single matter and then deal with other standing order changes through the standing order review, as we would normally throughout the term. I move the following amendment circulated in my name:

Omit all words after “That”, substitute:

“standing order 113A be amended by omitting all words and substituting:

‘questions without notice shall not be concluded until non-Executive Members seeking to ask a question have asked at least the number of questions equivalent to the number of non-Executive Members present in the Chamber from each party or grouping represented in the Assembly.’ ”.

This amendment has been through the admin and procedure committee and has the support, I understand, of all groups and parties of the Assembly. It will meet Mr Hanson’s objectives in his original motion, while still maintaining a lot of the conventions and principles that we have within this place around question time. I look forward to our changed question time, knowing that we will all be working under this new consensus model.

**MR BRADDOCK** (Yerrabi) (11.56): We agree with the amendment moved by Ms Orr to the standing order change and will be supporting that today.

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (11.56): To speak to the amendment and to close, I thank the admin and procedure committee for coming to an agreement on this

change to standing order 113A. This is about questions without notice and it is about the ability of the opposition to hold the government to account with a range of questions during question time.

We have spoken about this at length. My colleague Mr Hanson has been a fierce advocate for a change of this type to the standing orders, as has everyone in our party room, the Canberra Liberals. We absolutely support this amendment today, and it will be passed, but our slight disappointment is about the change to having the number of questions equivalent to the number of members present in the chamber. What that means, of course, is that if someone on our side is away sick or on maternity leave or paternity leave or on parliamentary business, we do not get the same opportunity in terms of the same number of questions to hold the government to account. We would like to have seen the same number of questions as we have elected representatives in our party room.

This is about holding the government to account. It is about the ability to ask questions without restricting our ability to ask questions in any way. We are supportive of this change. It achieves, to a very large extent, what we were seeking. We are keen to ensure that we have continued scrutiny. We have little enough opportunity, given that we are in opposition, to try to hold this government to account. We do it every day, to the best of our ability. We would like to have seen it continue with the same number of questions, irrespective of whether someone is away on a particular day. I commend the amendment to the Assembly. Once again, I thank admin and procedures for working through this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Original question, as amended, resolved in the affirmative.

## **Planning, Transport and City Services—Standing Committee Statement by chair**

**MS CLAY** (Ginninderra) (11.59): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Planning, Transport and City Services. I inform the Assembly of a new inquiry into EV vehicle charging in Canberra, announced out of session after the committee meeting last Thursday, 26 May 2022. The inquiry terms of reference are relatively broad to allow industry and community the opportunity to have input on the challenges facing Canberrans as the EV market expands and motorists choose more sustainable transport.

Research shows that electric car sales have tripled in Australia since 2020—to 20,655 last year—and electric cars now make up in excess of two per cent of all vehicles sold nationally. Yet the evidence of preparedness of jurisdictions to cater for the infrastructure needs of this desirable change appears mixed in many parts of Australia. The committee decided on an extended submission period to encourage adequate consideration, and in briefing the Assembly today we anticipate that this inquiry may be held during the second half of 2022.



**Statement by chair**

**MS CLAY** (Ginninderra) (11.59): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Planning, Transport and City Services. Petition 24-21, concerning housing development on the Federal Golf Club course, was received by the Assembly on 8 August 2021 and referred to the committee under standing order 99A. As signatories to the petition, 1,527 residents of the ACT requested that the Assembly reject amendments to the Territory Plan that would enable housing development on the site of the Federal Golf Club course. The committee notes that, in his response to the petition, the Minister for Planning and Land Management said:

... the ACT government has undertaken considerable community consultation and environmental studies in developing the Integrated Plan for Red Hill Nature Reserve and Surrounds.

The committee considered the government response to be satisfactory and therefore resolved not to inquire further into the matters raised in the petition. The committee notes the government consideration of a draft variation that may arise on this issue and will await any further referrals.

**Statement by chair**

**MS CLAY** (Ginninderra) (12.01): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Planning, Transport and City Services. The issue outstanding for Giralang residents has been the development delays of the Giralang shops, which attracted the committee's attention late last year. We released our interim report on Giralang shops, committee report No 8, *Inquiry into Giralang Shops*, tabled on 12 December 2021. The committee is committed to seeking out further solutions that may resolve the development impasse experienced by residents and wishes to complete a final report on Giralang shops later this year.

**Statement by chair**

**MS CLAY** (Ginninderra) (12.01): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Planning, Transport and City Services. Madam Speaker, you wrote to the committee on 11 May 2022 informing us of the motion passed by the Assembly on 5 May last to consider an inquiry into Canberra's rental housing market and the impact of short-term holiday letting.

The committee considered the motion put forward by Mr Davis and has written to industry stakeholders to update market data and research on the current trends as COVID regulations ease, and to show to what extent Canberra has been affected. We hope to consider this research in coming months to inform our further deliberations on the motion.

**Statement by chair**

**MS CLAY** (Ginninderra) (12.02): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Planning, Transport and City

Services. The Minister for Planning and Land Development, Mr Mick Gentleman MLA, recently announced a community consultation on an exposure draft of the Planning and Development Act 2007, with proposals for amendments and planning reform. This consultation is due to continue until 15 June 2022, and legislation thereafter is expected in the latter part of 2022.

While it is too early to outline any referral or inquiry on this important upcoming legislation, the committee stands ready to contribute when this bill approaches a more final form. We congratulate Minister Gentleman on initiating this community consultation and await further announcements in the Assembly. This will apply similarly to the ACT government's plans for the forthcoming ACT Territory Plan review.

**Sitting suspended from 12.03 to 2.00 pm.**

## **Ministerial arrangements**

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Climate Action, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism) (2.00): Madam Speaker, again Minister Vassarotti is unable to be at question time, so the questions will be to Minister Gentleman and Minister Berry, as per yesterday.

## **Questions without notice**

### **Building—combustible cladding**

**MS LEE:** My question is to the Minister for Sustainable Building and Construction, whether it is Minister Gentleman or Minister Vassarotti.

Minister Gentleman, yesterday you said, at the conclusion of question time:

Madam Speaker, in relation to my answer to Mr Cain on combustible cladding, I can advise that no DA fees are applicable.

However, at a recent combustible cladding forum where over 100 people attended, Minister Vassarotti said that development application fees cannot and will not be waived. Which statement is correct—yours or Minister Vassarotti's?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Ms Lee for the question. The position is that DA fees are not applicable for the removal of asbestos cladding or combustible cladding.

**MS LEE:** Minister, can you please clarify whether DA fees are applicable for remediation works on combustible cladding, and why is your government putting forward confusing information that is contradictory?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Ms Lee for the follow-up question. To make it very clear, there is no DA applicable for the removal of combustible cladding on those buildings; so, therefore, no fees apply.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, who is really making decisions on the combustible cladding issue? Is it you or is it Minister Vassarotti?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** Minister Vassarotti has the portfolio for this particular subject. I have the planning portfolio. I am in control of the planning portfolio, which includes development applications. But in this case, if you were removing combustible cladding you would not need a development application.

### **Fadden Hills Pond—play space upgrade**

**MS LAWDER:** My question is to the minister for city services. Minister, after copious amounts of correspondence from me to you, and also a community petition, about the tower in the playground at Fadden Pond, I note that the tower has been removed this week. When can residents expect a replacement for the tower to be available for community use?

**MR STEEL:** The ACT government has outlined the playgrounds that we intend to upgrade throughout this term. We are in the process of consulting with communities in each of those locations around what they would like to see as part of those upgrades; and, of course, we also consulted on a new play space strategy, which has been finalised and released to the community, and which will inform future play space upgrades going forward. At this stage there are no plans to provide further upgrades at Fadden.

**MS LAWDER:** Minister, to be quite clear, are you saying that the tower has been removed but at this point there is no replacement equipment planned for that playground?

**MR STEEL:** As Ms Lawder is aware, the tower has not been in use for some time, having been blocked off for safety reasons. But there is existing equipment in that park. It may be that further improvements are identified in the future, but the ACT government has outlined which playgrounds will be upgraded over this term, and they are the ones that we brought to the election, based on an evidence base around community input—the play spaces forum that we undertook was part of a deliberative democracy process with the community. Of course, there are ongoing condition audits of our existing play spaces.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, why aren't you listening to the residents and installing a new piece of equipment for the Fadden community, as they have requested?

**MR STEEL:** We have listened, by removing that particular item in the play space, which is still broadly functional.

### **Cultural Facilities Corporation—superannuation payments**

**MR CAIN:** My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Minister, an article in the ABC was released today, stating that the ACT government has admitted to underpaying superannuation for the past 13 years to 663 current and former staff members of the Cultural Facilities Corporation, for which you are the responsible minister. The Cultural Facilities Corporation was made aware of this error in 2020. Minister, why has it taken two years for this issue to be addressed by the ACT government?

**MS CHEYNE:** To clarify, there was an unfortunate misreporting in the ABC article this morning. This was an issue that was self-identified by the CFC in March 2020 through an internal audit, and the CFC subsequently engaged external expertise to ensure that all staff are correctly repaid. It has taken a long time—it has taken until now—to resolve this issue, but that is due to the volume and complexity of data analysis and the cross-checking that was needed, including reviewing 69,000 individual pay slips. The CFC also needed to engage external expertise to fully identify and to quantify the underpayments, including a specific dollar figure for each person whose super payments were affected.

I note, as well, that not only has the CFC been investigating this issue, but they have resolved the issue in the time that has passed.

**MR CAIN:** Minister, what assurance can you give Canberrans that this is not happening to other ACT public service employees?

**MS CHEYNE:** This was a result of an incorrect software setting that came about due to human error.

**MS LAWDER:** I have a supplementary question. Minister, by what date will this issue be completely fixed, and how much is owing to ACT PS employees at the CFC.

**MS CHEYNE:** I thank Ms Lawder for the question. The CFC has already paid the total underpayment sum to the Australian Taxation Office, and they will pay it, with interest, into the super accounts of the impacted staff in the coming months. So the timing of this is now in the ATO's hands. The CFC has done everything it is required to do.

I note that this has been a regrettable situation. I know that CFC has apologised, and I would like to echo that apology. All past and present affected CFC staff have been contacted. There was an all-staff meeting earlier this week and there will be another one next week. The combined underpayment amounts total \$315,704, and the average underpayment is just under \$500. As Mr Cain noted before, there are 633 staff. But, to the extent that the CFC has done all that it can to resolve this issue, it has.

### **Health—alcohol and other drugs strategy**

**MR DAVIS:** My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, given Mr Pettersson's private member's bill to decriminalise the possession of drugs and the subsequent committee inquiry, I have been meeting with a lot of stakeholders in the alcohol and other drug sector space. One of the things that have been brought up with me regularly is their ambition to see the government do more around tobacco control and smoking cessation. Can you outline how tobacco control and smoking cessation are going to be included in the next ACT drug strategy?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Mr Davis for the question. I note that he is asking for an announcement of future policy, which I will not be making at this point in time. But what I can inform him is that the drug strategy action plan 2018-2021 includes

objectives to reduce the exposure of the ACT community, including children, to second-hand smoke and to reduce smoking rates, particularly among high-risk population groups, through both population and targeted measures. This is already a priority under the drug strategy action plan and I have no doubt that it will continue to be a priority for the ACT government.

I expect to table the outcomes and progress made against the actions in the first drug strategy action plan in the coming week, which will demonstrate that almost all of the actions were completed or partially completed, even accounting for and despite the impact of COVID-19. The next drug strategy action plan is currently being developed across government and with key stakeholders and partners in the alcohol and other drug treatment sector.

The ACT Health Directorate is working with other directorates to act on disrupting the uptake of vaping in particular, a relatively new challenge in this space, encouraging smokers to reduce or quit risky behaviour such as smoking and vaping and to continue reducing the impact of nicotine products in the ACT. I introduced the Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2022 in April, which includes provisions to improve compliance around e-cigarettes and sales of those to those under 18. Indeed, just the other day I had some correspondence to my office from a parent expressing concern about the ease with which their young person under the age of 18 could get hold of vaping products. This is a significant challenge for the community. Without making any specific policy announcements, I have no doubt that this has been raised by stakeholders and will be part of the response in the next drug strategy action plan.

**MR DAVIS:** Minister, will the government consider an evaluation of the Smoke-Free Public Places Act as part of the next drug strategy?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I am happy to take on board that suggestion from Mr Davis and from the community around considering the impact of the Smoke-Free Public Places Act and whether that needs to be amended or expanded or changed in some way. Of course, that is around the impact of second-hand smoke on people. A key policy emphasis that we have had over the last little while is ensuring that those people who have higher rates of smoking, or those groups in our community who have higher rates of smoking, are specifically supported through campaigns and services.

While smoking rates in the community have generally fallen over the last period of time—and I think it is important to recognise the success in the ACT where the proportion of daily smokers fell by more than half between 2001 and 2019, from 18.4 per cent to 8.2 per cent—we see an ongoing challenge in those groups in our community who experience various forms of disadvantage and discrimination. That is why a number of the measures that we take, including our Healthy Canberra grants, are particularly focused on that. For example, the Directions “butt it out!” smoking support program is an evidence-based program aiming to address tobacco dependency in a busy alcohol and other drug treatment and primary care service. It is really leading to a sustained practice of tobacco use intervention and supporting clients to successfully quit smoking. The Cancer Council’s “tackling tobacco in the ACT” is an integrated program aiming to reduce health and social inequalities through addressing

smoking in disadvantaged communities. There is also Worldview Foundation's work on a pre-release non-Indigenous supplement, along with post-release activity support.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Minister, has the ACT government costed the impact of tobacco on the ACT community?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I will take that question on notice. I am not sure whether we have done a specific costing, but we do know, of course, that tobacco smoking is and has been one of the most significant impacts on the health system and on people's individual health. It remains the leading cause of preventable disease and death in Australia. There is a lot of work nationally, of course, about the impact of tobacco smoking on the health of Australians and the cost of that to our community. I will take Mr Braddock's question about whether we have a specific costing in the ACT on notice.

### **Federal government—territory rights**

**MR PETTERSSON:** My question is to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, given the federal election result, is the ACT in a better position to have its territory rights restored? What is the ACT government doing in anticipation of this change?

**MR BARR:** I thank Mr Pettersson for the question. The clear answer is yes, we are in a better position to have territory rights restored, both in the house and in the Senate. It would be necessary for a repeal bill to pass both houses to remove the clause from the Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government) Act that prevents the ACT, and the equivalent clause in the Northern Territory (Self-Government) Act that prevents the Northern Territory parliament, from making laws with respect to voluntary assisted dying.

Every other jurisdiction in Australia has now gone down this legislative path, to the extent that there are now six working models or legislative examples. We are in a position to commence work on the preparation of a consultation document and our own draft legislation that would enable voluntary assisted dying in the territory. This needs to begin with a comparative examination of the laws passed in the six states and to draw from the evidence and community views heard during the end of life choices inquiry held in the last term of this place.

In short, we want to be ready with a draft piece of legislation by the time the federal parliament completes its process around, hopefully, removing the legislative barrier to the territory parliament debating this. We do not want a linear process where we wait for that to happen and then we commence work. We will commence work now so that we are ready to debate this matter as soon as we are allowed to.

There will of course be a need for due process in relation to any piece of legislation that comes into this place. That would, inevitably, given its complexity and seriousness, involve a referral to an Assembly committee for examination, but we need to have a draft piece of legislation ready for that committee to examine. That work gets underway as soon as possible.

**MR PETTERSSON:** Chief Minister, what previous attempts have been made to restore territory rights and why did they fail?

**MR BARR:** Since 1997 there have been many efforts, in terms of persuasion, following almost every federal election, seeking for the parliament of that new term to address this issue. The most recent attempt to restore territory rights was in 2018, with a private member's bill from a Liberal Democrats senator, David Leyonhjelm. I do not think many people in this place would have much in common with the views of David Leyonhjelm, but in this instance "any port in a storm"! So we were very happy to swing in behind that legislative reform.

It got very close. Firstly, credit to former Senator Leyonhjelm for bringing it forward. He did not represent the ACT; he was a New South Wales senator. So the fact that we got support from outside the territories for this was encouraging. The disappointing matter was that one of the territory's own senators voted against that legislation and that turned out to be the decisive vote in defeating it.

We then saw a former Northern Territory senator, CLP Senator Sam McMahon, introduce a private member's bill last year. Following a discussion with our former senator, it included the Northern Territory but excluded the ACT, extraordinarily. So we have had a few efforts in recent times. I think the people of Canberra have pretty conclusively settled this matter by voting out the senator who stood in the way, so we are now a step closer to getting this done for the people of the ACT.

**MS ORR:** Chief Minister, why is it important that the ACT can consider making laws with respect to voluntary assisted dying?

**MR BARR:** I thank Ms Orr for the supplementary. We know that Canberrans care about this issue. We know that community opinion is 80 and 90 per cent in support. We have seen that in many surveys. There is no statistical error here. It is not even close. It is overwhelming: the community wants to see this change. It has occurred in every Australian state. The views of Canberrans and the Australian people are very clear.

I know we have enough respect for ourselves in this chamber—and I think that is held across all parties—that we are mature enough to legislate on this issue. So I am glad that the new Prime Minister agrees with that. I hope that my friend and colleague Andrew Leigh will be able to introduce a private member's bill into the lower house, the House of Representatives, very soon after the house reconvenes, which I understand will be in late July. It will obviously need to pass through both the house and the Senate in order to repeal the Andrews bill.

I know it is on the way, so we need to get ready for this change—to the extent that this is putting everyone in this place on notice that we need to turn our minds to this issue and to have a good process to develop the best piece of legislation in Australia. I think we are up to that task.

### **Government—land and property reports**

**MR MILLIGAN:** My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management. In your government's response to the 2020 Auditor-General's report on land supply and release, you agreed to table land and property reports as quickly as possible, in the name of transparency around land sales. Minister, it is now June, and the land and property report for July to December 2021, which is nearly six months ago, has not yet been published. Why not?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Mr Milligan for his question. I will take that on notice.

**MR MILLIGAN:** Minister, will you also delay publication of the report for January to June 2022 by 12 months?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** That is a hypothetical question. We have not made any decisions on that yet.

**MS LEE:** Minister, when will you publish the report for July to December 2021? Why does it take six months to compile a report on land sales?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** As soon as the work is completed, we will be able to publish that report. There has been quite a bit of work to do in ensuring that we have all of the correct data for publishing, to make sure that Canberrans understand what we are doing.

### **Dhulwa Mental Health Unit—safety**

**MRS KIKKERT:** My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. On Monday you released the terms of reference for the Dhulwa inquiry. As well as nurses being attacked, security guards have been assaulted while protecting staff, including a guard who had his cheekbone shattered defending a doctor. Guards have suggested measures to improve safety, including cameras in seclusion rooms, carrying handcuffs, and body-worn cameras, but all have been declined. Minister, have you spoken to security guards who have been attacked, and what did they tell you?

**MS DAVIDSON:** Thank you for the question. I have been advised of a number of things that are being done to improve safety at Dhulwa, and I will be very happy to talk further with representatives of the security guards if they would like to. The safety strategies include reinvigorating the SafeWards methodology, dynamic ISBAR—which stands for “Introduction, Situation, Background Assessment Recommendations”—and read back has been introduced, which is being used by clinical and security teams to assess risk and develop a plan before approaching or undertaking any conversations with someone who is receiving care that might result in agitation or violence towards team members, including security. There are a number of other activities that are improving security. I could go through them all now, but I suspect that these have all been answered in a question on notice, already. I hope that that has satisfied you.



**MRS KIKKERT:** Minister, will the Dhulwa inquiry examine safety measures which security guards have called for, including body-worn cameras, handcuffs and cameras in seclusion rooms?

**MS DAVIDSON:** Thank you. The nature of appointing an independent chair means that they will address whatever issues they feel are relevant within the terms of reference, and the terms of reference do address the human rights of people receiving care as well as the safety of people who are working in Dhulwa, and that would include all of the staff there. I will leave it to the independent chair to determine who they need to speak to and what issues in detail need to be addressed. But there will be opportunities for submissions and for hearings, and I would hope that anyone who feels that they have relevant information to contribute will be able to make a submission.

**MR CAIN:** I have a supplementary question. Minister, will you commit to implementing all of the recommendations in the preliminary and final reports?

**MS DAVIDSON:** I am expecting to receive the preliminary report around 12 weeks after the inquiry has started, and I am very much looking forward to receiving that report and being able to then engage in conversation with the ANMF and with CHS about how we can go about implementing the recommendations that will be made. But now knowing what the recommendations are yet, I will have to wait until I have received the report.

## **Light rail—stage 2**

**MS CLAY:** My question is to the Minister for Transport and City Services. Minister, recently an FOI request led to the release of the Mecone consultancy report, an urban infill capacity assessment. The report was released under FOI where it was determined that disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to promote open discussion of public affairs and enhance the government's accountability as well as contribute to positive and informed debate on important issues or matters of public interest. Why was the report not pro-actively released?

**MR STEEL:** I thank the member for her question. This document was not prepared by my directorate, either Major Projects Canberra or Transport Canberra and City Services. It was prepared for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate. So I will not specifically talk to that document and the decision-making, which is not in my power under the FOI Act anyway.

What I would say in relation to the light rail project is that we have shown an unparalleled level of transparency in releasing the business case for both stage 1 and stage 2A to the community. No other government does that for light rail projects and other major infrastructure projects. It is reasonable to allow the government a period of time in order to consider documents, particularly those that relate to cabinet decision-making, and to be able to make policy decisions based on those documents.

We will be engaging extensively on the light rail stage 2A project and, following that, through to stage B, because this is the most complex project from a planning

approvals point of view in the whole of Australia. There are going to be multiple points where we engage with the community on much of the technical documentation that is being prepared for the project as part of works approvals, as part of development application approvals and as part of Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act approvals. That is part of the work that will be required by both houses of the parliament in the future.

We look forward to having more engagement than that on the project as well. There has also been ample opportunity for people to engage with the government with the pop-ups and through the extensive release of information that we have already made available on this project. There is a sensitive commercial element to it, so there will not be an opportunity to release some of that information while we are in that commercial process.

**MS CLAY:** Minister, are there other reports which the government is using to make informed decisions on the future of light rail stage 2 which are not yet released?

**MR STEEL:** There will be extensive reports will be made available to government, many of which will inform the commercial process that is underway as part of the procurement with Canberra metro for stage 2A and then in the future procurement on stage 2B. Of course, that information may be sensitive. In order to achieve the best value for money for the people of the Australian Capital Territory it will be necessary in some circumstances not to disclose that information, which could be of a commercial sensitive nature and could cause us to get a much poorer outcome from a value for money perspective on the project.

There will be extensive opportunities for people to engage on the various works approvals. We have had the works approval process already for raising London Circuit. All of the technical documentation was quite extensive. We are looking forward to engaging with the community on further works approvals for stage 2A as well as all the other planning approvals—consultation leading up to those approvals and engagement on the future design of this project going forward. There will be a lot of information that we are going to need to explain and put some context around as well. We will look at how we can provide as much information as we can to the community to help them engage with the design and implementation. We are committed to this project and bringing it down to Woden. We want to hear the community's engagement now on the design of that project.

**MR CAIN:** Minister, when is the expected delivery date for stage 2A?

**MR STEEL:** That is the process that we are going through as part of the procurement on stage 2A with Canberra Metro, so it is subject to that procurement process that is underway. Of course, we have already received works approval from the NCA on raising London Circuit. That will be the first major piece of work that has happened. Early works are already underway. We are looking forward to that occurring around the middle of this year, so very soon. We are getting started on RLC and, following that, we will get started on stage 2A.

*Mr Parton interjecting—*

**Transport Canberra—fuel costs**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Mr Parton, do you have a question, not an interjection?

**MR PARTON:** Yes, I do. Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Transport and City Services. Minister, what is the impact of rising fuel prices on Transport Canberra's bus operations, on two fronts: (a) obviously the increased cost associated with running the timetables and (b) the potential drift back to public transport because of the impact on the individual budgets of would-be public transport users?

**MR STEEL:** We know that rising fuel prices, particularly due to the war in Europe, are having an impact on many people across our city, including those businesses and organisations like Transport Canberra that use large amounts of fuel, particularly diesel fuel but also compressed natural gas, to run heavy vehicles. That would be having an impact on the price. I do not have any figures in front of me that I can provide on that, but that would certainly be adding to the fuel expenses, the operational expenses of Transport Canberra over this period of time.

We have the long-term Zero-Emission Transition Plan for Transport Canberra in place, to transition away from diesel and CNG buses to zero emissions buses, which have the potential to substantially bring down operating costs for vehicles, particularly through battery electric buses. We will be using the 100 per cent renewable electricity in our grid. These are very efficient forms of public transport. Through the government's zero emissions action plan for other vehicles as well, we will be supporting the transition of the broader community onto those more affordable forms of transport to operate from a fuel point of view as well.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, what is the strategy in place to manage the cost increase from the rising fuel price? Can the minister take on notice the actual amount of the cost blowout because of that?

**MR STEEL:** I can. Obviously, it will change from day to day as fuel prices change, but I can have a look at, for a period in time, what the increase in the cost has been. If the opposition spokesperson is suggesting that we cut bus services if there is an increase in the fuel price, we are simply not going to do that. We know that these are critical bus services that people rely on and we are still going to provide those regardless of what the cost of fuel is on a daily basis.

We do have a long-term transition plan to transition to zero emissions. We have secured 12 electric buses to arrive this year. We are in the market at the moment to purchase a further 90 battery electric buses as well. We will keep on delivering the services that people rely on and that are providing a really great option for people who want to get on to public transport and do not want to use their private vehicle at the moment because it is expensive to operate. We are providing those services for them at the moment, despite the challenges that we have with COVID-19 and the number of people that we have seen furloughed during this period.

**MR CAIN:** Minister, has this drift back to public transport inspired a more definitive date for the end of the interim bus timetable and the resumption of normal services?

**MR STEEL:** It has been a very gradual shift back to public transport. I was at a conference in Sydney the other week, talking with other transport operators about the return to public transport. They are experiencing, in cities like Auckland and other cities around Australia, a similar very gradual shift, but we are still quite significantly down on what we were. From the patronage figures that I saw the other day, it is about 38 per cent down on where we were in 2019, which is of course the year before the pandemic that we are comparing ourselves to. So there is a long way to go.

What we are not going to do is bring back services to a full timetable if we cannot deliver those services, because it is critical, if buses are timetabled, that they actually show up. The interim timetable is giving us a level of flexibility to be able to still deliver those services while we have around 35 bus drivers furloughed or off on leave at any one time, caring for others who may be sick as well. We will not be stepping up until we have the certainty that we can deliver the services under the full timetable. Of course, services already run frequently. The rapids still run frequently and the route bus services on weekdays. We will be stepping that up as soon as we have the reliability that we can offer to the community.

### **Crace Community Recreation Park—lighting**

**MR BRADDOCK:** My question is to the Minister for Transport and City Services. We have been corresponding about a constituent concern regarding the lighting at Crace Community Recreation Park, and I would like to thank him for adding those lights to the regular inspection program. My question is: when, as a result of this program, will those lights be operational again, so that constituents will be able to utilise those facilities after dusk?

**MR STEEL:** I will take that on notice.

**MR BRADDOCK:** Can you please advise why these lights were not already in the regular inspection program?

**MR STEEL:** I thank the member for his question. My understanding is that, with this particular place, the recreation park, the custodian of this asset changed hands to Transport Canberra and City Services, away from the sport and recreation facilities area. As a result it was not on the regular inspection program. That has been corrected. We do not think this is necessarily a systemic issue elsewhere; it has been an issue specifically related to this park, and that has been resolved. I will get back to you in relation to the specific issues regarding these lights and when they will be fixed.

**MS CLAY:** Minister, which parks around Canberra are part of the regular inspection program?

**MR STEEL:** I think the member asked me which are not on the regular inspection program?

**Ms Clay:** Either way. I asked which are, but whichever suits you.

**MR STEEL:** I will have to take that on notice. I expect there will be a very extensive list of parks that on there. I am happy to dig out that level of information. As I said I do not think it is necessarily a systemic issue. It is something that has arisen as a result of a change in custodianship.

### **LGBTIQ+ community—federal government**

**MS ORR:** My question is to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, the ACT has led the nation in many areas of reform for LGBTIQ+ Canberrans. How will the change of federal government lead to further opportunity for reform in this area?

**MR BARR:** I thank Ms Orr for the question. I think there are a range of areas where we can collaborate with the commonwealth to achieve further progress for LGBTIQ+ Canberrans. Some of those examples include following the ACT's lead on legislating discrimination protections for LGBTI children and staff in education institutions. I think there is an opportunity to get a nationally consistent approach, looking at the ACT legislation as a potential template.

I think we can work together to improve access to gender-affirming care under Medicare for trans and gender-diverse Australians. I think we can work together to review and reform documentation requirements, including the use of passports and birth certificates as they affect trans and intersex communities. Importantly, also, we can look forward to the end of the culture wars and the attempts to use the LGBTIQ+ community—politically the trans community—as a political wedge, as we saw in the last federal campaign. It was all about creating division in the community—unnecessary division. I hope we will see that ugly chapter of Australian politics closed, and the door slammed shut on that forever—forever!—because those communities feel it so much, and they do not deserve to be used as political wedges.

**MS ORR:** Chief Minister, how did this divisive debate around trans kids and religious discrimination affect our community and the election outcome?

**MR BARR:** It is clear the people felt quite intensely that their lives and their personal circumstances were the subject of wedge politics with desire to run a particular debate with one candidate in one seat, who was never going to win, in order to try and shift votes, presumably under the assumption that the Australian people would buy into that sort of hatred. I think we can draw a conclusion from the failure of that political strategy, and hopefully it will never, ever be used again.

That was combined with what was a prolonged debate during the last federal parliamentary term over the Morrison government's religious discrimination bill and the lead-up to the vote that was held. I want to acknowledge the courage of those Liberal MPs who crossed the floor to stop it happening. That took great courage, and I hope that we never again, as a nation, have to go through that ugly debate. Again, it was all about driving a political wedge of difference in the community.

If there is anything that can be read out of the federal election result across seats far and wide across the nation—city and country, regional and rural—it is that Australians are sick and tired of this sort of politics. Hopefully, as I said, the door is now slammed shut on this forever.

**MR DAVIS:** Chief Minister, would you support the Australian Greens’ calls for the establishment of a federal minister for equality and LGBTQIA+ human rights commissioner?

**MR BARR:** It certainly is important that those issues are examined. I take the role seriously, and I am the territory’s minister for equality. That is part of my portfolio responsibilities as the first minister. Given the Prime Minister’s track record over his career as an advocate for our community, he may well wish to take a leadership role there or, potentially, give responsibility to a particular minister, or—depending on the nature of reforms that are being pursued—it would be appropriate that a number of ministers contribute to work to improve outcomes for LGBTIQ+ people in Australia.

In relation to a human rights commission, it is really not for me to comment. I do not run that organisation, but I know that the arrangements that we have in place in the ACT work effectively. To the extent that other jurisdictions want to pick up on our arrangements, I would welcome that.

I ask that further questions be placed on the notice paper.

### **Supplementary answers to questions without notice**

#### **Building—combustible cladding**

**MS LEE:** Yesterday in question time Mr Cain asked Mr Gentleman a question, which was: “Minister, why won’t your government agree to waive development application fees for remediation works?” Mr Gentleman came back to the chamber and said, “Madam Speaker, in relation to my answer to Mr Cain on combustible cladding, I can advise that no DA fees are applicable.” I just wanted to give the minister an opportunity to confirm, given the confusion that we had today in question time, that that was in direct response to Mr Cain’s question, which specifically said—and I will repeat it—“Why won’t your government agree to waive development application fees for remediation works?”

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I had a message from Minister Vassarotti during question time with regard to Ms Lee’s question earlier. Minister Vassarotti has advised that Ms Lee has misrepresented her. At the forum, Minister Vassarotti was referring to building levies. Minister Vassarotti has also asked me to provide the following for the benefit of members.

There has been some discussion of the fact that some of the regulatory fees associated with remediation work should be waived for this group of people. Replacing the cladding on a building is development application exempt. However, there are building levies that apply to all building work.

The building levy and the training levy are both set as a small percentage of the total project cost. They are necessary to ensure that the ACT is able to continue to ensure that community standards around building quality are maintained and the industry is properly trained to perform the required work. This is the same treatment as for other owners who are required to remove other hazardous materials or undergo other sorts of remediation work. The cost of these levies can be included in the concessional loan amount by owners corporations, if they wish. I think that clears it up, Madam Speaker.

### **Government—land and property reports**

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I have another matter, following Mr Milligan's question that I took on notice. I draw Mr Milligan's attention to evidence from EPSDD officials to the public accounts standing committee on 27 April 2022. This matter was raised during those hearings and officials advised the following:

With respect to the property reports, the January to June 2021 report was published on the website on 17 November 2021. The July to December 2021 report is just being finalised. There have been some delays and it will be uploaded, it is anticipated, in June this year ... There have been some delays in terms of getting the right data and input from some of the agencies that we work with to gather the data.

A transcript of that evidence at the hearing is available and online.

### **Health—alcohol and other drugs strategy**

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** Mr Braddock asked me whether there has been modelling on the cost of tobacco to the ACT economy. Mr Davis had in fact asked me the same question on notice. I signed a response on 20 April, which I hope has been lodged. For the record, there is no specific modelling on the cost of tobacco to the ACT economy.

The National Drug Research Institute at Curtin University estimates that in 2015-16 the tangible cost of smoking in Australia, such as reduced economic output, medical and social care costs, was \$19.2 billion and the intangible cost borne by the smoker and their family, such as reduced quality of life, pain and suffering, was estimated as costing a further a \$117.7 billion.

### **ACT Health—nurses**

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** Yesterday Mrs Kikkert asked me a question which I will read out in full. I took it on notice because I was not quite sure her maths were making sense. Her question was:

My question is to the Minister for Health. Last month, on 17 May, the *Canberra Times* reported that, in March last year, there were 3,002 full-time nurses employed by Canberra Health Services. Twelve months later, in March this year, there were 3,280 employed, an increase of 278 nurses. However, 365 nursing staff either resigned or retired last year. Minister, if 278 extra nurses were employed, yet 365 nursing staff left, doesn't that mean Canberra is going backwards on nurse numbers?

Madam Speaker, I probably should have asked her to repeat the question because the beginning of the question said that there were 278 more nurses net in March this year than March last year. So with 365 left, that means we would have had to recruit—assuming it is an apples to apples comparison, which is not entirely clear—643 nurses to replace the ones that left and end up with 278 more at the end of the year. Again, the Canberra Liberals are trying to say we are going backwards on nurses. We are actually going forwards. It is in the beginning of Mrs Kikkert's question.

### **Sport—community wellbeing**

**MS BERRY:** I was asked a question by Mr Davis yesterday and I took on notice to provide additional information. I table the following paper:

Consultation on the Sport and Recreation Strategic Plan—List of interviewees.

### **Paper**

**Mr Gentleman** presented the following paper:

Children and Young People Act—Pursuant to subsection 727S(5)—ACT  
Children and Young People Death Review Committee—Annual Report 2021,  
dated 22 April 2022.

### **ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee—annual report**

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Manager of Government Business, Minister for Corrections, Minister for Industrial Relations and Workplace Safety, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (2.49): Pursuant to standing order 211, I move:

That the Assembly take note of the following paper:

Children and Young People Act—Pursuant to subsection 727S(5)—ACT  
Children and Young People Death Review Committee—Annual Report 2021.

Debate (on motion by **Ms Lawder**) adjourned to the next sitting.

### **Leave of absence**

Motion (by **Ms Lawder**) agreed to:

That leave of absence be granted to Ms Castley and Mr Hanson for today due to ill health.

### **Freedom of Information Amendment Bill 2022 Exposure draft**

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong—Leader of the Opposition) (2.50), by leave: I present the following paper:



Freedom of Information Amendment Bill 2022—Exposure draft, prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel's Office.

This bill is a very important step towards a more transparent and accountable territory government, to bring more transparency and more scrutiny to government decisions that have an enormous effect in our community. It is timely, because with the current government that has been in power for over 20 years we see too often this tenure leading to complacency, hubris and a culture of secrecy. My bill would amend the Freedom of Information Act to create a proactive disclosure provision for the government to publicly release records within 30 business days after cabinet consideration.

Madam Speaker, we are a unicameral jurisdiction. Without the additional checks and balances afforded by an upper house, the ACT government must continuously try to enhance transparency and accountability in government decisions, and the bill I am tabling as an exposure draft today is another step in seeking to do just that.

The bill has been modelled on the New Zealand government's proactive release of cabinet information policy, which has been in operation since 2018. New Zealand is also a unicameral jurisdiction and its commitment to more transparency in cabinet decisions provides a good example of what we could continue to do here in the ACT.

The bill contains an explicit definition of cabinet records and provisions for exemptions—for example, exemptions that apply if the release of a record would endanger persons, limit their rights or prejudice a criminal investigation, among others. The grounds for release or non-release in the public interest listed in schedules 1 and 2 of the Freedom of Information Act would also apply under my bill. Ministers would then exercise their judgement about what parts of records should be released.

The principle here is that transparency of government decision-making is essential and will foster better governance and more public confidence in the territory government. It is clear that our community want more transparency, more scrutiny, more accountability and more integrity in how government decisions are made.

Cabinet confidentiality has evolved over the centuries and there is no reason for it not to continue evolving. The role and composition of cabinets has also changed considerably in Australia since federation. Closer to home, you only have to look at how the role and composition of the ACT cabinet has evolved over its relatively short period under self-government to know that we are a jurisdiction that is capable of bringing good reform to how we govern.

This bill strikes the right balance between genuine cabinet confidentiality where documents that are clearly not in the public interest will continue to be protected, whilst at the same time providing a mechanism for the proactive release of records to give more public confidence in how cabinet decisions are made.

I invite all my colleagues here today and the broader public—and anyone else, for that matter, who is serious about transparency, accountability, integrity and scrutiny—to

seriously consider my bill and provide their feedback. I have opened it up to public consultation for two months. I will be seeking the views of Canberrans, law and public administration subject matter experts and anyone else interested in government transparency and accountability. I look forward to further discussing my bill when it is formally tabled and debated.

## **Housing—debt to commonwealth**

**MR DAVIS** (Brindabella) (2.54): I move:

That this Assembly:

(1) notes that:

- (a) the ACT Government has a housing debt of \$98.3 million owed to the Australian Government;
- (b) this debt is from investments the Australian Government made into the ACT's housing portfolio prior to self-government;
- (c) between the 2022-23 and 2024-25 financial years, the ACT Government will pay the Australian Government \$27.7 million (in principal and interest) to service these debts;
- (d) other state and territory governments also have historical housing-related debts to the Australian Government from the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement;
- (e) South Australia has had some of this debt waived by the Australian Government;
- (f) Tasmania has had all this debt waived by the Australian Government;
- (g) the ACT Government has been advocating to the Australian Government for our debt to be waived since 2019, with Senator Seselja, former Minister Sukkar and former Treasurer Frydenberg, acting on behalf of the former Coalition Government, having rejected, ignored, or delayed consideration of these multiple ACT requests;
- (h) the ACT Greens went to the federal election with a call to waive the ACT's historical housing-related debt;
- (i) Senator Katy Gallagher has historically shown support for this debt to be waived; and
- (j) incoming Senator David Pocock has also called for this debt to be waived;

(2) further notes that:

- (a) the Parliamentary and Governing Agreement commits the ACT Government to delivering an additional 400 public housing dwellings by 2025;
- (b) the Parliamentary and Governing Agreement also outlines the ACT Government's ambition to deliver 600 additional affordable housing dwellings by 2025-26;
- (c) the Parliamentary and Governing Agreement also makes a range of other commitments to make housing more affordable and support people experiencing homelessness including:

- (i) expanding specialist homelessness services;
- (ii) constructing more build to rent affordable rentals;
- (iii) providing additional funding for systemic advocacy in the housing sector; and
- (iv) expanding the existing land tax exemption program for affordable housing;
- (d) as of 7 March 2022, there are still 3028 individuals and families waiting to be placed into social housing in the ACT;
- (e) the average wait time for a social housing application assessed as high priority is 1040 days; and
- (f) the Chief Minister has already raised the housing debt waiver directly with the Prime Minister and Finance Minister since they assumed office last week;
- (3) acknowledges that the ACT Chief Minister and Government have publicly committed that savings from a debt waiver would be reinvested into new social and community housing;
- (4) requests that the Chief Minister continue to raise waiving the ACT's housing debts with the newly elected Federal Labor Government at all appropriate opportunities, to ensure the matter is dealt with as expeditiously as possible; and
- (5) as a follow-on action, calls on the ACT Government to:
  - (a) reconfirm that, in addition to existing financial commitments made by the ACT Government, it will invest into public housing all the principal and interest payments that no longer need to be made; and
  - (b) report back to the Assembly by the final sitting day of 2023 on the progress of these calls, including the total debt waived, the interest saved, and plans for public housing investments resulting from this motion.

As we have noted, debated, discussed and even agreed in a tripartisan manner in this chamber many times over recent years, the ACT is in a housing affordability crisis. This crisis has affected our entire country, from the country to capital cities. House prices in the ACT have skyrocketed over the last two years. Across all jurisdictions, rents have risen above what ordinary people can afford.

This has affected almost everyone who is currently in insecure housing: renters, people in public and social housing and those looking to buy a home. We know, of course, that it has disproportionately impacted those who are most in need. We are all too well aware of this and it is causing significant distress throughout our community. We are in a crisis and solutions must come from every level of government; they must be bold and they must all be genuinely considered.

My motion today calls on the federal government to forgive the ACT's historic housing debt, but additionally for the ACT government to invest all the money that it saves from the forgiveness of such debt directly into public housing. Madam Speaker, I am someone who grew up in public housing. I have a deep appreciation for and understanding of the need for secure, government-provided homes.

What we are talking about when we talk about waiving this debt is not an act of charity; it is an act of social justice. Buying and building public housing and ensuring housing security for people desperately waiting for safe accommodation is an absolute, bottom line, basic requirement of government. The Housing First approach on which the Greens' housing policy is based tells us that providing safe and secure housing to people facing complex challenges is the best way of helping the most vulnerable.

The Prime Minister's trajectory from public housing to the prime ministership is now well known. This is part of his story and has been a key narrative in the post-election commentary and analysis, and I am grateful for the platform that his election has given to representing the lives and opportunities afforded to those of us who are provided with secure public housing.

It is, however, very important for us to take stock of the fact that the Prime Minister's childhood story would have been very different, should it have unfolded in the present moment and not in the sixties and seventies. As Kate Colvin, national spokesperson for the Everybody's Home campaign, wrote in the *Sydney Morning Herald* this week:

The PM is right to hope his story inspires others. But we should also recognise that story is less likely today. Right now, only 4 per cent of our national housing stock is social housing, compared with 6 per cent when Anthony Albanese was a child.

A case in point: to prepare for the new government, the National Council of Single Mothers and their Children conducted a survey of over 300 single mothers. Of these families, close to 80 per cent live with housing issues such as constant housing stress, sleeping rough or homelessness. Thanks to the safety net of public housing, this is not something that the Prime Minister's single-parent family experienced.

At a high level, housing policy has significantly shifted over the last 40 to 50 years. Over this time we have seen the corrosive impacts of the neoliberalisation of public housing and of government-funded social services at large. While we hold ourselves out to be the most progressive jurisdiction in the country, we are not immune here to the so-called rationalisation of government services and assets and must fight against these trends to ensure that housing is considered a fundamental right and that the provision of housing is understood by every decision-maker to be the core work of good, progressive government.

It is time for us to work together with our new federal government to boost the supply of public housing here in Canberra through forgiving the historical housing debt and then guaranteeing the investment, dollar for dollar, of that money back into sorely needed public housing across our city.

As discussed yesterday in my response to Mr Hanson's motion on education, I am highly optimistic that a change of federal government, a change for the better, will see a much more reasonable approach to the range of social, legal and economic issues that the ACT is facing over which the commonwealth government has significant influence. The historic debt that is owed to the commonwealth by the ACT is one such example.

As my motion details, the ACT government has a debt of \$98.3 million to the commonwealth, due to investments in housing made prior to self-government. Other states had a similar debt which arose from other arrangements. In Tasmania, the debt has been waived entirely. In South Australia the debt has been partially waived. I might take this moment to add here, though, that what is unique about the debt that the ACT and the Northern Territory face is that that debt was acquired at a time when we did not have self-government. This seems like a basic infringement of the fundamental principles of democracy: that we have landed with a debt from a time in which we were not democratically represented.

Over the next two years alone, this historic housing debt will cost Canberrans about \$30 million. This is more than the annual provision of \$25 million made to support people who are at risk of, or experiencing, homelessness. Let me underline that fact one more time: over the next two years the ACT government is due to spend more in servicing its housing debt to the commonwealth than we currently pay frontline services to help those living roughest.

Unfortunately, locally, persistent activism by my fellow politicians from both Labor and the Greens to have the ACT's debt waived did not result in any response from the former coalition government and did not find an advocate in our former coalition senator. Prior to this issue being raised in this year's federal election, fellow Greens MLA Caroline Le Couteur proposed amendments to a motion put forward by Liberals leader Alistair Coe in 2019 calling on the parliamentary leaders of this Assembly to write a joint letter to the Prime Minister to support the waiver of historical housing debts from the commonwealth government. This amendment was supported by our colleagues in ACT Labor but unfortunately rejected by Liberal MLAs.

It is curious that, with all their newfound zeal for solving the housing crisis at a local level, our local Liberals would reject steps to create a significant dollar injection into public and social housing for the poorest Canberrans. In doing so, they missed a once in a lifetime opportunity to actually realise their dream of being able to provide more for Canberrans without raising taxes.

Of course, without ring-fencing the funds, there is no guarantee that this money will be injected into housing, where it can make the most difference to vulnerable Canberrans. In South Australia, for example, after the debt was partially forgiven, state government investment in housing actually decreased. The risk of the money going astray is why my motion calls on the government to commit to all of the savings—dollar for dollar, no spare red cent—being invested directly into the purchase and construction of public housing.

Federally, significant housing inequality reform advocacy will continue to be carried by the Australian Greens, now represented by 12 senators and four members of the House of Representatives. The Greens remain absolutely adamant that we cannot fix this housing inequality situation without changing the incentives for investors that skew the market towards them. We hope that our colleagues on the hill can work collegiately to repair the uneven playing field that benefits the rich and excludes the poor across every jurisdiction in Australia. We also hope that they support our call to build one million new public houses across our nation.

Our laser-like focus on housing is one of many reasons I chose to join, campaign and now proudly represent the ACT Greens in this place. We went to the 2020 territory election with a plan for a home for all, and we are absolutely committed to ensuring that every Canberran has a home. We sought to build and were able to secure commitments in the parliamentary and governing agreement with ACT Labor to the policy prioritisation of public housing. This plan includes building and buying 400 new public housing dwellings over this term, a commitment which saw a doubling of the existing housing targets. The centrality of housing to the parliamentary and governing agreement reflects the commitment of our two governing parties to provide secure housing for all.

Addressing issues of housing and security is essential to meeting the basic needs of Canberrans and then being able to provide adequate supports to remediate other social inequalities. Increasing Canberra's public housing stock and improving the services provided to our tenants is core to the ACT Greens' vision for building a just and equitable city.

Thanks to Minister Vassarotti and her team, since February last year the government has made financial commitments of more than \$12 million, in addition to the \$25 million provided annually to support people who are at risk of, or experiencing, homelessness. The territory government, and indeed the Chief Minister, led the nation by appointing specifically a minister for homelessness. I am pleased to see the new federal Labor government take that lead.

As a member of the crossbench, I have taken a particular interest in housing affordability and the role of the Assembly's functions in finding solutions to this crisis—not headlines; solutions. This year alone, I have put forward two separate motions to the Assembly asking this Assembly to inquire into housing affordability, the mechanisms available to government to incentivise people to rent out their properties and the barriers in place to ensuring that every single dwelling that can be occupied in our city is indeed occupied.

As a local member, I have asked questions to my ministerial colleagues *ad nauseum* about public housing in my electorate. This includes questions about the causes of some of the delays to building public housing that my constituents are witnessing. I know that people that I represent are absolutely adamant about the need to build and buy more homes. I appreciate their ongoing support and questions that demonstrate their enthusiasm for ending this crisis.

Investment in public housing is the gift that keeps on giving. It has positive effects far beyond each dollar spent. As Kate Colvin, the national spokesperson for Everybody's Home explains:

Providing access to affordable homes to people on low and modest incomes means more people have the stable home they need to be refreshed and healthy for a day's work or education. It decreases the strain on our hospitals, police, mental health and community services.

It also happens to be the right thing to do.

Study after study demonstrates the wisdom of social housing investment. Although we don't need to rely on theory alone. After a decade of stalled investment we are living with the real-world cost of neglect. Extra trips to hospital emergency wards and more psychological counselling. Lower school achievement and lower incomes. Women and children unable to escape family violence and more pressure on the justice system.

This is the reality of underinvestment in public housing by the federal government over the last decade. Now we have the chance to increase the investment, even beyond the historic levels already committed to under the Labor-Greens parliamentary and governing agreement.

If the entirety of the money saved, both principal and interest, is invested directly into public housing then we have the chance to make a real dent in the number of people in our city waiting for a safe and secure home. Perhaps none of these people will become Prime Minister, but they all deserve a chance to live a secure and comfortable life and to participate in our society to their full potential. Housing is a human right. Abundant, accessible and appropriate public housing is fundamental to an equitable society.

As someone who grew up in public housing, this issue is deeply personal. I know what it is like to be a tenant of the territory. I understand what it is like to experience housing stress. I have lived through the day-to-day anxieties that insecure housing places upon people and families in our city. People in my family, my friends and my colleagues are still living day to day.

I call on all my fellow members, all 25 of us, and also on the newly elected and re-elected members of the federal parliament, to support forgiving the historic housing debt and, upon that forgiveness, ensuring dollar-for-dollar investment of that money back into public housing, enabling even more Canberrans to access a safe and secure home.

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Climate Action, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism) (3.07): I thank Mr Davis for bringing this forward today and, in the motion itself, acknowledging all of the work that has been done to date. Clearly, there is a bit of history with this, and we have had mixed success with the previous commonwealth government in relation to our historic housing debts.

We will acknowledge that a small debt—I think that by the time it was allowed to be paid out it was about \$2 million—was agreed by former Treasurer Frydenberg. We were paying 12.5 per cent interest on that loan, so I shamed Treasurer Frydenberg at the time, when interest rates were about one per cent, into enabling us to pay that out early. I did not have as much success on the other, more substantive, loan that is at a 4.5 per cent interest rate, so that remains unfinished business for the territory government and something that we are re-prosecuting with the new administration.

Obviously, from the Prime Minister to the finance minister to our local federal representatives, I have already made clear the ACT's desire to see this housing debt waived and our commitment to do just as the motion has indicated: to reinvest the

principal and interest back into our public housing system. It is worth noting that there is effectively a two-way flow of funds at the moment. Under our national partnership agreement, the commonwealth provides the states and territories with funding to support housing and homelessness activities, but we roughly pay half of that back in the interest and capital repayments on this outstanding loan. Unless anything substantive changes, we will be doing that until 2041-42, which is a long time to wait for action.

Releasing the ACT from this particular debt would of course enable the territory government to redirect the servicing costs associated with these debts towards new or expanded housing and homelessness services and social and affordable housing. So we have been very clear about what we would do, were we to be granted a debt waiver or a debt restructure. We acknowledge that we would have to sign up to our end of the bargain so as to avoid the situation that Mr Davis outlined that occurred in South Australia. That would need to be a bilateral agreement between the commonwealth and the territory to achieve a shared and desired outcome.

I do note that my federal colleagues will create the Housing Australia Future Fund, which is a \$10 billion fund. If that were allocated on a per capita basis to the territory, we would see, in effect, more than our current historic housing debt being invested in public housing. So we will look to be creative and flexible in how we work with the commonwealth to assist them to deliver on their policy commitments and the ACT's share of those 20,000 additional public housing properties.

There are another 10,000 in this scheme that are, effectively, key worker housing projects. Again, we will go into that discussion with the commonwealth, arguing for our per capita share of that national program. My presumption would be that the commonwealth would move away from pork barrelling in the marginal electorates and allocate these national programs via some formula associated with per capita and with needs-based being the principal reason, not politics and the margin of a federal electorate.

**Mr Parton:** We will be watching.

**MR BARR:** Indeed, lots of people will be, including us, so rest assured that that is one that we will be pursuing. I am very happy to support the motion today and to advise the Assembly that we will continue to engage with the commonwealth on these matters. They were the subject of my initial conversations and correspondence with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Finance, and I will pursue that with the Treasurer as well when we meet in the not too distant future. As housing and homelessness have now been elevated into the federal cabinet, I am sure the Deputy Chief Minister, when she meets with Minister Collins in the near future, will also be pursuing this on the territory's behalf.

I think the future looks brighter for public housing for two reasons. Firstly, there is a stated commitment and \$10 billion that has been set aside across the nation. Depending on how efficiently we could deliver the ACT's share, that is potentially up to about 330 extra public housing properties from the ACT's per capita share that could be delivered through that commonwealth program, so that is important.



Then, obviously, we have our own commitments that we are pursuing under the parliamentary and governing agreement. Combined with the renewal program, we will see the biggest improvement in both the quality and quantity of public housing in the ACT, really, since the city was formed and the commonwealth built a lot of housing in a hurry, when major public service departments were being relocated into the ACT in the 1940s, fifties and sixties. So it is a generational shift. It is an exciting opportunity, but there is a lot of hard work ahead. I know that Minister Berry and Minister Vassarotti are working well together to deliver on this outcome for the people of Canberra. I commend the motion to the Assembly.

**MR PARTON** (Brindabella) (3.13): The Canberra Liberals will not be opposing this motion. When I leave this place, either when I make the decision to retire or when the voters of Brindabella decide that they have had quite enough of me, one of the things that I will be able to say to people is that I spent time in the Assembly with the great ideas man, the amazing political genius, Johnathan Davis. I do not know; is it just me or does it seem that all of the great ideas in this place, pretty much every single one, come from Mr Davis?

We had a motion the other day calling upon the planning committee to consider something that it is already considering. We have a motion today calling upon the Assembly and the government to do what they are already doing. None of this is new, and the Assembly, along with all of the three parties in it, has been pushing, in different ways, for years to get the federal government to waive the long-term housing debt. I wonder why we are even debating it.

I am trying to think of some other things that Mr Davis could bring to the chamber in motions in coming weeks. I am thinking he could bring in a motion calling upon the government to build a high school in Kenny. How could they refuse? You would have to build it. You would have to build it, and then, when it is opened, Mr Davis can say, "How good am I? Look at this. We've done it." It is not too late to take credit for light rail stage 2A. Perhaps Mr Davis could bring in a motion calling upon the government to construct light rail to Commonwealth Park and a separate motion the following week calling upon them to raise London Circuit.

I think this is a fascinating motion because what it says is: "I'm a part of the government which is"—according to the words in the motion—"absolutely failing on the housing front." Mr Davis, who is a part of the government, outlines how dire the housing crisis is that has affected the ACT. He, like me, grew up in public housing. Me and Mr Davis and Mr Albanese, we have had that same shared experience. The motion then says, "I know that my government has already raised the long-term housing debt with the incoming federal government, but I sort of want to make it look as though I'm the one responsible for doing this." I do not really understand it.

So we support the gist of the motion, we absolutely support the gist of the motion, but I just do not understand why it is here. The motion, in its text, concedes that the government are already doing what Mr Davis is calling upon them to do. In September 2019 the Chief Minister and Minister Berry wrote to the Prime Minister and federal housing minister to wave that \$115 million debt. That is on the record.

You did it. In October 2019 Minister Berry personally raised the issue with and wrote to the Prime Minister and the Treasurer, and these are the words of Ms Berry:

I raised the issue with Mr Frydenberg in four different ways over four different events in the last month, requesting the same deal for the ACT.

That is what Ms Berry did. The Canberra Liberals also made numerous approaches to the federal government on this issue. Some of those approaches were not really all that public, but I can tell you that they went on because I was involved in quite a number of them. This continued up until the final days of the Morrison government.

I am not often standing in this chamber to defend the Chief Minister, but the Chief Minister is on the record as saying only a fortnight ago:

“[We’ve] raised this at least a dozen times with the previous government so it’s on the agenda, we’ll have those discussions with the Commonwealth once things have settled down a little,” said Mr Barr, adding finance minister and ACT Senator Katy Gallagher was “across the detail of the issue”.

So the ACT government is already doing what Mr Davis is calling for. The ACT government have already stated that the funds saved if the debt is waived would be reinvested in new social and community housing. The ACT government should be able to successfully complete their promises, under the parliamentary and governing agreement, of delivering an additional 400 public housing dwellings—I certainly hope they can; we will be looking at it very closely—by 2024, and an additional 600 affordable housing dwellings by 2025-26. Surely they will be able to do that without the need for the debt to be waived? You cannot make promises that cannot be delivered without something else that has not occurred.

The Canberra Liberals have consistently brought housing affordability and social housing concerns to the Assembly. No-one can accuse us of sitting on our hands in this space because we have been extremely active in this space, and we note that more needs to be done. The wait list is growing, as are the wait times that we have before us, and we have brought that to the chamber and to various hearings on many occasions. I would appreciate it if Mr Davis actually did some work within the government that he is a part of to fix that, rather than bringing a motion like this to the chamber. But, with all that said, we are fully in support of it. Thank you.

**MS DAVIDSON** (Murrumbidgee—Assistant Minister for Families and Community Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Justice Health, Minister for Mental Health and Minister for Veterans and Seniors) (3.19): I just have a few words to say in support of Mr Davis’s motion. I thank him for bringing his creativity and his commitment to a home for all and for giving me the opportunity today to follow in the footsteps of my predecessor as a Greens MLA in Murrumbidgee, Caroline Le Couteur, in advocating for more and better quality public housing for the ACT.

If this debt to the commonwealth is cancelled, it will mean that the ACT government is able to invest millions of dollars more into Housing ACT each year. The ACT Greens want public housing that works for people, and the cancelling of this debt would mean more money to ensure that Housing ACT is able to deliver this. We

know that there is an increasing need for social and affordable community housing in the ACT as home ownership and private rentals are more unaffordable than ever before and this impacts the most on those with the lowest incomes.

Over the decade from 2007-08 to 2017-18, housing costs as a proportion of gross household income for those in the lowest quintile, the lowest 20 per cent of household incomes in the ACT, rose from 23.5 per cent of their income to 35 per cent. For those in the second quintile, housing costs rose from 19.9 per cent of their income to 24.2 per cent. But for those in the top 20 per cent of household incomes in the ACT, housing costs as a proportion of gross household income actually dropped from 10.9 per cent to 8.3 per cent of their income.

A significant factor in this shift—and I hope that Mr Parton is still listening, because I know I just dropped a lot of data there and that can make people feel a little bit sleepy—has been the impact on the property market of many years of negative gearing and capital gains tax discounts, which encourage speculative property investment at a time when many aspirational first home buyers are just looking for a home to live in.

From 2007-08 to 2017-18, the percentage of Australian households who owned their own home dropped from 70.8 per cent to 63.8 per cent, and the percentage of households living in state or territory-owned public housing dropped from 8½ per cent to 6.8 per cent, while the percentage in private rental housing rose from 17.3 to 26.1 per cent. In addition, the proportion of dwellings in the ACT that were community housing remained unchanged over that period, at 0.4 per cent of all properties in the ACT. So increasing investment in community housing will also help to increase affordable housing supply.

Keep in mind the rise in housing costs as a proportion of gross household income that I was just talking about for the lowest 40 per cent of household incomes. What I am talking about here are the people in our community who can least afford to compete in the private rental market having to do just that. This also has a gendered impact, and I am talking about single women with children.

The 2016 census showed that there were 3,477 single women with children in low income households, with an equivalent household income of \$500 per week or less, in the ACT. In addition, 46.4 per cent of women and girls living in middle income households—that is, with an equivalent household income of \$52,000 to \$103,999 per year in the ACT—are reliant on the income of a partner or parent for their middle income status. This is part of the reason why a 2014 report from the Domestic Violence Crisis Service found that 54.6 per cent of women with home ownership and 62½ per cent of women renting lose their homes within a year of separation.

For many women who are sole parents on low incomes, housing choices are almost non-existent because, as the Anglicare rental affordability index tells us year after year, the private rental market has nothing they can afford. This is why we are seeing an increase in the concentration of low income households in areas that are further away from employment opportunities, education, health and other services or social

networks, because that is the compromise that these women need to make to avoid homelessness.

Low income households reliant on the private rental market also have to compromise on the appropriateness of housing to be able to afford somewhere to call home. They may need to live in overcrowded accommodation or live in housing that is not adaptable or accessible to their physical needs. We know that the needs of Housing ACT tenants are changing and we need the public housing stock to reflect these changes—for example, through delivering more accessible and class C adaptable properties.

I thank Minister Vassarotti for the work she has done as ACT Minister for Sustainable Building and Construction in achieving mandatory accessibility standards in the National Construction Code so that all homes in future will be built with universal design standards. We know that our public housing stock is ageing. We need our public housing stock to be climate wise and energy efficient so that everyone can afford to heat and cool their home.

The ACT government is already responding to these challenges through the growth and renewal program by investing over a billion dollars to build 400 more properties and renew 1,000 properties, but if this historic debt is abolished, we will be able to do more. The provision of an energy-efficient class C adaptable property for each tenancy is life-changing and it is what our community deserves. Everyone needs a safe place that they can call home, one that they feel proud of and where they can live with dignity. We must do everything in our power to provide this to everyone who needs it here in the ACT. I commend the motion.

**MS BERRY** (Ginninderra—Deputy Chief Minister, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Women) (3.25): I feel like Mrs Jones has set the scene today for this motion, with a lot of really positive comments. There were a few pointed barbs as well from Mr Parton. I am thrilled that we have been able to come to a point today where we all support the direction for the government with regard to public housing in the ACT. It certainly has not always been the case, so I am thrilled today, as I said, that we have been able to get to this place. I thank Mrs Jones for setting up the vibe for this afternoon's debate.

Mr Parton is right: we have discussed in this chamber before the challenges of addressing housing and rental affordability in Canberra and across Australia. The ACT government are getting on with the job of implementing our housing strategy, which has seen increased support for homelessness services, increased funding for social housing and a range of measures to increase the number of affordable rental and affordable home purchase opportunities in the ACT.

The need to address this challenge has been building for decades at every level of government in this country. The ACT government will continue to be guided by the ACT housing strategy. The ACT government's housing strategy, which was developed with the housing sector community, the wider public and, importantly,

public housing tenants—as well as Mr Parton, who attended some of the workshops that were put together to develop the housing strategy—is about taking those important steps to address housing affordability across the board with the tools we have available at the territory level.

The ACT government is committed to strengthening social housing through increasing, growing and renewing the territory's public housing stock and, in turn, reducing homelessness and contributing to a safer, stronger and more inclusive Canberra. This has not always been an easy task. It will continue to be challenging to deliver across our community, but this is a commitment that has been clearly demonstrated through the government's ongoing and significant investment in public housing.

Through the ACT government's housing strategy, the Growing and Renewing Public Housing Program, the government will continue to renew its ageing public housing stock, replacing it with well-designed, comfortable and easy-to-run homes so that our portfolio continues to meet the needs of our tenants now and into the future.

Over the next five years the ACT government will invest more than half a million dollars to deliver 1,400 new, modern, efficient properties, including 400 additional homes for those who need them most. This program includes a direct budget investment of over \$150 million. This is, per capita, the biggest investment in public housing in the country. It will also see a quarter of our public housing stock renewed, with a \$1.2 billion investment in public housing from 2014 to 2025.

The 2021-22 budget saw \$100 million committed to growing, renewing and maintaining our public properties. As Ms Davidson said, the dropping of data can make people a bit sleepy but, for us, this significant investment is about providing people with homes, providing people with somewhere to live that best suits their needs, wherever they want to live across the city, so that they can broaden their horizons and have the same aspirations as the rest of us. This investment builds on the success of our previous public housing renewal program, which was commenced under the Chief Minister, which saw the replacement of 1,288 ageing, no longer fit-for-purpose properties in higher concentrations with more efficient homes in small developments spread across the city.

In 2021-22 the budget also saw a boost to the maintenance budget for public housing, with \$80 million committed to general repairs, maintenance, upgrades to kitchens and bathrooms, as well as upgrades for homes that needed disability modifications, and security improvements. This investment has seen a significant increase in maintenance works across the portfolio whilst also supporting our local industries.

Mr Parton is right: I have been calling for more action at a federal level to support the ACT government's work on housing affordability. With the election of the Albanese government and the appointment of Julie Collins as the new minister responsible for housing and homelessness, we can now hope for delivery on some of these actions that I have been calling for over the years.

On the historic housing debt, the Chief Minister and I have been calling for this to be waived, but these calls often fell on deaf ears with the coalition government. This issue came to prominence in 2019, with the waiving of the historic housing debt for Tasmania as part of an agreement with Senator Jacqui Lambie. Both the Chief Minister and I have already had discussions at multiple levels of the new commonwealth government and I am looking forward to an outcome that will see more funding to maintain, renew and grow public housing in this city.

The ACT government and the Labor Party are some of the strongest supporters of public housing. And now, with our friends and colleagues the Greens supporting that call, we know that we can make even more improvements here in the ACT. With the Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister growing up in government housing—and Mr Davis and Mr Parton as well—and our Prime Minister growing up in public housing, the Labor Party understands the safety and security that public housing provides to families and individuals who need it most. The Chief Minister and I are absolutely committed to extending the safety net as far as we can to build more public housing for Canberrans.

At a federal level, the issue has been elevated to natural prominence, as I said. The Albanese government has committed to a national housing and homelessness strategy, something that I and the sector here in the ACT have been calling for now for almost a decade. The commitments in the election campaign for social and affordable housing are a very welcome change, including the establishment of a \$10 billion Housing Australia Future Fund to support the delivery of 30,000 social and affordable houses across the country, with a priority focus on women and children experiencing domestic and family violence.

In conclusion, the Chief Minister and I, with the support of our colleagues in the ACT Greens, and now with the Canberra Liberals today, will continue to work across government to deliver on our ACT housing strategy, reflecting our strong and shared commitment to public housing in the ACT. I look forward to working with the new Australian government on this national challenge to deliver more housing for families looking for a place to call home.

**MR DAVIS** (Brindabella) (3.31), in reply: It seems everybody had an important job today and we all did our job well. By Mr Parton's own admission, I am the ideas man and I brought the motion forward. The Chief Minister provided us with the background. The housing minister provided us with the context of what we are doing right now. Minister Davidson brought us the data and Mr Parton brought us the jokes. So everybody had a part to play and everybody played their part excellently today. Well done, everybody!

I am pleased that, as a result of this motion, the private conversations—as I believe Mr Parton might have put it—that we might not have heard or that might not have been public with the previous coalition Treasurer at least now are public. At least now we can see that the Canberra Liberals have a clearly articulated position on the forgiveness of the historical public housing debt. That means the Canberra Liberals have two housing policies. The first, of course, is to bulldoze every square inch of the

territory into rolling cul-de-sacs and crescents, as we saw on coreflutes on every street corner in the context of the federal election.

Now at least we know that, finally and fortunately, we have advocates on the other side of the chamber joining the calls of the ACT Greens and ACT Labor to see a forgiveness of that housing debt. So if nothing else—by your own admission, Mr Parton, I am the ideas man—I am pleased to be providing more ideas to the Canberra Liberals to boost their policy chops. So that is useful.

In all seriousness, one of the things that I think have come from this debate certainly was not specifically part of the motion but has proven quite useful today and is worth reflecting on. I will take my lead from Mrs Jones, who, in her valedictory today, spoke quite eloquently about the need to perhaps be a bit kinder to one another.

It is really nice to see how many of my colleagues who grew up in public housing are proud to talk about having grown up in public housing and the great start that public housing has provided them. It looks like we are talking about 20 to 25 per cent of this Legislative Assembly being the products of great public housing. I think that is a credit to that investment. It is a credit that, across the political divide, we can all look at that. It invites a really important conversation that all 25 of us can start to have in our electorates about the need to push back against nimbyism in our community.

If my motivation behind this motion bears fruit—that we will have more money in public housing and we will be buying and building more public housing—the inevitable conclusion to that is the conversations, through the planning processes, about where these properties will be located. Of course, we have seen historic examples in the ACT of unflattering, uncomfortable high-rise public housing projects.

I distinctly recall a moment when I was younger, visiting my dad, when we went to the former Fraser Court, which I am sure members a little older might remember, down in Kingston. It was a rough part of the world. The ACT government's approach to salt and peppering our public housing investment, I think, is really important. But that salt and peppering comes with making those investments in places where people already live, in apartment buildings and townhouse complexes where people already own property.

Today we have reflected on how many people grew up in public housing and how, as leaders and across three political parties, we all value public housing. We want to see greater investment. That invites a really important conversation about everyone's need for a home, where those homes can go, the value in having diverse and eclectic communities in every postcode, in every SES bracket, near shops, away from shops, close to public transport, in your building and in your suburb. It is a really exciting next step to this process and an exciting community conversation that I certainly hope we can all have.

I underline the point that Senator Katy Gallagher and, indeed, what looks to be Senator-elect David Pocock were clear on these positions during the campaign. I warmly welcome their re-election and possible election. Perhaps the fate of Senator Seselja might have been different if the comments made by Mr Parton today about the

Canberra Liberals' enthusiasm to see a forgiveness of this debt had been more public comments prior to the election, as opposed to having one singular policy solution to the problem. Perhaps things might have been different. But we are where we are now. I am pleased to see federal allies on the question and I am pleased to see that the Chief Minister will continue to do what he does and make those representations federally.

To end on a good note, where Mr Parton and I might find a unity ticket, I trust it will be Mr Parton and me finely poring over, line by line, future territory budgets. Imagine, Mr Assistant Speaker, if the federal government forgives that debt. Today's motion will be successful, it appears, and therefore we will expect to see additional investments in public housing, beyond the already very ambitious commitments between the Greens and Labor in the parliamentary and governing agreement.

**Mr Parton:** You would have done it; you would have achieved it.

**MR DAVIS:** I hope that, as an opposition MLA, Mr Parton will join me in working through those budget papers in future years to make sure that that additional investment bears fruit. Mr Parton, I am not sure if you are trying to insult me, but you are failing because I do not think there is a single person in our electorate, even those who do not like me—

**Mr Parton:** On a point of order: I am just wondering if the member could address his conversation through the chair?

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Mr Cain):** Address the chair; thank you, Mr Davis.

**MR DAVIS:** Absolutely, Mr Assistant Speaker. My apologies. Mr Assistant Speaker, through you, I do wonder whether, in Mr Parton's contribution to the debate, his attempt was to insult me. Can I, through you, Mr Assistant Speaker, inform Mr Parton that he is indeed mistaken. No doubt there are people in our shared constituency, Mr Parton, who do not like you and they like me. There are those that do not like me and they like you, and vice versa. But I do not think even my worst critic would hate the fact that I bring ideas to the chamber and that I propose issues of public policy for debate.

I bring issues to the chamber that force all three parties and a diversity of members to broadcast their views on the question. I utilise the tools available to me as a member, sitting where I sit, to engage in the committee process, to put motions to government, to sponsor petitions et cetera. I am really struggling to find why that is a bad thing, when you have just aptly described what should be our job description for all 25 of us. I am pretty pleased with the job I am doing. But you can always do better, so I appreciate the feedback. I always willingly invite feedback. In fact, every Friday morning from nine to 12 I am at my electorate office. Jindebah coffee is the best coffee in town. I thought I would take the opportunity for a bit of a shout-out there.

It is really fortunate that in the first sitting week immediately after the federal election campaign we have increased the Canberra Liberals' housing policies by 100 per cent. I think that is tremendous. I look forward to members of the Canberra Liberals opposition joining us in writing to the new federal government, sharing our motion,



speaking about our motion and joining the lobbying efforts, as the Chief Minister and housing minister so eloquently spoke about, to ensure that this debt is forgiven as soon as possible. Mr Parton, I will meet you at the Erindale Vikings for a beer at the next budget papers and we can go through them together.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Building—combustible cladding**

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong—Leader of the Opposition) (3.40): I move:

That this Assembly:

(1) notes that:

- (a) combustible cladding has been a pressing issue since the Grenfell Tower fire in London in June 2017;
- (b) it has taken the ACT Government over five years to progress remediation works on government-owned buildings;
- (c) despite the need for urgent action raised by many owners corporations and strata managers, the ACT Government has been slow in addressing the issue of combustible cladding in residential buildings in Canberra;
- (d) due to inaction by the ACT Government, some owners corporations have been forced to take active steps to remove combustible cladding and commence remediation works;
- (e) the ACT Government only announced some assistance for testing and assessment for residential buildings in July 2021;
- (f) despite announcing a concessional loan scheme in April, no details have been finalised; and
- (g) owners corporations need support and certainty from the ACT Government to remediate combustible cladding on residential buildings; and

(2) calls on the ACT Government to:

- (a) finalise and publish details, including eligibility and terms, of the remediation loan scheme by 30 June 2022;
- (b) undertake a thorough and comprehensive audit of any residential buildings not yet tested by 30 September 2022;
- (c) set a target end date for the remediation of all cladding in Canberra;
- (d) waive development application fees for cladding remediation works; and
- (e) establish a dedicated team within the planning directorate to fast track development applications for cladding remediation works.

I will begin by acknowledging some of the Canberrans who have joined us in the public gallery today, who have all been affected by this government's failures in fixing this combustible cladding issue and have been tireless advocates for action. Through you, Mr Assistant Speaker Cain, thank you to all of you for your efforts—

and those of you who are not able to join us today but who I know are keenly watching the debate.

Combustible cladding is a known hazard present in our community. It can be life-threatening. The extent of the issue is still not completely understood in Canberra. The reason it is not completely understood is that this Labor-Greens government refuses to acknowledge, refuses to take action and refuses to actually find out the full extent of the problem. In the years since the Lacrosse Tower fire in Melbourne in 2014 and the Grenfell Tower fire in London in 2017, the Labor-Greens government has barely been able to address the issue of combustible cladding in its own ACT government buildings.

This government has not taken, and still does not take, combustible cladding seriously. It put an inexperienced minister in charge in the last term—a minister who took over eight months just to respond to a letter from one owners corporation—and it has yet again put an inexperienced junior minister in charge. This government is still dragging its feet on providing any certainty, any assurance, for the thousands of Canberrans that are affected.

It was not until July 2021—July last year—years after the issue was first raised as an urgent problem, that the ACT government finally announced some assistance for residential buildings in Canberra. The tardiness of this response left some owners corporations high and dry, because it was a case of too little, too late. Owners corporations who were so frustrated with the delay in action by this Labor-Greens government were forced to take proactive steps to remediate their combustible cladding or face the enormous risk of being unable to insure their buildings or, worse, see their buildings go up in flames.

Here we are, almost a year later, June 2022, and the Labor-Greens government still has not finalised the details of a scheme to support owners corporations to remediate cladding on their buildings—remediation works which can reach costs in the tens of millions of dollars. The financial burden of cladding remediation is enormous and it affects thousands and thousands of Canberrans.

Perhaps it is worth noting at this point that this is the same government that is forcing 70 per cent of Canberrans into high-rise apartment towers, and it does not even have the decency to ensure that those people can do so safely and affordably. The minister says that 65 residential buildings will probably be eligible for the loan scheme that the government has not even finalised yet. We do not even know what the eligibility criteria are going to be.

A couple of weeks ago I was at a combustible cladding forum run by the Owners Corporation Network—and I acknowledge their president, Gary Petherbridge, who is joining us today—and the Strata Community Association, and its head, Shelley Mulherin. It was well attended, with representatives from owners corporations, insurance providers, the Master Builders Association and over 100 affected members of the Canberra community. They were there to share their experiences but, most importantly, they were there to get answers. What they got instead was a minister floundering, a minister not across her brief, and a minister who clearly does not understand the gravity of the issues affecting thousands and thousands of Canberrans.

If anyone had come to get some assurances that this government was taking this issue seriously—a government that has a concrete plan to provide certainty for the way forward—they were left severely disappointed. Having spoken to numerous attendees from that forum since, the message sent by the minister was essentially, “I don’t really know what this problem means to you. I don’t really know what needs to be done, and I don’t really know if I can help you.” I was genuinely shocked by the woeful, inadequate response by the minister. I thought that, surely, the minister would have come to this forum well prepared, well aware of the gravity of this issue and with an understanding of how important it was for the thousands of Canberrans that are affected to be assured that their government was taking their concerns seriously and had a plan to address them.

This was a forum that had been postponed for many months. If not in the years and years since the problem first came to light, if not in the time that she has been the responsible minister, at least in the time that has passed since the forum was postponed due to COVID, you would have thought she would have come prepared with some assurances, with some concrete plan forward. From everyone who turned up to the forum there was an openness, a willingness and, most importantly, a hope that they would be provided with some assurance that their concerns were being taken seriously and, at the very least, details of the loan scheme. Astonishingly, there was nothing but a diatribe of talking points read out loud, full of fluffy words and no concrete action.

We saw yesterday in question time when Minister Gentleman took questions about this issue on behalf of Minister Vassarotti that his performance was also completely uninspiring. In response to a straightforward question, “When will the details of the loan scheme be available?” it was literally: “Oh, Minister Vassarotti is working on that.” Well, she has been “working” on it now for a year and the community is still none the wiser. In today’s question time we sought further clarification on development application fees for the removal of cladding and for remediation works. I note that Minister Gentleman brought back some words from Minister Vassarotti about being “misrepresented”. If she has been misrepresented, Mr Assistant Speaker, it is because she has been absolutely opaque during this entire debacle.

There are many, many people who have been engaged with this issue for years who are still none the wiser about what fees apply and what fees are exempt, just as they have no idea about what the process is, what the plan is and what the next step is. This really highlights the complete and utter lack of competence of this Labor-Greens government in dealing with this very serious issue. The lack of certainty and the lack of action that has been going on and on has already become an enormous source of frustration for so many in our community.

I am curious to see what those opposite will do today. As you know, they usually gang up and amend our motions beyond recognition. I note that an amendment has literally just landed on my desk, and there are no surprises here; it is a complete rewrite. I do not even have to read this, but I will: “Omit all text after “That this Assembly”. It is a complete rewrite of the motion. I have not even read it because it has literally landed on my desk.

Let's put a few facts on the record. In 2019 it was actually the ACT Greens that called for the government to audit private buildings. They want everyone living in apartment towers, even though most of them do not want to live in apartment towers. Of course, remember that with the government it is one rule for them and one rule for everybody else. It was their federal colleague Adam Bandt who wanted to see the cladding issue fixed once and for all. It is standard for the Labor-Greens government in this chamber to talk about federal politics when it suits them and to ignore it when it does not. The Greens now have a minister in charge of this situation, right here in the ACT. Unfortunately, she has been sitting on her hands, head in the sand, and has been completely ineffective at communicating what the government is doing.

The ACT Labor-Greens government must stop stalling. They must take their heads out of the sand and they must take action. I am calling on this government to finalise the details of the cladding remediation scheme before 30 June and to undertake a thorough and complete audit of residential buildings that have not yet been tested by 30 September. Minister Gentleman has stated for the record today that remediation works are DA-exempt and therefore no DA fees apply. But in terms of all government fees and charges that are applicable, it is only decent that this government must consider a waiver of all those fees. These are not optional works that are being carried out to improve a building. These are crucial works required to be done to keep Canberrans safe.

I am also calling on this government to set a target end date for the removal of all combustible cladding in Canberra. This cannot be pushed anymore. Most importantly, I am calling on this Labor-Greens government to show support for the thousands and thousands of Canberrans who have been affected by this issue for too long. To these government ministers, it might be reports, it might be assessments and it might be dollar figures, but to the thousands of Canberrans that are affected, this is their home. As I said at the cladding forum only a few weeks ago, I sincerely hope that we are still not talking about this during the next Assembly, come October 2024. I commend my motion to the Assembly.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong—Attorney-General, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Gaming and Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction) (3.51): Unfortunately, due to health reasons, Minister Vassarotti is unable to be here today for the debate, so I am representing her in this discussion. I rise to speak to Ms Lee's motion and reflect on the speech that she just gave, a speech that was about as one-eyed as you could get. I think it reflects poorly on politicians because there is a serious issue to be discussed here, but Ms Lee cannot help lacing her speeches with derogatory comments about individuals. The playing of the person goes well beyond the pale when there is an important issue to discuss here.

*Ms Lee interjecting—*

**MR RATTENBURY:** I am disappointed that not only is Ms Lee interjecting already, after giving a fairly offensive speech about my colleague—she interjects immediately—but we have to have a speech like that, where she cannot just talk about the issues but in fact denigrates the minister at a personal level, well beyond what is necessary for the purposes of the discussion.

*Ms Lee interjecting—*

**MR RATTENBURY:** Whilst the interjections continue, I will now turn to the substance of the matter. It is a very important matter and it is one that I know Minister Vassarotti has been working on extensively. I will go through the details because I am not sure whether it is through deliberate political strategy or wilful ignorance but Ms Lee has failed to recognise the extensive work that has already taken place in this space.

All of us were chilled by the scenes of the Grenfell tragedy in the UK in 2017. That disaster highlighted the risks of certain products that had been widely used across the world and saw governments across Australia and the world respond to this newly identified risk. This tragedy spurred governments across the world to act, and I would like to assure the Assembly that, since that time, the ACT government has been working to protect the community and manage the risk posed by the situation.

This is an opportune time to update this Assembly and those who are watching on what has been occurring over the last few years to deal with this issue, and what is currently underway. In 2017 the ACT government formed the Inter-agency Building Cladding Review Group to determine whether combustible materials had been used in territory buildings in a way that posed a risk to building occupants. This was a complex issue and, as in other jurisdictions, there was a need to understand the specific risk for ACT government-owned properties, as well as the risk for other building owners. A key issue for this group was to assess the risk to the public with regard to ACT government-owned buildings.

During this time the ACT government also worked with other jurisdictions to amend the National Construction Code to ensure that these products were not used. An amendment to the National Construction Code came into effect in the ACT in March 2018 to provide absolute clarity that in type A or B construction—apartments over three storeys are type A—the external walls and common walls, including the facade covering the framing and the insulation, must be non-combustible. Previously, the National Construction Code did not specifically mention these elements of the facade with regard to non-combustibility, which led to the general interpretation across Australia that the requirements for non-combustibility did not apply to cladding.

In December 2019 a cladding audit response team was established to progress the important work in addressing the issues identified with ACT government buildings through further detailed assessments and identification of remediation options. Since this time the ACT government has been working to rectify all buildings that have been assessed to have either a high or moderate risk. Despite COVID-19 restrictions, a construction lockdown and significant challenges around supply chains and skill shortages, I am pleased to note that this work has been progressing well and all ACT government buildings will be rectified by the end of the 2022 calendar year.

Members will be aware that the ACT government has proactively released information once buildings have been rectified, given the risks of releasing information prior to risks being minimised. The response team also undertook a

desktop analysis to identify privately owned buildings that might be affected. It also undertook a kerbside identification of buildings with cladding material, carried out by ACT Fire & Rescue in the most likely suburbs of Canberra—around town centres, transit corridors and areas of apartment development.

The outcome of this kerbside identification process was around 90 apartment buildings of three storeys or higher, potentially with combustible cladding. Inquiries into these 90 buildings indicate that some of the 90 buildings do not have combustible cladding, while others have already completed remediation works. Of those buildings, approximately 53 owners corporations are eligible for assistance under the Private Buildings Cladding Scheme. Twelve owners corporations have also applied for the scheme who were not previously identified as part of the kerbside process.

A number of outreach activities have been undertaken to contact the maximum number of owners corporations who may be affected. This has included undertaking presentations on the scheme to owners corporations who are members of the Owners Corporation Network, contacting all of the strata agencies in the ACT, talking them through the scheme and obtaining their assistance to identify buildings they manage which may be eligible for the scheme, and sending letters to owners of class 2 buildings that may have cladding.

Given the size of our city, the nature of the products and the very proactive approach taken by Major Projects Canberra, we can be confident that there is a strong understanding of the buildings potentially impacted, and early calls for an audit have essentially been responded to. Testing and assessment mean that building owners will have a much more specific understanding of potential risks and clear advice on how to deal with specific issues. While the calls for an audit may have had some merit in mid-2019, the subsequent work that has occurred since this time, which has seen the identification support for assessment work to occur, has rendered this call essentially completed.

The ACT government is working to see that all buildings with a high and moderate risk due to combustible cladding are rectified. As noted in relation to ACT government-owned buildings, this will be achieved by the end of 2022. In relation to privately owned apartment buildings, the ACT government has been working to support private owners to assess and manage this risk. Across Australia, outside our biggest states, whose significantly higher risk profile can be immediately seen when we survey the skylines of our two largest cities, the ACT is the only jurisdiction that has provided any support to private building owners. This is in recognition that, while this is a responsibility of private owners, it is a challenging process that can be difficult to navigate.

The ACT government has aimed to take a balanced approach of adopting a voluntary scheme that aims to support private building owners to assess and manage their risk. Since immediately after this government was elected, we have been working to produce a two-phase scheme to assist building owners. Phase 1 of the scheme was developed and funded through the government's 2020-21 budget and provides a 50 per cent rebate for testing and assessment of potentially combustible cladding. So far, the government has assisted 25 owners corporations with the testing and

assessment of their cladding and expects more to apply before applications close in July this year.

In undertaking this work we have facilitated the delivery of expert professional advice so that owners have a realistic understanding of the risk posed by the cladding on their buildings. This means owners have been able to make informed decisions about how to best mitigate the risk. The government has also made sure that owners are aware of the steps they can take to reduce fire risk by working with ACT Fire & Rescue, who have provided practical tips and advice. ACT Fire & Rescue are provided with information regarding individual risk assessments to ensure that they have good information if there is an incident to respond to.

For owners corporations who now know that they have combustible cladding that needs remediation, the ACT government is progressing the delivery of a concessional loan scheme to support the removal and replacement of combustible cladding on their buildings. It has been important to draw on the learnings from phase 1 of the scheme to develop a loan scheme that is useful to owners corporations and responds to the issues we know they will be facing. This scheme was announced as part of the 2021-22 budget, and key elements of the scheme have been announced, contrary to the speech that Ms Lee gave in the chamber today. (*Quorum formed.*)

For members of the public who are wondering what just happened, the Liberal Party pulled a procedural stunt to draw more people into the chamber, in the middle of my speech. As I was saying before I was interrupted, the government has announced a loan scheme and has announced quite a range of its details. There will be \$50 million initially allocated to the scheme, with a fixed interest rate at the government cost of borrowing, which is currently in the band of 2.5 to three per cent, loan terms of 10 years, no application or other loan fees, individual loans generally up to \$15 million per owners corporation, and no penalties for repaying the loan early. Ms Lee, in her remarks, suggested there were no details available. That is quite a lot of detail.

We understand that cladding remediation and loan administration will be a significant undertaking for owners corporations and executive committees. Under the loan, owners corporations will have access to an extra \$10,000 on their loan to fund administration costs, such as administration support services, tools or additional strata management services related to loan administration. The government will also allow the first \$100,000 of the loan to be released early for owners corporations to engage a range of project management, architectural and fire and engineering services to design their remediation works and go out to tender. The loan will assist with all remediation works and any associated costs, including the costs of building professionals, strata managers, legal and regulatory fees.

The Assembly will be pleased to know that this is subject to a procurement process and the government is in the final phases of this process. Minister Vassarotti looks forward to announcing the final details and opening applications very shortly. Members will appreciate that the government cannot announce all of the details until the procurement is complete because there is a certain amount of negotiation with the provider that will need to be finalised as part of those contract negotiations. As soon

as those negotiations are completed, the government will make those full details available.

There has been some discussion of the fact that some of the regulatory fees associated with remediation works should be waived for these projects. Replacing the cladding on a building is development application exempt. However, there are building levies that apply to all building work. The building levy and the training levy both sit as a small percentage of the total project cost. They are necessary to ensure that the ACT is able to continue to ensure that community standards around building quality are maintained and that the industry is properly trained to perform the required work. This is the same treatment as for other owners that are required to remove other hazardous materials or undergo other sorts of remediation work. The cost of these levies can be included in the concessional loan amount by owners corporations if they wish.

Let me wrap this up by saying that I welcome the opportunity today to outline the work that the ACT government has been undertaking, and to assure both Ms Lee and others within the Assembly that the government is far from ignoring this important issue. The ACT government is working hard to manage cladding risks for buildings that are the government's own responsibility, supporting private apartment building owners to identify and manage risk in their buildings, and for them to be empowered to make decisions about how they want to proceed and to be financially supported with the path that they choose.

We do recognise that this has been a difficult process for building owners. We thank individual owners and organisations such as the Strata Community Association and the Owners Corporation Network for their collaborative approach in assisting the government to design and promote the support being provided for private building owners. I encourage all private apartment owners who may have concerns to engage with Major Projects Canberra and access the support being provided by the government. Together we can ensure that we reduce the risk and respond to this issue that communities across Australia and the world have been managing in recent years.

As has been flagged, there is a government amendment today, and I now move the amendment circulated in my name:

Omit all text after "That this Assembly", substitute:

"(1) notes:

- (a) in response to the 2017 Grenfell Tower fire in London, all jurisdictions agreed to and amended the Australian National Construction Code in 2019 to disallow the use of potentially combustible cladding for certain classes of buildings;
- (b) the ACT Government has been progressively working to identify the risk and where necessary ensure that potentially combustible cladding on public and private buildings constructed before 2019 is remediated, where the risk it poses is unacceptable;
- (c) this work has included:
  - (i) remediation of ACT Government owned buildings with high-risk cladding;



- (ii) identifying the risk profile of private buildings, including private residential apartment buildings potentially with cladding; and
  - (iii) collaboration with other jurisdictions to identify the appropriate level of support to offer private building owners needing to identify their risk level from potentially combustible cladding, and take action to address that risk;
  - (d) owners corporations are responsible for ensuring their buildings are safe for residents and visitors;
  - (e) immediately following the 2020 ACT election results, the ACT Government announced we would implement financial support for owners corporations to test any potentially combustible cladding on their building, and that access to low interest loans will be provided to assist with meeting the costs of any required remediation of high risk potentially combustible cladding on their buildings;
  - (f) in July 2021, the ACT Government opened up the first phase of financial assistance for owners corporations, consisting of rebates to support the cost of testing for potentially high risk combustible cladding, and through Major Projects Canberra has been working productively with owners and strata managers to ensure all potentially eligible building owners are aware of the scheme and how to access it. This rebate for testing is open until 21 July 2022;
  - (g) in April 2022, the Government announced that phase two of the scheme—a concessional loan scheme would be opened in mid-2022 and provided detailed information regarding eligibility, likely interest rates and other key parameters;
  - (h) rectification of potential combustible cladding is exempt from development approvals and therefore not subject to Development Approval fees, and Building Approval fees can be included in the concessional loan amount; and
  - (i) the ACT Government aims to see all buildings in the ACT with potentially combustible cladding that is rated as high or moderate risk rectified to low risk. This will be achieved to buildings owned and controlled by ACT Government by the end of the 2022 calendar year. The ACT Government's support and assistance for the owners of private apartment buildings is targeted to ensure the same outcome for private affected buildings; and
- (2) calls on the ACT Government to:
- (a) publish the finalised details, including eligibility and terms, of the remediation loan scheme and the loan provider once the procurement process, currently in its final stages, is completed;
  - (b) continue to work with owners corporations and strata managers to ensure that they are managing risks associated with potentially combustible cladding on their buildings; and
  - (c) continue to support the process of building owners ensuring they have appropriate building approvals in place through building certification processes."

I offer an apology for the late circulation of the amendment. As the standing minister, I did make a snafu on that one, and I apologise to colleagues for that. Let me quickly

take the time to explain the amendment. I am sure colleagues have now had a chance to read it. It essentially sets out the steps that the ACT government has been taking. It provides a lot of the information that Ms Lee alluded to in her remarks as not being available. It is in fact available. It is in writing now, just to make sure that there is no misunderstanding about that.

It calls on the ACT government to publish the final details, including eligibility and the terms of the remediation loan scheme and the loan provider once the procurement process, currently in its final stages, is completed. As I stressed in my remarks, it is quite important that we finalise the procurement so that we can give people the exact details that will then not change. They can have certainty.

The government will also continue to work with owners corporations and strata managers to ensure that they are managing the risks associated with potentially combustible cladding. That partnership will be very important, given the complexity, and provide as much support as possible with building approvals and certification processes.

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong—Leader of the Opposition) (4.08): In closing, I have now had a chance to read Mr Rattenbury's amendment that was circulated while I was on my feet. Very interestingly—this will be of very great interest to several Canberrans who are in the public gallery and who are watching this debate very keenly—Mr Rattenbury went to great lengths to say, “All of the details that you say are not available are available.” It will be of great interest to those in the gallery, this two-page document and how much more reassurance this is providing to them.

The most important thing that I will highlight is the “calls on”. It talks about publishing the final details, including eligibility and terms—of course, they were from my original motion—once the procurement process, currently in its final stages, is completed; that is, “You will get it when you get it.” This is what we have heard from this government throughout the day today, isn't it? “You will get it when we say it's ready, and you will get it when you get it.” No time frame, no accountability and no transparency.

In the amendment they also say “continue to work with” and “continue to support”. Not only has it been years and years, and there was a previous minister who had responsibility for this, but let us not forget that the current government announced in July last year that there was going to be a scheme. Whilst Mr Rattenbury goes on about, “We need to do this and we need to do that to get this ready,” what has been happening? It is a year later. I am heartened that, in media reports, Mr Rattenbury, apparently, earlier today, confirmed that it would be within the coming weeks. Perhaps it will give some—some—small assurance to the thousands of Canberrans that are affected that at least something will be coming.

The Canberra Liberals will not be supporting this amendment, and the reason is this: it once again denies any accountability for actually providing action within a time frame. As is the case with all of the amendments that are brought in by members of Labor and the Greens in this chamber, it is always a self-congratulatory rewrite. “Look at us. Let's call on the ACT government to continue to do what we're doing, because everything we're doing is fantastic.”

This is an absolute slap in the face to not only the Canberrans that are in the public gallery right now and those that are watching this debate online but the thousands and thousands of Canberrans that are affected. Despite the well-rehearsed talking points that have been prepared for Mr Rattenbury by the directorate, there is still no acknowledgement that this is a significant, serious, life-threatening issue and that we are talking about people's homes. We are talking about people's homes, and there is no acknowledgement of that.

We will not be supporting this amendment. It is not good enough, years and years down the track, for this Labor-Greens government to say, "Yep, we'll publish it when we're ready to." That is nowhere near good enough. It is not good enough to come into this chamber and to start his remarks by being all high and mighty and telling me that I cannot help making a personal attack. I know that Mr Rattenbury has not had the privilege of being in opposition. At least Ms Stephen-Smith understands what the opposition's role is; it is to hold the government to account. If I cannot make any comments about the woeful, inadequate performance of a minister in her portfolio, what am I meant to talk about? This is ridiculous. It is absolutely ridiculous for Mr Rattenbury to fake outrage that I have made personal, offensive remarks when I have spoken very much about the minister's performance as a minister looking after this portfolio.

If Mr Rattenbury wants to talk about personal, offensive comments, where was he when his colleagues stood there and called me a right-wing puppet, a puppet of Zed Seselja? I faced personal, deeply offensive comments that, despite being a woman of colour who has worked extremely hard to overcome many barriers to be the leader of a party, I am the puppet of a white man. How offensive is that? Where was Mr Rattenbury when those comments were being thrown about? Please do not sit here in this place and throw around remarks condescendingly to me when I have made genuine and warranted criticisms of the minister and her inadequate, woeful performance. I will not have any minister attempt to shut me up because I am calling out the government and the ministers for inadequately addressing what is in their portfolio.

This is unacceptable, and the people sitting in the gallery and the people watching know this, along with the thousands and thousands of Canberrans that are deeply and personally affected by this Labor-Greens government's inaction on addressing a seriously dangerous, life-threatening issue. To turn that into saying, "Don't say this about my colleague," is totally unacceptable.

I sincerely hope that what I have read in the media reports this afternoon is true and that Mr Rattenbury will announce the details of the loan scheme within the coming weeks. That is the very least that this government can do after sitting on its hands, after having its head in the sand, taking no action and providing no assurances to the public for years and years. Mr Deputy Speaker, I want to say directly to the thousands and thousands of Canberrans that are affected: whilst the Labor-Greens government does not acknowledge, does not understand and does not take seriously your concerns, the Canberra Liberals will, and we will always stand up for you. We will not be supporting the amendment.

Question put:

That the amendment be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 12

Noes 4

Ms Berry	Ms Orr
Mr Braddock	Mr Pettersson
Ms Burch	Mr Rattenbury
Ms Cheyne	Mr Steel
Ms Clay	Ms Stephen-Smith
Ms Davidson	
Mr Davis	

Mr Cain  
Mrs Kikkert  
Ms Lee  
Mr Parton

Amendment agreed to.

Original question, as amended, resolved in the affirmative.

## **Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety— report 5—government response Ministerial statement**

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong—Attorney-General, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Gaming and Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction) (4.21): I am pleased to advise the Assembly about the government response to the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety's report on the inquiry into the Family Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2022, which I am tabling today.

I introduced the Family Violence Legislation Amendment Bill into the Assembly on 10 February this year. The bill makes a number of important changes to ACT legislation and continues the ACT government's work to strengthen our response to domestic and family violence. The bill is intended to help ensure that the ACT's laws respond appropriately to perpetrators of domestic and family violence offences and make changes to help reduce trauma for victim-survivors involved in court proceedings.

On 14 February the standing committee resolved to undertake a public inquiry into the bill. The government welcomed this inquiry, as it provided an opportunity for public discussion about how the bill would operate in practice and an additional chance for stakeholders and general members of the public to give feedback for the ACT government to consider prior to the debate on the bill. The government acknowledges that ongoing conversation about domestic and family violence is a critical aspect of advancing improvements to our approach to addressing this important issue.

The standing committee invited written submissions on the bill and conducted a public hearing on 18 March, at which both the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence and I appeared as witnesses. The standing committee

published its report on 14 April. The government thanks the standing committee for its report and has now carefully considered its seven recommendations.

The government notes and welcomes the recommendation for the Assembly to pass the Family Violence Legislation Amendment Bill. This recommendation is recognition by the standing committee of the essential nature of the law reform in this bill, as part of our work to better respond to and prevent domestic and family violence in the territory. The ACT government has also agreed to four recommendations of the standing committee.

First, the government has agreed to the recommendation to review the impacts of an offender's ability to access restorative justice practices and community corrections orders as a result of longer sentences under the aggravated offence scheme. These matters were also the subject of consideration during the initial development of the bill. Offences can be referred for restorative justice at various points—for example, by ACT Policing or the Director of Public Prosecutions—which may be instead of a formal prosecution, or they can be referred by the courts, which cannot be done as an alternative to prosecution. This policy approach, as set out in the Crimes (Restorative Justice) Act 2004 is grounded in the belief that, while restorative justice can be beneficial for all offences, offences that are extremely serious still need to be dealt with through the formal legal system.

The increased maximum penalties for some of the aggravated offences would make it so that the offender could only be referred after the courts, who have been able to give the most comprehensive consideration to all perspectives and circumstances, have determined to do so. The treatment of these offences would be consistent with the pre-existing policy approach in restorative justice legislation, and the effects of this will certainly form part of the government's future approaches. The government also considered the interaction between the new aggravated family violence offences and the ACT sentencing framework during the development of the bill. Importantly, the sentencing options, including for intensive correction orders and suspended sentences, are not directly impacted by the maximum penalties available for the new offences.

Secondly, the government has agreed to the recommendation to investigate whether sentencing based on breaches of trust, rather than breaches in the context of family relationships, may result in fairer justice outcomes. I note at the outset that an offender being in a position of trust or authority is already one of the general sentencing considerations. As to the matter of aggravation, clearly, breaches of trust are a key part of what is so especially abhorrent about family violence offending.

However, this is a complex and novel area of policy. Whether breaches of trust are the primary characteristic we are seeking to denounce or whether there are other similarly important characteristics as to why we need to regard this kind of offending so seriously, and how those could be legislated and proven at trial, are all issues we will need to work through and consult on. For the time being, however, a response is clearly required, given the Court of Appeal's finding that there was no legislative basis for taking a special approach to sentencing for family violence offending.

Thirdly, the government has agreed to provide an update to the Assembly on the impact of the legislation in two years, noting that this will be focused on any data readily available from criminal justice agencies, as the bill already includes a requirement for a more comprehensive statutory review after three years of the provisions being in effect.

Fourthly, the government has agreed to the recommendation of the standing committee to assess, as part of the review of the legislation after three years, the impact on offender rehabilitation of longer sentences under the aggravated offence scheme. Given the government's policy of justice reinvestment and reducing recidivism, I look forward to seeing what lessons can be learned to improve community wellbeing and safety.

In addition, the government agrees in principle to two recommendations. Those recommendations are to provide additional investment in family violence programs, alongside culturally appropriate and safe restorative justice processes; and to support the amendment to include technological abuse in the definition of family violence, with training and resourcing, including for police attending family violence matters.

The ACT government is committed to providing a holistic approach to domestic and family violence, including through continued investment in family violence programs, early intervention programs and training for service providers such as police. The ACT government is already developing and delivering a number of policies and programs to improve effective responses to domestic and family violence and invests in these responses, including through the Safer Families levy. Additional resourcing will be subject to particular areas of need and budget processes and priorities.

In closing, I thank the standing committee for conducting the public inquiry into the Family Violence Legislation Amendment Bill and for providing an opportunity for an ongoing discussion about the impacts of domestic and family violence on the Canberra community. I would also like to thank the stakeholders who contributed written submissions and who appeared as witnesses. This engagement and feedback, including from those with lived experience of family violence, and from those who work in frontline services, provides further valuable insights to the government and helps to ensure that our legal framework and overall approach to domestic and family violence is effective.

I present the following papers:

Standing Committee—Justice and Community Safety—Report No 5—*Inquiry into Family Violence Legislation Amendment Bill 2022*—

Government response.

Ministerial statement, 2 June 2022.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the ministerial statement.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions investigative report— government response Ministerial statement**

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong—Attorney-General, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Gaming and Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction) (4.28): I am pleased to table the government response to the scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions in the ACT investigation undertaken by the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment. In August 2020, as the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, I asked the commissioner to investigate scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions for the ACT, including consideration of possible ways to measure and reduce them; possible targets; and recommendations for short and long-term actions.

In September 2021 the investigation was completed and delivered to the ACT government. The key findings of the commissioner included that scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions in the ACT are significant, at approximately 94 per cent of the total emissions in the territory; approximately 30 per cent of the ACT's scope 3 emissions originate outside of Australia, 19 per cent from Queensland and 18 per cent from New South Wales; households account for almost 60 per cent of the scope 3 emissions, government 33 per cent, and business around eight per cent; and the majority of scope 3 emissions produced by the ACT government are related to building and lease assets.

The report was tabled in November 2021 and provided an overview of the investigation's findings. The commissioner provided 12 recommendations, which are outlined and addressed in this government response. The report makes 12 recommendations for the reduction of scope 3 emissions in the territory. They concern the ACT's leadership on climate action; ACT government operations; households; and planning, construction and infrastructure.

These recommendations include setting scope 3 emission reduction targets for government operations; reducing the physical footprint of ACT government staff toward seven square metres per person; developing scope 3 emissions reduction targets for infrastructure projects; implementing mandatory embodied carbon limits for all new and replacement buildings, fit-outs and infrastructure; and increasing inspections and reporting of compliance with building codes. The recommendations relate to all directorates and ministerial portfolios, and input was provided from across government agencies in the drafting of the government response. The government has agreed to one, agreed in principle to eight, and noted three recommendations.

Several recommendations relate to the setting of targets and contemplate changes to carbon accounting and methodology. The government has agreed in principle to these recommendations, given the scale of changes proposed and the need to undertake further detailed examination. This response recognises that there is still further work required to understand scope 3 emissions in the ACT context.

The commissioner identifies that the majority of ACT scope 3 emissions are sourced from other jurisdictions, particularly from other Australian states. The territory will need to work with these entities to build upon the findings of the report and consider options for reducing scope 3 emissions. The government has agreed to a recommendation that commits the territory to work with state, territory and national governments to discuss initiatives to reduce scope 3 emissions across jurisdictions.

Several recommendations that directly relate to ACT government operations have been either agreed in principle or noted. This response recognises activity either already underway or the importance of government taking a leadership role in reducing the environmental impact associated with its own operations.

Finally, several recommendations relate to specific sectors such as food and organic waste, and building and construction. The government has agreed in principle or noted these recommendations, in recognition of the numerous policy and program initiatives and commitments that the ACT government has on foot to address emissions and sustainability outcomes in these sectors.

In conclusion, the government response to the recommendations reflects the complexity inherent in scope 3 emissions and the difficulties in measuring emissions generated by goods and services not produced in the territory and over which we do not have direct control or visibility to obtain accurate, transparent and consistent data for reporting. The government response to the recommendations recognises that there is still further work required to understand scope 3 emissions in the territory.

I present the following papers:

Scope 3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the ACT—Investigation report—

Government response.

Ministerial statement, 2 June 2022.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the ministerial statement.

**MS CLAY** (Ginninderra) (4.33): I am really, really pleased to hear this considered and enthusiastic response from Minister Rattenbury on scope 3 emissions. I was really pleased to see the commissioner's original report. We have done a great job here in the ACT, leading the rest of the country on scope 1 and scope 2 emissions. A lot of people are not familiar with this language. Scope 1 and scope 2 emissions are tailpipe emissions from our cars. It is the petrol and diesel in our cars. They come from the electricity that we use in our homes, from the gas we use in our homes and our businesses, and from the methane gas that is coming off our landfill. All of that is scope 1 and scope 2, and we are doing a really great job there. We are tracking that. We have legislated really ambitious targets, and we are meeting those stretch goals. We have switched to 100 per cent renewable electricity. We are far ahead of most of the rest of the country.



But we have barely begun the hard work on scope 3, and that is why it is so interesting to have this new piece of work opened up. Cities like Canberra have a really big scope 3 impact, and that is because scope 3 emissions are the emissions of everyday consumption. There are emissions in everything that we buy. They are in the clothes that we wear, the food that we grow and eat, in the concrete in our buildings, and in the energy that goes into making cars. So the emissions from petrol and diesel are in scope 1 and 2, but the energy that went into making the car in the first place is all scope 3.

The Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment found that 94 per cent of Canberra's emissions are scope 3. That means that they are 16 times higher than the emissions we have been working on for a long time. We have done a really good job of reducing that section, but we have a much bigger job to start now. We have been doing our climate reduction and our emissions tracking in exactly the same way as governments all around the world have been doing it. Most governments do scope 1 and scope 2. That is the internationally recommended way to do it. It is a very normal way to do it, and there are certain reasons that we do it that way. It avoids double counting and there are certain standard conventions.

But the problem is that it is time for us, as a society and as a whole world, to start fronting up to scope 3. The good news is that it is not brand new to businesses and consumers. I think the language is really unfamiliar to most people, but the concept is not unfamiliar at all. Ethical consumption is really well established now. If we put it into normal language, we all understand that there are emissions in our food, in our goods, in the things that we buy and in the daily choices that we make.

Australia, as a whole, is actually a long way behind on this, unfortunately. Some countries are a lot further ahead. I first came across this concept when I read a UK book called *How bad are bananas?* by Mike Berners Lee. He ran a business where he carbon-accounted everything, from bananas all the way up to flights to a conference. He worked out where a lot of emissions were and where not many emissions were at all—and all of that is scope 3 emissions. He put that book out in 2009.

Five years ago, in 2017, I did a carbon accounting course which helped me calculate scope 3 emissions. That is a course that is offered to businesses to help them reduce their emissions. It helps you look at the paper in your photocopier, the catering at your functions and the uniforms that you buy, and maybe has a look at your supply chains. It is complicated. There is a lot to it. We have a less standardised way of reporting it, but it is pretty familiar to a lot of businesses who want to do the right thing and it is familiar to a lot of customers, consumers and regular people who want to do the right thing and who have been making these sorts of choices for a while.

I used quite a lot of that information on a project I ran called the Carbon Diet, where I tracked all of that and cut my footprint by 75 per cent. It was really good to see how easy it is to make big reductions once you start focusing on it and reducing it. There is a bit of a tension here, though, for a government. And this is where it gets interesting and actually quite hard. Governments want us to spend money. We are built on a system in which spending money is what makes our economy go around. We do not

necessarily distinguish between good expenditure and environmentally harmful expenditure that does not really help us in terms of human happiness. I think it is going to be really interesting for us to work our way through those tensions as we start to look at the emissions and the impact of everyday consumption, as a government.

Here in the ACT, I am really please to say that we have already started this work. We have the wellbeing indicators, which are an attempt to look at what makes us healthy and happy, not simply what drives the bottom line. But I think we are going to get further and further into this work as we start looking more at scope 3. It is really exciting work to do. This is the start of looking at a genuinely circular economy. There is a lot of commentary at the moment about circularity. A lot of people talk about it, but there are not many governments that are genuinely doing it. I am really excited to be in one that is now fronting up and trying to do this really well.

We have got a lot of opportunities in doing this, and before I finish up I want to leave us with a tangible image, because it is sometimes quite hard to engage with some of these concepts. We have heard a lot in our COVID economic recovery about the expenditure bouncing—and that is great news for businesses—but one of the figures I have heard quoted a few times by our Treasurer, and I have read it in the *Financial Review* as well, is that one of the bounce-backs in our figures was from clothing and footwear, at 40 per cent. During and after COVID we all rushed out and bought more shoes and clothes.

It is a really interesting figure for environmentalists, because we know that we did not actually grow more feet during COVID. We did not suddenly have a new need for more shoes. We probably had less need for shoes. We were stuck at home and probably wearing them out a bit less than we had been. But, for some reason, all of that anxiety and all of those fears and all of the change that happened during COVID made us go out and buy shoes.

I confess that I am not an economist. I am a writer, so I have spent more time reading Douglas Adams than I have reading the *Financial Review*. Douglas Adams came across this sort of concept many decades ago. He talked about the shoe event horizon, and he painted a picture of a planet that was suffering massive social and environmental collapse. The way it came about was that one day there were just a few too many shoe shops in the main street and the people were not very happy with their lives. They would shuffle around, looking at their feet, and think that they might cheer themselves up by buying more shoes. So they all rushed out to the main street and bought more shoes. Eventually there were more and more shoe shops because everyone was buying shoes. The only way those shoe shops could compete with one another was to sell an ever-decreasing quality of shoes, which wore out faster and faster. Eventually the only thing that that society could make or sell were shoes, and everybody was very unhappy and no-one really won from that.

I do not think that we are up to the shoe event horizon, which is great, but I want to pause and say the great news is that we are talking about scope 3 emissions and we are talking about the genuine environmental impact of everyday consumption. That is great. We have so many opportunities here to move to a service-based economy and to start looking at what we actually need and what actually makes us happy, and it is

probably not 40 per cent more shoes than we had before. I am really looking forward to the work that is going to follow on this topic of general consumption.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Mental health—MindMap youth navigation portal**

### **Ministerial statement**

**MS DAVIDSON** (Murrumbidgee—Assistant Minister for Families and Community Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Justice Health, Minister for Mental Health and Minister for Veterans and Seniors) (4.41): On 19 October 2021 the ACT government released the online youth navigation portal MindMap. MindMap is the first of its kind to provide a consolidated and coordinated approach for young people seeking support and assistance for their mental health and links with existing services within the Canberra region. Children and young people, along with parents and carers, are able to find the right services and supports for their needs with the platform. There are also youth navigators to assist, and clinical support if required.

We know, through the review of children and young people undertaken by the Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing in 2019, that young people find it hard to navigate the mental health sector and are not aware of the supports available here in the ACT or how best to access these supports. We know this is true also for parents and carers looking for the right services for the children and young people in their lives. We heard that young people wanted the knowledge and skills to manage their mental health and wellbeing and to be empowered to take ownership of their journey.

MindMap provides a safe space for young people to engage in an appropriate way to find the right services and supports for their mental health and wellbeing, with a range of features including online chat, phone support and email. Through searching the site anonymously, young people can seek and find the support they need. MindMap is staffed by youth navigators and clinical youth navigators through Marymead who are available between 12 pm and 11 pm, seven days per week.

MindMap has almost 100 services linked to the site and has nearly 300 resources to support young people seeking information on mental health. MindMap was developed with young people, for young people, and will continue to evolve to ensure that the site is offering up-to-date support for our community. I am pleased to provide an update on the implementation of MindMap and the current data we are seeing through the site.

Since the launch, MindMap has been accessed by over 9,100 people, with over 25,000 pages viewed. The youth navigators have received over 150 telephone calls, which has progressively increased since the launch. The chat feature is the preferred method for young people seeking to engage with a youth navigator for assistance. The key issues that are being raised are support for anxiety and depression, both within the search functions but also via telephone and through the chat feature. Other topics relate to relationships, abuse and family violence, feelings and emotions, self-harm and suicide prevention, social and emotional wellbeing, and eating disorders and body

image. We can also see that users are seeking dedicated support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander services.

We can see that, of those users that chose to provide their age, 50 per cent were between six and 17 years of age, 24 per cent were between the ages of 18 and 24, and 26 per cent were nominated as parents or carers. We can see through this data that 38 per cent were happy to travel to access the right service in Canberra, by selecting multiple locations through the search feature. Breakdown data for locations is included in the report, noting that a young person can seek information on services without choosing a preferred location. Fifty-one per cent were seeking face-to-face services, with 28 per cent seeking a combination of delivery options. This is consistent with the feedback we are hearing from young people that are interested in face-to-face support at the commencement of their journey, with online support only following an established relationship.

An important offering of MindMap is the active hold service that Marymead offers to support a young person while they are on a waiting list for a service. This involves face-to-face or phone counselling sessions, at a young person's request, with a clinical youth navigator, along with contact with the young person. This feature is an incredible opportunity to support a young person, including their family, before they commence with a service and to ensure that their needs have not changed.

We know from the advice provided by mental health community advocates, service providers and researchers in the ACT that it is critically important to be able to respond quickly when someone has the courage to say that they need help. Being able to hold the space for someone until they are able to engage with the service is helpfully managing symptoms while they wait and ensuring that they do not disengage before they have the chance to receive the support that they need. Currently, the active hold service provided by the clinical youth navigator at MindMap does not appear to be widely known. So far, only one young person has engaged in this service, but the feedback was highly positive for both the young person and their family. The Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing and Marymead are investigating further strategies to make this service more widely known.

I am encouraged by the data and feedback from the community that MindMap is already a valuable resource for our community. A critical part of MindMap is the formal evaluation, which is currently in progress. The evaluation is being overseen by the MindMap governance committee that meets monthly. There is a dedicated group looking specifically at the evaluation, involving the Australian National University, the University of Canberra, the Youth Coalition, Mental Illness Education ACT, Marymead and the office.

The first part of the evaluation will focus on the process of implementation, followed by the short-term outcomes and first-year impact. I am keen to hear the findings of this evaluation and will be happy to share the findings later this year so that we can continue to work with young people and our community to ensure that they receive the support that they need.

I present the following paper:

Health and Community Wellbeing—Standing Committee—Report 1—*Annual and Financial Reports 2019-2020; Appropriation Bill 2020-2021 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2020-2021*—Update on recommendation 17—Mindmap the ACT Youth Navigation Portal—Ministerial statement, 2 June 2022

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## Adjournment

Motion (by **Ms Stephen-Smith**) proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

## ACT Law Week

**MR CAIN** (Ginninderra) (4.47): I wish to speak for a few moments in my capacity as shadow attorney-general. I wish to point out to everyone here something that is very obvious—that the law is of fundamental importance to the governance of any community. The rule of law is important to the very fibre and character of our territory and great nation. It even features in the ACT's motto, "For the Queen, the Law and the People".

As shadow attorney-general, and on behalf of the Canberra Liberals, I have attended several law-related activities over the last few weeks. Monday, 9 May ushered in Australian Law Week, a fantastic annual initiative organised by the various member associations in each jurisdiction—in our case the ACT Law Society and the ACT Bar Association, most notably.

During this week there is engagement with the approximately 2,500 solicitors in the territory and dozens of barristers, with invitations to attend various social and informative events. Along with many lawyers, on the Monday I enjoyed the ACT Golden Gavel speaking competition, listened to new Chief Justice McCallum at the ACT Bar women barristers committee breakfast on Thursday morning, and enjoyed the reflections of Ms Michelle Law at the Women Lawyers Association Law Week dinner on Thursday evening. Members will have to forgive me for skipping the six-a-side soccer tournament.

The whole week was full of informative and engaging activities—unfortunately, I was unable to attend every single one of them—which brought together lawyers and legal professionals from different firms and government departments across the ACT. Of course, events were open to members of the public in several cases.

Canberra has lots of opportunities for a career in law, and it is a great place to live and work as a lawyer or in a related profession. Top-tier law firms, government departments, family practices and community legal centres operate very successfully in the territory. Every facet of the profession is represented in our city's legal sector,

including the justice system branch of government. We can be proud of our young lawyers. Six young Canberra lawyers were named in the latest edition of Best Lawyers in Australia's list of ones to watch.

Over the course of Law Week the Law Society, along with the ACT Law Society Foundation, raised much-needed funds for Painting with Parkinson's, a wonderful initiative of Parkinson's ACT.

Last week I had the privilege of attending the opening and launch of a new legal service, Farrar Gesini Dunn, a legal service focused on the LGBTIQ community. I want to thank Daniel Magnussen and Kasey Fox from that firm for the invitation and for allowing our office to see how this service will operate in the ACT.

It has become apparent to me, in talking further with these lawyers and other members of the community, that the LGBTIQ community have distinctive legal needs. It is good to see a service that is particularly focusing on that part of our Canberra community. As a lawyer and as shadow attorney-general here in the ACT, I am always delighted to see new initiatives launched that are designed to provide inclusive and direct legal access for all members of our community. I look forward to an in-person briefing on this service next week.

Lastly, from one lawyer to many others in the ACT, I wish the solicitors, barristers, judges, paralegals, law students and legal professionals of Canberra all the best for 2022 and beyond.

### **Seniors—Silver is Gold Festival**

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (4.51): I am pleased to rise today to speak about last week's seniors expo, the new and improved seniors festival here in the ACT. It is known this year, for the first time, I believe, as the Silver is Gold Festival. It was held last Thursday by the ACT Council on the Ageing at EPIC.

The Silver is Gold Festival is an exhibition of all things relating to seniors. It is a showcase of the wide-ranging services and opportunities that exist for Canberra's senior population. As shadow minister for seniors, it was very reassuring and pleasing to see the abundance of community groups that exist all over the ACT that were on show last Thursday.

These groups provide invaluable support, services and friendships to many of our older community members. I would like to acknowledge and thank them. I would like specifically to acknowledge some of the government services that were present at the expo, including ACT Policing and Transport Canberra, for their efforts in supporting seniors.

The Silver is Gold Festival was very popular, with an estimated 4,000 to 5,000 visitors in the course of the day. It included a talk by celebrity chef Maggie Beer, who talked mostly about food in our aged-care centres and what can be done to improve that food. It also included some of our cutest frontline workers, some ex-sniffer dogs who were doing the rounds and talking to people in a friendly, wet-nosed kind of

fashion, and a few intimidating dalek robots, a la *Doctor Who*, who went around saying, “Exterminate! Exterminate!”

It was great to see so many committed and passionate volunteers—those with COTA ACT and many other organisations as well. Some of my Assembly colleagues were there on the day, at various stalls, and many organisations were represented. There were representatives of some of Canberra’s most important volunteering community organisations, including Rotary, the Men’s Shed, St John Ambulance, the Red Cross, the ACT Deafness Resource Centre, the Heart Foundation, the Cancer Council and Meridian ACT. The list went on and on. ArtSound FM were there as well. There were hundreds of stalls.

We had presentations showcasing electric vehicles. There were medical, financial and legal services available, an impressive vintage car display, and wonderful performances by local music groups. I also note that the Canberra Ornithologists Group had a stall there, featuring our friend Mr Hermes, who used to work in this building. I also enjoyed chatting with members of the Canberra Model Railway Club, which is a very welcoming organisation that provides a space for ACT residents to enjoy a hobby—model railways—and socialise.

Our older Canberrans have faced many challenges over the past couple of years, with the health concerns and isolation difficulties of the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as the rising cost of living pressures that they are facing. But the atmosphere and enthusiasm felt at the Silver is Gold Festival, after it had been cancelled for the previous two years, reminded me of the strength and resilience of our senior community.

I would like to thank COTA ACT for all that they do in their advocacy and support for our senior Canberrans and for organising last Thursday’s seniors festival—the staff of COTA ACT, the board members and their many volunteers. It is a huge undertaking to put on this expo from which, as I said, thousands and thousands of older Canberrans benefit. I congratulate them on what was a great atmosphere. It was buzzing, and there were so many great conversations to be had.

I look forward to attending future Silver is Gold festivals. I say to every volunteer from every community organisation and business that was there, and to the sponsors, which include LDK at Greenway: thank you for your support and your continued commitment to improving the lives of older Canberrans.

### **Small business—Rotary initiative**

**MS CHEYNE** (Ginninderra—Assistant Minister for Economic Development, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Business and Better Regulation, Minister for Human Rights and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (4.56): I want to speak briefly tonight to congratulate the Rotary Club of Belconnen and the Rotary Club of Canberra Weston Creek on the establishment of their fantastic initiative, the Rotary Small Business Breakfast series, which I was very pleased to get along to and launch last Wednesday.

This has been some years in the making, as I understand it, from several members of the Rotary Club of Canberra Weston Creek initially. It is great to see them partner with Rotary Belconnen for a series of 90 minutes—and it is very firmly a 90-minute only breakfast—that will be held on the last Wednesday of the month for the next six months.

Rotary has established this having identified that there is a need particularly for small business owners to be able to get together, to spend some time networking, meeting different people and sharing interesting stories, but also hearing from different people as well. This first event, hosted at Raiders Kippax, where it will continue to be hosted over the series of breakfasts over the next six months, had me as one of the speakers, with a short introductory speech and drawing on some of the work that the ACT government has done and is doing to support our small business community in the ACT.

Also, it was lovely and really very inspiring to hear from Cam Sullings, who was the keynote speaker and gave a very interesting and detailed speech about his career, including his transition to being a small business owner and what that had meant and the challenges and the goals that he had set himself and the steps that he had taken to reach those goals.

I really commend the clubs for their initiative and particularly single out President Wayne Goodman from Rotary Belconnen and President of the Rotary Club of Canberra Weston Creek Ash Pagent for their collaboration on this. And of course it was fantastic to have the presence of the district governor, Leo Farrelly OAM, there as well.

I think what really stood out to me was a few things but also the sheer number of people that were there—more than 80 people in attendance very early on quite a cold morning—and the number of people who stayed on after the allotted 90 minutes was up. People stayed and kept connecting and chatting, so it was really more than two hours later that it concluded.

Again, my sincerest and warmest congratulations to all those who have driven this. We do have incredibly strong business networks here in the ACT and they are a key ingredient, I think, to small business success. Those opportunities to connect and to share stories and challenges are vital. That this is providing that safe space to do that is so commendable, and I wish them so very well for the next five breakfasts. Thanks very much.

### **Kurrajong electorate—footpaths**

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong—Leader of the Opposition) (5.00): You only need to look around our suburbs to know that this Labor-Greens government is letting Canberrans down on basic municipal services, particularly in our older suburbs. As local member, by far the majority of the issues that are raised with me by constituents are about footpaths, mowing and potholes. Whilst many of the issues are about the lack of maintenance and the inadequate bandaid fixes for the problems that arise, there are some areas in my electorate where the most basic of services were never built at all.



Somers Crescent in Forrest is a thoroughfare for many inner south families whose children go to Forrest Primary School. It is probably not surprising that many residents who navigate Somers Crescent are also older Canberrans. This street has no footpath—not just no footpath on one side; it has no footpath. Local residents and schoolchildren who walk this street are forced to navigate uneven nature strips or walk along the narrow road, watching out for cars, and are often forced to cross to the other side because of cars that are parked on that street.

Locals who have asked for a footpath to be built here also raised the same issue with the late Steve Doszpot, first when he was a member for Molonglo, then as a member for Kurrajong, before his passing several years ago. These residents are grateful for Steve's, as we know, dogged lobbying on local issues. But many, many years on, it is a sad indictment of this Labor-Greens government that there is still no appetite to do anything for these residents.

I know that this Labor-Greens government does not find footpaths very sexy, but it is a basic municipal service that is bread and butter for any local government. It is this very basic service that this government continues to fail at, all while it continues to of course gouge Canberrans with eye-wateringly high rates. Many residents who live in this area pay over \$10,000 a year in rates and they do not even get a basic footpath so that they can walk their own street.

Somers Crescent is not the only street that is crying out for a footpath. Whilst there are countless others, a few that I will mention here today, because they are repeatedly raised with me, are Esperance Street in Red Hill, Vasey Crescent in Campbell and various sections of Antill Street in Watson. These are all very busy streets in my electorate of Kurrajong where constituents have continued to raise with me the lack of a footpath.

Whilst footpaths do not grab media attention or make for an inspiring adjournment speech in the Assembly, it is incredibly frustrating for local residents that their lobbying for years and years for a basic municipal service continues to be ignored. This is a government that has spent the last nine years trying to be the federal opposition, so perhaps now, finally, it can do its actual job of being a local government. After all, Canberrans deserve a city that is befitting of the title of nation's capital.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

**The Assembly adjourned at 5.03 pm until Tuesday, 7 June 2022 at 10.00 am.**

## Answers to questions

### Government—grants programs (Question No 587)

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, upon notice, on 11 February 2022:

- (1) What grant programs were operated or administered by your portfolio in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20, (e) 2020-21, and (f) 2021-22?
- (2) For each grant program referred to in part (1), (a) what was the purpose of the grant program, (b) how much money was budgeted for the grant program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (c) how much money was expended under the grant program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (d) was the program accounted for as an expense on behalf of the Territory (“administered” within the meaning of Australian accounting standard AASB 1050), (e) how many applications were received for grants under the program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (f) who decided, approved or rejected applications for grants, (g) what percentage of applicants were approved in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (h) what percentage of applicants were rejected in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (i) what criteria, policies, guidelines applied to the program.
- (3) For each grant program referred to in part (1), but excluding non-competitive grant programs that provide generalised financial assistance to individuals or businesses, (a) who received a grant in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (b) when did the recipient apply for the grant, (c) when did the recipient receive the grant, (d) how much was the grant and (e) did the conditions that attached to the grant prevent (or have the effect of preventing) the recipient making public comment on any issue; if so, how was the recipient prevented from making public comment.
- (4) Has the portfolio provided a grant that was not provided under one of the programs identified in part (1) in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20, (e) 2020-21, and (f) 2021-22.
- (5) For each grant referred to in part (4), (a) who received the grant, (b) how was the recipient of the grant identified, (c) what was the purpose of the grant, (d) when did the person receive the grant, (e) what conditions attached to the grant, (f) did the conditions that attached to the grant prevent (or have the effect of preventing) the recipient making public comment on any issue; if so, how was the recipient prevented from making public comment and (g) how much was the grant.
- (6) Does the Government report or disclose publicly the recipients of grants and the conditions that attach to those grants.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Answering this question to the level of detail required would require the diversion of significant resources. Links have therefore been provided to published information about grant programs.

1. (a)-(f) Portfolio arrangements and administration of grants have changed over time. The grants currently in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs portfolio are the Cultural, Leadership and Scholarship Grants and Reconciliation Day Grants. New and Emerging Organisations Grants were also awarded in 2019 and 2020.

The outcome of these grants, including recipients and amounts received is available here: <https://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/atsia/grants>. This webpage provides information back to 2014-15 for the programs that existed at that time (Leadership and Scholarship Grants). Note that the names of recipients are redacted when the recipient is an individual.

2. (a) Cultural grants are available to individuals and organisations for the purpose of delivering a program or holding an event within the ACT that will celebrate or strengthen cultural heritage and promote wider understanding of culture.

Leadership Grants aim to encourage Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people or Community Organisations to undertake learning activities that will enhance their leadership skills and abilities to better equip them to lead and engage within the ACT on behalf of their communities and/or organisations.

Scholarship grants are available to individuals and organisations for studying or training, to build employment opportunities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in the ACT.

Reconciliation Day Grants aims to support community organised events, which are held by individuals or organisations, with a strong focus on Reconciliation, specifically:

- promoting understanding of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures in the wider community;
- celebrating and raising the significance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures in the wider community;
- promoting understanding of, and the impact on, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of past policies and historical events;
- delivering opportunities for children, young people and elders to be involved and have the ability to participate in community events that promote Reconciliation; and
- developing seminars and/or panel discussions on the importance of Reconciliation for all Australians.

New and Emerging Organisations grants supported Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations in Canberra with set-up costs, including business or strategic planning program design.

(b)-(c) Please see the publicly available information in Community Services Directorate (CSD) Annual Reports and the webpage link above. Provision of the level of detail requested would require a significant diversion of resources that cannot be justified.

(d) These grants are paid through the Territory controlled accounts and are therefore not accounted for as administered items.

(e) Provision of the level of detail requested would require a significant diversion of resources that cannot be justified.

(f) Grants are assessed by a panel comprising government and community members. All panel members are required to sign a conflict of interest declaration to ensure that there are no conflicts with grant applicants. Once recommendations are put forward by the panel, these are approved by the panel Chair and the relevant delegate within CSD. There are feedback and complaints mechanisms provided to applicants regarding the grant process.

(g)-(h) Provision of the level of detail requested would require a significant diversion of resources that cannot be justified.

(i) There are Grant Guidelines available for each grant program and these are published on the CSD website here: <https://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/home/grants> when grant rounds are open. This website also includes a link to general information about applying for a grant.

3. (a) and (d) As noted in response to Question 1, grants recipients are listed at the following webpage: <https://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/atsia/grants>. These links provide the amount received by each grant recipient (noting that the names of recipients are redacted when the recipient is an individual).

(b)-(c) Provision of the level of detail requested would require a significant diversion of resources that cannot be justified.

(e) There are sometimes conditions put on successful recipients where there are specific requirements of the grant that needs to be met. This could include things like the requirement to obtain the proper insurance for an event. However, no Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander grant programs prevent (or have the effect of preventing) a recipient making public comment on any issue.

4. Information about the broad range of grants outside the competitive grants programs, including grants delivered in response to COVID-19, is reported in CSD Annual Report available at:

- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-17](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2017-18](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2018-19](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2019-20](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2020-21](#)

5) Providing this level of detail would require a significant diversion of resources that cannot be justified given the level of information publicly available on grants, as outlined above.

6) See responses above. Any conditions on grant recipients are included in the individualised Letter of Offer provided to successful applicants, which are not published. However, conditions that apply to grants generally are outlined in the Grant Guidelines for each program.

---

**Government—grants programs**  
**(Question Nos 595, 598, 605, 613, 617, 623)**

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Early Childhood Development; the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Sport and Recreation and the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 11 February 2022:

- (1) What grant programs were operated or administered by your portfolio in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20, (e) 2020-21, and (f) 2021-22?
- (2) For each grant program referred to in part (1), (a) what was the purpose of the grant program, (b) how much money was budgeted for the grant program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (c) how much money was expended under the grant program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (d) was the program accounted for as an expense on behalf of the Territory (“administered” within the meaning of Australian accounting standard AASB 1050), (e) how many applications were received for grants under the program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (f) who decided, approved or rejected applications for grants, (g) what percentage of applicants were approved in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (h) what percentage of applicants were rejected in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (i) what criteria, policies, guidelines applied to the program.
- (3) For each grant program referred to in part (1), but excluding non-competitive grant programs that provide generalised financial assistance to individuals or businesses, (a) who received a grant in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22, (b) when did the recipient apply for the grant, (c) when did the recipient receive the grant, (d) how much was the grant and (e) did the conditions that attached to the grant prevent (or have the effect of preventing) the recipient making public comment on any issue; if so, how was the recipient prevented from making public comment.
- (4) Has the portfolio provided a grant that was not provided under one of the programs identified in part (1) in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20, (e) 2020-21, and (f) 2021-22.
- (5) For each grant referred to in part (4), (a) who received the grant, (b) how was the recipient of the grant identified, (c) what was the purpose of the grant, (d) when did the person receive the grant, (e) what conditions attached to the grant, (f) did the conditions that attached to the grant prevent (or have the effect of preventing) the recipient making public comment on any issue; if so, how was the recipient prevented from making public comment and (g) how much was the grant.
- (6) Does the Government report or disclose publicly the recipients of grants and the conditions that attach to those grants.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please refer to the Attachments A – F.

**Attachment A**

**Question 598: Minister for Early Childhood and Development**

- (1) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)
- (2) (a-c) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)
- (d) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)
- (e-h) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources
- (i) This information is set out in the advertising of the grants. General information is available on the Education Directorate website  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)
- (3) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources
- (4) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources
- (5) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources
- (6) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)

**Attachment B**

**Question 598: Minister for Education and Youth Affairs**

Education Directorate

- (1) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)
- (2) (a-c) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)
- (d) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_a-z/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_a-z/annual-report)

(e-h) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources

(i) This information is set out in the advertising of the grants. General information is available on the Education Directorate website  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_az/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_az/annual-report)

(3) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources

(4) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources

(5) The time required to collate this information is deemed an unreasonable diversion of resources

(6) This information is available on the Education Directorate website at  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications\\_az/annual-report](https://www.education.act.gov.au/about-us/policies-and-publications/publications_az/annual-report)

#### Community Services Directorate

Answering this question to the level of detail required would require the diversion of significant resources.

For the period requested links have been provided to published information about grant programs.

1 (a) Portfolio arrangements and administration of grants have changed over time. There are two grant programs in the Youth Affairs component of this portfolio.

The Youth Interact Grant Program provides funding to young people aged 12-25 years for innovative new projects leading to greater inclusion and participation in community development.

The ACT Youth Week Grant Program is available to assist groups of young people to organise events for other young people as part of ACT Youth Week, a celebration of young people aged 12-25 years in our community. The grant provides funding for innovative new projects that enable young people aged 12-25 years old to lead and participate in community development activities targeted for other young people in Canberra and the region.

The outcome of these grants is reported in the annual report and this information is available publicly from the following sites:

- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-17](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2017-18](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2018-19](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2019-20](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2020-21](#)

- (b) This information is provided at the websites in question 1(a).
- (c) This information is provided at the websites in question 1(a).
- (d) These grants are paid through the territory controlled accounts and are therefore not accounted for as administered items.
- (e) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
- (f) Grants are assessed through a panel arrangement; the panel is comprised of government and community members. All panel members are required to sign a conflict of interest declaration to ensure that there are no conflicts with grant applicants. Once recommendations are put forward by the panel, these are approved by the panel Chair and the relevant delegate within CSD. There are feedback and complaints mechanisms provided to applicants regarding the grant process.
- (g) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
- (h) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
- (i) There are Grant Guidelines available for each grant program and these are published on the CSD website here: Grants, Scholarships and Awards - Community Services (act.gov.au) when grant rounds are open.

2 (a) Recipients of the Youth Interact Grants and ACT Youth Week Grants are published on the CSD Grants Website Grants - Community Services (act.gov.au).

- (b) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
- (c) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
- (d) This information is published on the CSD website at 2(a).
- (e) There are sometimes conditions put on successful recipients of Youth Interact Grants and ACT Youth Week Grants where there are specific requirements of the grant that needs to be met. This could include things like the requirement to obtain the proper insurance for an activity or project. The conditions placed on these grants vary broadly and depend upon the nature of the grant, the recipient who has applied and the project being funded. Generally, there is no condition placed on a recipient of the Youth Interact Grants or ACT Youth Week Grants regarding making public comment.

3) Information about the broad range of grants outside the competitive grant programs, including grants delivered in response to COVID-19, is reported in the CSD annual report and is available at:

- Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-17
- Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2017-18
- Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2018-19
- Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2019-20
- Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2020-21

4) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.



5) The outcome of grants is reported in the annual report and this information is available publicly at the websites provided in question 1(a). Any conditions on a grant applicant are included in the individualised Letter of Offer provided to successful applicants, which are not published.

### Attachment C

#### Question 605: Minister for Housing and Suburban Development

##### Affordable Housing Innovation Fund

**Administered by the Planning and Urban Policy Division, Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD)**

**(1) What grant programs were operated or administered by your portfolio in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20, (e) 2020-21, and (f) 2021-22?**

The Affordable Housing Innovation Fund (the fund) responded to a 2017 commitment under the Parliamentary Agreement for the 9th ACT Legislative Assembly to: “Create an innovation fund to support new approaches to affordable housing, provide support to establish HomeGround Real Estate, Homeshare for older Canberrans, and a Nightingale Housing Model in Canberra.”

The fund provided \$1 million over two years to support pilot projects to support the initial stages of innovative new programs that aim to increase the supply of affordable housing to low-income households. Round one of grants were offered in 2018-19 and round two was offered in 2019-20.

**(2) For each grant program referred to in part (1)**

**a. what was is the purpose of the grant program?**

The purpose of the grant was to support innovative projects that aim to increase the supply of affordable housing to low-income households.

**b. how much money was budgeted for the grant program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22?**

2018-19	\$500,000
2019-20	\$500,000
All other years	Nil

**c. how much money was expended under the grant program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22?**

2018-19	\$280,000 in grants allocated
2019-20	\$645,000 in grants allocated
All other years	N/A

**d. was the program accounted for as an expense on behalf of the Territory (“administered” within the meaning of Australian accounting standard AASB 1050)?**

No, the payment was paid from Controlled Recurrent Payment funding.

**e. how many applications were received for grants under the program in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22?**

2018-19	Ten applications received	Three successful applicants
2019-20	Fourteen applications received	Six successful applicants
All other years	N/A	N/A

**f. who decided, approved or rejected applications for grants?**

A cross-government evaluation panel made recommendations to the Delegate, the Director General, Environment Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD).

**g. what percentage of applicants were approved in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22?**

2018-2019	30 per cent
2019-2020	43 per cent
All other years	N/A

**h. what percentage of applicants were rejected in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22?**

2018-2019	70 per cent
2019-2020	57 per cent
All other years	N/A

**i. what criteria, policies, guidelines applied to the program?**

A copy of the program guidelines for the fund is publicly available on the EPSDD website: <https://www.planning.act.gov.au/urban-renewal/affordable-housing/innovation-fund/affordable-housing-innovation-fund-guidelines>.

**(3) For each grant program referred to in part (1), but excluding non-competitive grant programs that provide generalised financial assistance to individuals or businesses,**

**a. who received a grant in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18, (iii) 2018-19, (iv) 2019-20, (v) 2020-21, and (vi) 2021-22?**

**b. when did the recipient apply for the grant?**

**c. when did the recipient receive the grant?**

**d. how much was the grant?**

Year	Recipient	Amount	Project
2018-19	Community Housing Canberra	\$230,000	Affordable Rental Real Estate Management Model
2018-19	Environmental Collective Housing Organisation (ECHO)	\$15,000	Co-Housing project
2018-19	Smart Urban Villages (SUV)	\$35,000	Co-Housing project
2019-20	Summer Foundation Limited	\$35,000	Disability Accommodation project
2019-20	Rights and Inclusion Australia	\$90,000	Disability Accommodation project
2019-20	YWCA for YHomes	\$125,000	Supportive Housing project on Underutilised Community Facility Land
2019-20	CatholicCare Canberra and Goulburn	\$50,000	Supportive Housing project on Underutilised Community Facility Land
2019-20	BUILD.RENT Pty Ltd	\$125,000	Other Innovative Approaches to Boosting Affordable Housing Supply
2019-20	Community Connections Incorporated	\$220,000	HomeShare
All other years	N/A	N/A	N/A

**e. did the conditions that attached to the grant prevent (or have the effect of preventing) the recipient making public comment on any issue; if so, how was the recipient prevented from making public comment.**

No

**(4) Has the portfolio provided a grant that was not provided under one of the programs identified in part (1) in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20, (e) 2020-21, and (f) 2021-22.**

A grant was provided to University of Canberra for \$700,000 in 2017-18 and \$400,000 in 2019-20 relating to student housing.

- (5) For each grant referred to in part (4), (a) who received the grant, (b) how was the recipient of the grant identified, (c) what was the purpose of the grant, (d) when did the person receive the grant, (e) what conditions attached to the grant, (f) did the conditions that attached to the grant prevent (or have the effect of preventing) the recipient making public comment on any issue; if so, how was the recipient prevented from making public comment and (g) how much was the grant.**

To provide details regarding the grant payment would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.

- (6) Does the Government report or disclose publicly the recipients of grants and the conditions that attach to those grants?**

Yes, the grant amounts and recipients were announced by the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development and published in EPSDD's Annual Report. A Deed of Grant is issued to recipients which sets out the conditions of the grant.

#### **Administered by the Community Services Directorate**

The following information has been provided and is being responded to by the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development as the Minister responsible for financial matters within the social housing and homelessness portfolios.

Answering this question to the level of detail required would require the diversion of significant resources.

For the period requested links have been provided to published information about grant programs.

1. Portfolio arrangements and administration of grants has changed over time. There are currently 2 grant programs administered in the social housing and homelessness portfolios.

**a) Safer Families Assistance Program** – The Safer Families Grant Program was established in February 2017. Following a review of the program in 2018, the Safer Families Assistance Program commenced in November 2018. The Safer Families Assistance Program, administered by Housing ACT, provides financial assistance to people affected by domestic and family violence to help with costs associated with maintaining or establishing a home in the ACT through a \$2,000 grant to eligible persons.

**Tenant Participation Grant (TPG) Program** - Eligibility is limited to public housing tenants and to those community and supported housing tenants who have been in a tenancy for 12 months or more and who pay subsidised income-based rent.

The TPG is for tenants/residents and their families in social housing to apply for funding of up to \$400 per application for activities and/or items under three categories:

- Social activities
- Life skills activities

- Education and work activities

The outcome of these grants is reported in the annual report and this information is available publicly at:

- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-17](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2017-18](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2018-19](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2019-20](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2020-21](#)

b) This information is provided at the websites in question 1(a).

c) This information is provided at the websites in question 1(a).

d) These grants are paid out through our controlled accounts and are not accounted for as 'administered' items within the "Territorial Financial Statement" in line with AASB 1050.

e) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

f) For Safer Families Assistance, eligibility requirements are available online, as is the application form, at : [Safer Families Assistance - Community Services \(act.gov.au\)](#)

For the TPG, the outcome of grant programs is determined by a panel, comprised of government and community members. All panel members are required to sign a conflict-of-interest declaration to ensure that there are no conflicts with grant applicants. Once recommendations are put forward by the panel, these are approved by the panel Chair and the relevant delegate within CSD. There are feedback and complaints mechanisms provided to applicants regarding the grant process.

g) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

h) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

i) For Safer Families Assistance, information on the application policy and process can be found online at: [Safer Families Assistance - Community Services \(act.gov.au\)](#)

For the TPG – information on the application process for each round can be found at: [Tenant Participation Grants - Community Services \(act.gov.au\)](#)

2. a) Safer Families Assistance grants recipients are not published due to privacy.

For the TPG, deidentified information is publicly available at:

- [Community Support - Grants and Sponsorship - Community Services | Annual Report 2020-21 \(act.gov.au\)](#)
- [Community Engagement and Support - Community Services | Annual Report 2019-20 \(act.gov.au\)](#)
- [Community Engagement and Support - Community Services | Annual Report 2018-19 \(act.gov.au\)](#)
- [Home - 2017-2018 \(act.gov.au\)](#)
- [Home - 2016-2017 \(act.gov.au\)](#)

- b) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
  - c) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
  - d) This information is published on the CSD websites listed at 1(a) or 2(a)
  - e) In relation to both programs mentioned in this response, there are no conditions put on the recipient to restrict them from making public comment.
3. Information about the broad range of grants outside the competitive grant programs, including grants delivered in response to COVID-19, is reported in the CSD annual report and is available at:
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-17](#)
  - [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2017-18](#)
  - [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2018-19](#)
  - [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2019-20](#)
  - [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2020-21](#)
4. Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.
5. The outcome of grants is reported in the annual report and this information is available publicly at the websites provided in question 1(a). Any conditions on a grant applicant are included in the individualised Letter of Offer provided to successful applicants, which are not published.

**Attachment D**

**Question 613: Minister for Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence**

Q1 – There are no grant programs under the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence Portfolio.

Q2 – Not Applicable

Q3 – Not Applicable

Q4 – Yes

Q5 - All funding for organisations in the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence portfolio is listed in the Budget Papers or published in the Community Services Directorate's Annual Report. There are no limitations placed on funded organisations regarding public comments as a condition of their funding.

Q6 – All funding in the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence Portfolio is published in the Annual Budget Paper or the Annual Report. The terms of the Deeds of Grant are not published, however are negotiated, and agreed between the Territory and the provider.

## Attachment E

**Question 617: Minister for Sport and Recreation**

(1) Public reporting in ACT Government Annual Reports includes the type, monetary value and recipients of Grant funding:

- a. Publications - Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (act.gov.au). (CMTEDD)

Further budget information can be found in the ACT Government budget papers.

- b. ACT Budget - Treasury

\*NOTE portfolios and priorities have changed since 2016, whilst reporting of these grant programs is currently in the CMTEDD Annual Reports now, they may have been reported in other ACT Government Annual Reports previously:

[https://www.cmtedd.act.gov.au/open\\_government/report/annual-reports](https://www.cmtedd.act.gov.au/open_government/report/annual-reports)

Reporting on 2021-22 grant programs will be reported in the 2021-22 annual report, to collate this information now on any of the 2021-22 grant programs would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.

(2)

(a)-(c): Refer to response 1

(d) Most of the grants are expensed through CMTEDD's Controlled accounts, and are funded using Controlled Recurrent Payments appropriation.

(e) Identifying the number of applications received against each program is an unreasonable diversion of resources.

(f): Specific funding guidelines/criteria and assessment process for each grant program were developed for the information of potential grant applicants. Information is not readily available for this question and would require a significant diversion of resources not readily available in this format.

(g)-(h): Information is not readily available for this question and would require a significant diversion of resources.

(i): Refer to (f) above.

(3)

(a): See response provided under Question 1 and 2.

(b)-(e): Information is not readily available for this question and would require a significant diversion of resources.

(4) Refer to response 1. To collate any further information would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.

(5) Not applicable.

- (6) Information regarding funding recipients is publicly made available through related media activities and detailed in the Annual Report. The conditions attached to these grants are generally not disclosed publicly other than via the general applicant information which is contained within the published grant funding guidelines for each program.

**Attachment F**

**Question 623: Minister for Women**

Answering this question to the level of detail requested would require the diversion of significant resources.

For the period requested links have been provided to published information about grant programs.

1 (a) Portfolio arrangements and administration of grants have changed over time. There are 4 grants in the Women's portfolio.

The ACT Women's Grant Program provides funding support for individuals, organisations and community groups for innovative projects to improve the health, wellbeing and safety of ACT Women.

The Women's Safety Grant is to support innovative projects to advance the priorities in the Fourth Action Plan 2019-22 under the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children 2010-2022.

The Participation (Women's) Grants are to support innovative projects that promote the priorities of the ACT Women's Plan 2016-26.

The Women's Return to Work Grants are to support women to get back into the workforce.

The outcome of these grants is reported in the annual report and this information is available publicly from the following sites:

- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-17](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2017-18](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2018-19](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2019-20](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2020-21](#)

(b) This information is provided at the websites in question 1(a).

(c) This information is provided at the websites in question 1(a).

(d) These grants are paid through the territories controlled accounts and are therefore not accounted for as administered items.

(e) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

(f) Grants are assessed through a panel arrangement; the panel is comprised of government and community members. All panel members are required to sign a conflict



of interest declaration to ensure that there are no conflicts with grant applicants. Once recommendations are put forward by the panel, these are approved by the panel Chair and the relevant delegate within CSD. There are feedback and complaints mechanisms provided to applicants regarding the grant process.

(g) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

(h) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

(i) There are Grant Guidelines available for each grant program and these are published on the CSD website here: [Grants, Scholarships and Awards - Community Services \(act.gov.au\)](#) when grant rounds are open.

2 (a) Recipients of the ACT Women's Grants, Women's Participation Grants, the Audrey Fagan Young Women's Enrichment Grants and the Women's Return to Work Grants are published on the CSD Grants Website [Grants - Community Services \(act.gov.au\)](#).

(b) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

(c) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

(d) This information is published on the CSD website at 2(a).

(e) There are sometimes conditions put on successful recipients for the ACT Women's Grants, Women's Participation Grants, the Audrey Fagan Young Women's Enrichment Grants and the Women's Return to Work Grants where there are specific requirements of the grant that need to be met. This could include things like the requirement to obtain the proper insurance for an activity or project. The conditions placed on these grants vary broadly and depend upon the nature of the grant, the recipient who has applied and the project being funded. Generally, there is no condition placed on a recipient of the ACT Women's Grants, Women's Participation Grants, the Audrey Fagan Young Women's Enrichment Grants and the Women's Return to Work Grants regarding making public comment.

3) Information about the broad range of grants outside the competitive grant programs, including grants delivered in response to COVID-19, are reported in the CSD annual report and is available at:

- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-17](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2017-18](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2018-19](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2019-20](#)
- [Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2020-21](#)

4) Providing this level of detail would require the diversion of significant resources.

5) The outcome of grants is reported in the annual report and this information is available publicly at the websites provided in question 1(a). Any conditions on a grant applicant are included in the individualised Letter of Offer provided to successful applicants, which are not published.

---

**Schools—nurses  
(Question No 667)**

**Ms Castley** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2022:

- (1) How many School Youth Health Nurses are there.
- (2) Does every ACT public (a) secondary school and (b) college have a School Youth Health Nurse; if so, are they full-time at the secondary school from Monday to Friday; if not, how many days are they at the secondary school.
- (3) Are there any School Youth Health Nurses in primary schools; if so, can the Minister provide details.
- (4) Are School Youth Health Nurses required to submit reports to the Health and/or Education Directorate about their work and the student issues they deal with; if so, can the Minister provide this information/reports for the last two years.
- (5) Has the number of School Youth Health Nurses changed over the last five years; if so, can the Minister provide details.
- (6) Is information kept on what the waiting time is for a student to see a School Youth Health Nurse; if so, can the Minister provide that information.
- (7) Can students in Year 7, from the age of 11, make an appointment to see the nurse without their parent/carers' consent.
- (8) Can teachers request an appointment for a student with the nurse without the consent of the parents/carers.
- (9) How many times will a School Youth Health Nurse see a student/child, on average.
- (10) What are the five most common reasons for students to see a School Youth Health Nurse.
- (11) What qualifications do School Youth Health Nurses have.
- (12) Has there been a review of the School Youth Health Nurse program over the last six years; if so, can the Minister provide any report and recommendations.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The School Youth Health Nurse (SYHN) program is funded for 9.7 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Registered Nurses (RN).
2. (a) 19 Secondary schools, two days a week in each school.  
(b) The SYHN program is not offered in college.
3. There is no provision for the SYHN program in Primary Schools.

4. Yes, reports are generated at the end of term and presented to cross directorate committees. The program was disrupted in 2020 and 2021 due to the ACT's response to the pandemic. Generated reports are at Attachment A.
5. At the commencement of the program in 2018 there were 4 FTE RNs. The program has expanded since this time and now provides 9.7 FTE RN and 1 FTE Clinical Nurse Consultant.
6. The SYHN works closely with each school's Wellness team. Each school has a different preference for how they want students to access the SYHN, whether it be drop in or booking a time with the school's front office. There is no central booking system. For this reason, collecting data on wait times is not feasible.
7. The SYHN program is aimed at providing a health service for students autonomously. Students are assessed by the nurse on presentation according to the Gillick competency principles. Nurses will contact a parent/carer with the student's knowledge if there is a concern regarding the student's capacity to consent.
8. Teachers can request an appointment for a high school student through the school's referral process without the consent of the parents/carers.
9. On average, students access the SYHN program three times. This varies due to initial reason of presentation.
10. Please see reports at Attachment A.
11. It is mandatory for a SYHN RN to be registered or eligible for Registration with the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency and have experience working in adolescent health. It is desirable for an RN to have more than four years' experience working in adolescent health and have additional qualifications in Health Promotion, Sexual Health, Mental Health and/or Adolescent Health.
12. The SYHN program was formally evaluated by the Australian National University Australian Primary Health Care Research Institute in 2012 (Attachment B).

*(Copies of the attachments are available at the Chamber Support Office).*

---

### **Florey—dryland oval (Question No 681)**

**Ms Clay** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 25 March 2022:

- (1) Can the Minister provide an update on the progress of consultation with the Florey school community, and broader Florey community on the future of their dryland oval.
- (2) Can the Minister provide a timeline for this consultation.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) as the land custodian has been collaboratively working with the Education Directorate to determine opportunities for

the Florey dryland oval. The Education Directorate has been working with the school to gather ideas for a suitable open space for the students on a portion of the oval site, which would also improve local recreation facilities. The ACT COVID-19 lockdown delayed any further engagement work planned by the Education Directorate in 2021. Indicative sketches have been developed and will form the basis for the next phase of consultation.

- (2) TCCS is currently reviewing the existing land management plans for public unleased land, which includes dryland ovals. As part of that review, consideration will be given to the future management of dryland ovals. The review will result in a single land management plan which is anticipated to be released as a draft for public comment in mid-2022. With regard to Florey Oval, the Education Directorate met with the school Principal in April 2022 to recommence communication and engagement activities. Over coming months this will include engagement with staff, students and the school community; exploration and discussion with local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander representatives; as well as seeking feedback from the Florey and Belconnen communities. Community engagement activities are expected to be completed and an outcome announced by the end of July 2022. Following the community engagement activities Education will work with TCCS to determine pathways to achieving outcomes.

---

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—mental health staffing (Question No 689)**

**Mrs Kikkert** asked the Minister for Justice Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2022:

- (1) For how long has custodial health had funding for a total of 16 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.
- (2) Have the 16 FTE positions ever all been filled at the same time since funding for the positions became available.
- (3) What is the current FTE for custodial mental health.
- (4) How many of these FTE positions are for psychologists.
- (5) What are the job titles of these positions.
- (6) How many psychologist positions are filled and what is their FTE.
- (7) Which psychologist positions are currently unstaffed and how long have these positions been unstaffed.
- (8) Does the team leader of the Specialist Interventions Team receive an allowance or additional pay for being the team leader.
- (9) How many recruitment rounds have taken place to fill unstaffed psychologist positions at the Alexander Maconochie Centre in the last four years.
- (10) Why has Canberra Health Services found it difficult to recruit psychological staff.

- (11) Why was the attempt to develop a separate classification and award structure for psychologists within the 2018-2021 ACT Public Sector Enterprise Agreement unsuccessful.
- (12) What objections were made to this attempt and who/what organisations objected or expressed reservations.

**Ms Davidson:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. Custodial Mental Health (CMH) does not have budgeted FTE or positions. All positions are recruited to the broader Forensic Mental Health Service (FMHS) and staffing for CMH is derived from an overall budgeted FTE for FMHS of 23. CMH has allocated 16 FTE positions since 2020.
2. FMHS has not filled all positions simultaneously for approximately four years.
3. Current FTE for CMH as of 1 April 2022 was 12.2FTE
4. Current budgeted FTE for psychologists in CMH is 3.0FTE permanent and 1.0FTE temporary.
5. The job titles for psychologists in CMH are Health Professional Officer (Level 1 or 2) and may be filled by general registered psychologists, clinical psychology registrars or clinically or forensically endorsed psychologists.
6. Currently all psychologist positions are filled with total FTE of 4.6 made of permanently and temporarily funded positions.
7. There are no psychologist positions currently unstaffed in CMH.
8. The Team Leader Specialist Interventions position is a Health Professional Level 4 (HP4) position with supervisory responsibilities and is a higher classification and, as such, there is no allowance or additional pay.
9. In the past three years, there have been 20 advertised recruitment rounds to fill Health Professional positions at various levels.
10. As articulated by the subject matter experts employed to assist the Audit Office, difficulties in recruitment and retention of psychologists is not unique to Canberra Health Services. The introduction of the *Better Access* Medicare provisions has drastically increased job opportunities for psychologists in the private sector that exceed the number of graduates produced by the tertiary institutions. CHS has several incentives to improve attraction and retention of psychologists in mental health including a mental health psychologist allowance, a professional development allowance of up to \$1500 per year, access to clinical supervision, and financial support to achieve post-graduate specialist qualifications. In addition, Forensic Mental Health Services provides its psychologists with access to specialist professional development and study leave, flexible working arrangements, individual clinical supervision, specialist group supervision, and support to obtain endorsement in either Clinical or Forensic Psychology. Mental Health, Justice Health and Alcohol & Drug Services also sponsors six candidates each year to undertake the psychology internship pathway to registration.

11. A number of claims were made in respect to the Health Professional Classification structure and individual professions in the course of negotiations for the 2018-2021 Agreement, including in respect to psychologists. While some new classifications were introduced as a result of incorporating existing Attraction and Retention Incentives into existing pay scales, it was agreed by all bargaining parties that any further change, including in respect to the psychologist's structure, would be best considered in the context of an overall joint review of the Health Professional Classification.

That report of the Joint Working Party that undertook the Health Professional Classification Review was finalised in July 2021, and has since been endorsed by the CEO of Canberra Health Services. Its recommendations will be considered in the current round of bargaining.

12. The Territory took the view in bargaining that potential changes to the health professional classification structure should be considered in total, rather than profession by profession.

---

### **Yerrabi Pond—water quality (Question No 703)**

**Ms Castley** asked the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) On what dates has the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) tested the water quality in Yerrabi Pond since 2016 and can the Minister provide a copy of all test results and analysis since 2016.
- (2) Does EPSDD conduct regular scheduled testing of Yerrabi Pond; if so, when; if not, why do EPSDD test Yerrabi pond infrequently.
- (3) Does EPSDD conduct regular testing of catchments in the ACT.
- (4) Has EPSDD ever determined that the water quality in Yerrabi Pond is having a negative impact on the environment; if so, (a) what date was EPSDD made aware of the poor water quality, (b) what policy/solution did EPSDD propose to improve water quality, (c) how much did the policy/solution cost and (d) when was the policy/solution implemented.
- (5) Has the biosecurity response team ever requested that the lakes manager remove weeds from Yerrabi Pond; if so, on what date.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The results of monitoring from 2015 to July 2021 accompany this response (Attachment A). Data from monitoring since then will take time to collate but can be provided if requested.
- (2) The testing regime for Yerrabi Pond was outlined in response to question 4 of QON 668. The testing regime is above the level required for a waterway classified as secondary contact only.

- (3) Yes, ACT catchments are assessed for river health (AUSRIVAS) and waterways are monitored through the Waterwatch citizen science program. There is also regular monitoring of water quality in lakes and rivers, and monitoring of streamflows.
- (4) No. There are reports of excessive algae below the dam for Yerrabi Pond, which indicates that outflows from Yerrabi Pond are nutrient rich. However, Yerrabi Pond should be trapping a portion of inflowing nutrients, sediments and other pollutants, which would improve water quality compared to if Yerrabi Pond was not built into the stormwater drainage.
- (5) TCCS manage Yerrabi Pond. Alligator Weed is periodically sprayed by TCCS, most recently on 1 April 2022 when 15-60 plants were treated.

*(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).*

### **Suburban Land Agency—revenue (Question No 706)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

Further to the information contained in annual reports in relation to the Suburban Land Agency (SLA), can the Minister provide a breakdown of revenue from land sales for each financial year since the SLA was established, for (a) single residential blocks, (b) medium-density blocks and (c) high-density blocks.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The response to Question on Notice 706 is provided in the table below:

	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>
<b>Single Residential</b>	\$245,690,260	\$54,481,067	\$183,607,067	\$677,677,013
<b>Medium Density</b>	\$11,149,221	\$65,540,124	\$4,597,409	\$62,703,350
<b>High Density</b>	-	\$172,358,186	\$9,160,000	\$14,168,468
	<b>\$256,839,481</b>	<b>\$292,379,377</b>	<b>\$197,364,476</b>	<b>\$754,548,831</b>

This information represents revenue from land sales consistent with the annual financial statement presentation. As such, this information excludes sales generated under the Asset Recycling Initiative which are disclosed separately in the 2017-18 and 2018-19 annual reports.

### **ActewAGL—hydrogen (Question No 712)**

**Mr Parton** asked the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) Has ActewAGL announced the price of hydrogen, given it was reported in The Canberra Times on 5 February that ActewAGL was going to make the announcement on 1 April.

- (2) What is the price of hydrogen per kilogram at the Fyshwick Refuelling Centre.
- (3) What was the cause of the delay for the announcement of this price.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A price has not been finalised.
- (2) A price has not been finalised.
- (3) This is a new business, and a new business model, and is a matter of ongoing discussion with the many partners in this nation-leading project.

---

### **Suburban Land Agency—residential blocks (Question No 713)**

**Mr Cain** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

Did the Suburban Land Agency have available 462 single residential blocks as inventory on 30 June 2020; if so, for each of these single residential blocks can the Minister advise the (a) street address or suburb, (b) price and (c) estimated date of release.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

As advised in the response to Question Taken on Notice No. 4 of 4 March 2022 during the Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2020-2021, the Suburban Land Agency (Agency) had 462 single residential blocks available as inventory on 30 June 2020.

The Agency releases land using block, section and suburb/estate identifiers. The list of inventory and prices as of 30 June 2020 including release dates can be found at [Attachment A](#).

*(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).*

---

### **Suburban Land Agency—ballots (Question No 718)**

**Mr Cain** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 8 April 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) How many land ballots were there during the financial years of (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20 and (e) 2020-21.
- (2) For each land ballot described in part (1), how many (a) ballot entrants were there for each ballot, (b) blocks were made available and (c) blocks were sold in the financial years of (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20 and (e) 2020-21.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:



- (1) The number of land ballots during the financial years (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2018-19, (d) 2019-20 and (e) 2020-21 were:

Financial Year	Number of Ballots
(a) 2016-17	1
(b) 2017-18	2
(c) 2018-19	0
(d) 2019-20	1
(e) 2020-21	5*

\*2020-21 – Two ballots were undertaken as “Book to Buy” releases using a random number draw

- (2) The number of ballot registrations and blocks made available were:

Financial Year	Estate	(a) Ballot Registrations	(b) Blocks Available
(a) 2016-17	Taylor	3,158	126
(b) 2017-18	Taylor	2,449	142
	Coombs and Wright combined	2,044	123
			71
(c) 2018-19	N/A	N/A	N/A
(d) 2019-20	Taylor^	96	68
(e) 2020-21	Tharwa	284	1
	Whitlam*	3,262	250
	Taylor and Whitlam combined^	353	44
			38
	Whitlam*	7,566	92
	Taylor	4,188	162

^Land Rent Only Releases

\*2020-21 – Ballots were ‘Book to Buy’ releases using a random number draw

- (c) The number of blocks sold in each financial year is shown below:

Year	Blocks Sold <sup>#</sup>
(a) 2016-17	125
(b) 2017-18	233
(c) 2018-19	20
(d) 2019-20	107
(e) 2020-21	623

<sup>#</sup> Sold refers to contract exchanged for sale.

## Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 719)

Ms Clay asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 8 April 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction*):

- (1) In relation to the ACT Government's commitment to a zero emissions government, while the ACT Government is committed to leading by example to showcase best practice sustainability in Government operations, by pursuing rapid emission reduction targets of greater than a 33 percent reduction in emissions from government operations by 2025 (from 2020 levels), and zero emissions from government operations from 2040, can the Chief Minister explain how the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (CMTEDD) calculates its contributions to this emission reduction target.
- (2) What is CMTEDD's current percentage reduction in emissions.
- (3) What measures has the Chief Minister put in place to reduce emissions.
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that this is a reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions only.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) Please refer to the answer previously provided in response to ECCB QON 06, which is available online at: [Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2020-21 – ECCB QON 06 \(act.gov.au\)](#).
- 

### **Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 720)**

**Ms Clay** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 April 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction*):

- (1) In relation to the ACT Government's commitment to a zero emissions government, while the ACT Government is committed to leading by example to showcase best practice sustainability in Government operations, by pursuing rapid emission reduction targets of greater than a 33 percent reduction in emissions from government operations by 2025 (from 2020 levels), and zero emissions from government operations from 2040, can the Chief Minister explain how the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate (TCCSD) calculates its contributions to this emission reduction target.
- (2) What is the TCCSD's current percentage reduction in emissions.
- (3) What measures has the Minister put in place to reduce emissions.
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that this is a reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions only.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the answer previously provided in response to ECCB QON No. 11, which is available online at: [Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2020-2021 - ECCB QON 11 \(act.gov.au\)](#).

---

**Government—emissions reduction targets  
(Question No 721)**

**Ms Clay** asked the Minister for Families and Community Services, upon notice, on 8 April 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction*):

- (1) In relation to the ACT Government's commitment to a zero emissions government, while the ACT Government is committed to leading by example to showcase best practice sustainability in Government operations, by pursuing rapid emission reduction targets of greater than a 33 percent reduction in emissions from government operations by 2025 (from 2020 levels), and zero emissions from government operations from 2040, can the Minister explain how the Community Services Directorate (CSD) calculates its contributions to this emission reduction target.
- (2) What is the CSD's current percentage reduction in emissions.
- (3) What measures has the Minister put in place to reduce emissions.
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that this is a reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions only.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) All Directorates use the ACT Government's Enterprise Sustainability Platform (ESP) to track and calculate their emissions. The ESP is a database that collates utility data such as natural gas and transport fuel consumption and calculates the emissions profile for the Directorate.
- 2) In 2020-21, the Community Services Directorate's greenhouse gas emissions were 474 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent. This is 14.4% below the 2020 baseline (which is the 2019 calendar year to exclude COVID impacts on baseline emissions), and 17% lower than 2019-20 emissions. Annual emissions of ACT Government Directorates and progress against the 2020 baseline are reported each year in the Minister's Annual Report under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act. This can be found on page 14 of the 2020-21 Minister's Annual Report which is available at <https://www.environment.act.gov.au/cc/publications>, or the direct link here.
- 3) The Community Services Directorate reports measures undertaken to address emissions in the Directorate Annual Report, which is available online at: [Annual Reports-Community Services Directorate \(act.gov.au\)](https://www.environment.act.gov.au/cc/publications). Emissions reduction measures are included in the section starting on page 217 of the 2020-21 Annual Report.
- 4) The results provided cover Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions.

---

**Government—emissions reduction targets  
(Question No 722)**

**Ms Clay** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 8 April 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction*):

- (1) In relation to the ACT Government's commitment to a zero emissions government, while the ACT Government is committed to leading by example to showcase best

practice sustainability in Government operations, by pursuing rapid emission reduction targets of greater than a 33 percent reduction in emissions from government operations by 2025 (from 2020 levels), and zero emissions from government operations from 2040, can the Minister explain how the Justice and Community Services Directorate (JACSD) calculates its contributions to this emission reduction target.

- (2) What is the JACSD's current percentage reduction in emissions.
- (3) What measures has the Minister put in place to reduce emissions.
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that this is a reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions only.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) All Directorates use the ACT Government's Enterprise Sustainability Platform (ESP) to track and calculate their emissions. The ESP is a database that collates utility data such as natural gas and transport fuel consumption and calculates the emissions profile for the Directorate.
- 2) In 2020-21, the Justice and Community Safety Directorate's emissions were 3852 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent. This is 8.7% above the 2020 baseline (which is the 2019 calendar year to exclude COVID impacts on baseline emissions). Annual emissions of ACT Government Directorates and progress against the 2020 baseline are reported each year in the Minister's Annual Report under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act. This can be found on page 14 of the 2020-21 Minister's Annual Report which is available at <https://www.environment.act.gov.au/cc/publications>, or the direct link [here](https://www.environment.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/1910486/2020-21-ministers-annual-report-under-the-climate-change-and-greenhouse-gas-reduction-act-2010.pdf) [https://www.environment.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/1910486/2020-21-ministers-annual-report-under-the-climate-change-and-greenhouse-gas-reduction-act-2010.pdf](https://www.environment.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/1910486/2020-21-ministers-annual-report-under-the-climate-change-and-greenhouse-gas-reduction-act-2010.pdf).
- 3) The Justice and Community Safety Directorate reports measures undertaken to address emissions in the Directorate Annual Report, which is available online at: [Annual Reports- Justice and Community Safety Directorate \(act.gov.au\)](https://www.act.gov.au/annual-reports-justice-and-community-safety-directorate). Information about emissions reduction measures is included on page 184 of the 2020-21 Annual Report.
- 4) The results provided cover Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions.

---

## **Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 723)**

**Ms Clay** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 8 April 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction*):

- (1) In relation to the ACT Government's commitment to a zero emissions government, while the ACT Government is committed to leading by example to showcase best practice sustainability in Government operations, by pursuing rapid emission reduction targets of greater than a 33 percent reduction in emissions from government operations by 2025 (from 2020 levels), and zero emissions from government operations from 2040, can the Minister explain how the Health Directorate (HD) calculates its contributions to this emission reduction target.

- (2) What is the HD's current percentage reduction in emissions.
- (3) What measures has the Minister put in place to reduce emissions.
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that this is a reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions only.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) Please refer to the answer previously provided in response to ECCB QON No. 13, which is available online at: [Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2020-2021 – ECCB QON 13 \(act.gov.au\)](#).

### **Government—emissions reduction targets (Question No 724)**

**Ms Clay** asked the Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, upon notice, on 8 April 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Water, Energy and Emissions Reduction*):

- (1) In relation to the ACT Government's commitment to a zero emissions government, while the ACT Government is committed to leading by example to showcase best practice sustainability in Government operations, by pursuing rapid emission reduction targets of greater than a 33 percent reduction in emissions from government operations by 2025 (from 2020 levels), and zero emissions from government operations from 2040, can the Minister explain how the Education Directorate (ED) calculates its contributions to this emission reduction target.
- (2) What is the ED's current percentage reduction in emissions.
- (3) What measures has the Minister put in place to reduce emissions.
- (4) Can the Minister confirm that this is a reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions only.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) All Directorates use the ACT Government's Enterprise Sustainability Platform (ESP) to track and calculate their emissions. The ESP is a database that collates utility data such as natural gas and transport fuel and transport fuel consumption and calculates the emissions profile for the Directorate.
- 2) In 2020-21, the Education Directorate's emissions were 5839 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent. This is 4.3% below the 2020 baseline (which is the 2019 calendar year to exclude COVID impacts on baseline emissions), and 3% lower than 2019-20 emissions. Annual emissions of ACT Government Directorates and progress against the 2020 baseline are reported each year in the Minister's Annual Report under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act. This can be found on page 14 of the 2020-21 Minister's Annual Report which is available at <https://www.environment.act.gov.au/cc/publications>, or the direct link [here](https://www.environment.act.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/1910486/2020-21-ministers-annual-report-under-the-climate-change-and-greenhouse-gas-reduction-act-2010.pdf) [https://www.environment.act.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/1910486/2020-21-ministers-annual-report-under-the-climate-change-and-greenhouse-gas-reduction-act-2010.pdf](https://www.environment.act.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/1910486/2020-21-ministers-annual-report-under-the-climate-change-and-greenhouse-gas-reduction-act-2010.pdf).

- 3) The Education Directorate reports measures undertaken to address emissions in the Directorate Annual Report, which is available online at: [Annual Report- Education Directorate \(act.gov.au\)](https://www.act.gov.au/education-directorate/annual-report). Information about emissions reduction measures is included in the section starting on page 113 of the 2020-21 Annual Report.
  - 4) The results provided cover Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions.
- 

### **Roads—Ngunnawal (Question No 726)**

**Ms Castley** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) Further to the response to question on notice No 661 which stated that “Design and investigations have been carried out and tender documents have been prepared”, what were the results of the investigations and can the Minister provide a copy of the investigators report.
- (2) What design did the report suggest and can the Minister provide a copy of the design.
- (3) What tender documents have been prepared.
- (4) When will the tender be published.
- (5) When will work start and how (a) long will it take and (b) much will it cost.
- (6) Who did the report and can the Minister provide details including cost and breakdown of services.
- (7) What Transport Canberra and City Services staff have been involved and can the Minister provide a breakdown of (a) number of staff, (b) job title, (c) work classification, (d) employment type and (e) workload.
- (8) Have there been other reports/complaints about Jabanungga Avenue; if so, can the Minister provide those reports/complaints including Fix My Street issues.
- (9) Why does the directorate not have information for (a) hours worked for the 16 road maintenance activities since 2016 and (b) cost of work carried out on Jabanungga Avenue since 2016.
- (10) When did the 16 roadworks start and finish and how many staff, in total, worked on them.

**Mr Steel:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) The result of the investigations completed to date have been inconclusive. However, the consultant’s report concludes from tests undertaken that the cause is “*likely to be a Natural Groundwater Discharge*”. A copy of the report is provided at [Attachment A](#).
- (2) The consultant’s report included many recommendations, and detailed design drawings have been prepared following the assessment of the report. This includes

installation of a drainage mat and deep subsurface drainage to lower and convey intercepted groundwater flows and act as a hydraulic break.

In addition, the design includes pavement reconstruction with stable granular materials and a full depth asphaltic concrete pavement appropriate for a collector road and bus route and utility relocations. The design cannot be released to public at this point in time due to probity of upcoming procurement.

- (3) Standard ACT Government AS2124 Form of Contract tender documents for construction of the above works were prepared.
- (4) The construction tender is expected to be published in early June 2022.
- (5) Works are expected to commence in July 2022 and (a) be completed by September 2022 (weather permitting).
  - (b) The cost of the works is subject to negotiation through the procurement process.
- (6) Indesco Consulting Engineers provided the report at a cost of \$150,000. Scope of the services associated with this engagement included desktop hydrological investigations, geotechnical investigations and design, and tender and construction phase services.
- (7) One project manager (civil engineer) at the equivalent of an Infrastructure Officer Level 4 has been used to manage this process in conjunction with external consultants. This officer will be involved in the tendering of works with the assistance of Major Projects Canberra.
- (8) There have been a number of work requests and enquiries received in relation to Jabanunga Avenue and Tarra Place in Ngunnawal. As these records would need to be inspected and identified manually, it would be impractical to provide copies of this information.
- (9) TCCS undertook these works as part of routine recurrent programs over a number of financial years.
- (10) TCCS undertook these works as part of routine recurrent programs over a number of financial years. Itemised records of staff details and hours worked are not available.

*(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).*

---

## **ACT Health—performance reports (Question No 736)**

**Ms Castley** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) When will the Government release the ACT Public Health Services Quarterly Performance Report for (a) Quarter 2 2021, (b) Quarter 3 and (c) Quarter 4.
- (2) Why is there a delay between the end of the quarter and when the report is released.

- (3) Can the Minister provide (a) a breakdown of the number and classification of staff who have worked on the report each year since 2015-16, (b) a breakdown of the consultants or third parties (beyond the directorate and Canberra Health Services) who have worked on the report since 2015-16, (c) details about the services the consultants have provided and total cost and (d) details on whether consultants have been engaged and why.
- (4) Is there an intentional lag time in releasing the report; if so, why.
- (5) On what dates were the (a) Quarter 1, (b) Quarter 2, (c) Quarter 3 and (d) Quarter 4 reports published on Health's ACT Public Health Services Quarterly Performance Report webpage since 2015-16.
- (6) Can the Minister provide details on what the total cost of producing and publishing the report has been since 2015-16.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Public Health Services Quarterly Performance Report (QPR) for Quarter 2 2021-22 was published to the ACT Health Directorate (ACTHD) website on 20 April 2022.
- (2) The ACTHD aims to finalise a QPR approximately 90 days after the end of the quarter. This allows for a standard six-week period during which clinical coding is completed by each hospital and data quality can be reviewed.

Subject to any delays due to data validation, diversion of resources to competing priorities and other unforeseen impacts, the QPRs for Quarter 3, 2021-22 and Quarter 4, 2021-22 are expected to be released in late June 2022 and late September 2022, respectively.

- (3) The QPR is prepared primarily by ACTHD in collaboration with Canberra Health Services (CHS) and Calvary Public Hospital Bruce (CPHB). A summary of standard staff classification and roles of staff involved in QPR production between 2015-16 and 2021-22 is provided in the table below:

Classification of staff	Role
1-2 X APS6	Upload of data to Data Warehouse/ Data Repository
1 X SOG B	Clearance of extracted data
2-3 X APS6-SOGA*	Communications and engagement
1-2X SOGC^	Preparation of report/correspondence and clearance paperwork
1-2 X SOGB^	Review of data and report/correspondence and Clearance paperwork
1 X SOGA	Approval of QPR, correspondence and Clearance paperwork
1 X SES Level 1	Endorsement of QPR, Clearance of correspondence to stakeholders
1 X SES Level 2	Approve Minister Brief/QPR/Technical and Supplementary Information
Director General	Review QPR and recommend Minister agree to the QPR's publication

\*Approximately three staff spend an estimated 5 to 10 hours per Report.

^ Usually 1 X SOGC and 1 X SOGB provide these functions. For the Quarter 4, 2018-19 Report additional staff worked on the QPR building the QPR datasets into the new ACT Health Data Repository and developing Quarterly Performance Report indicators.



The production of the QPR involves numerous steps including:

- clinical coding of data;
- receipt of data on patient experience and safety and quality metrics;
- validation of data;
- report preparation;
- receipt of feedback from stakeholders and incorporation into the Report;
- clearance of the Report by Executive management in ACTHD, CHS and CPHB;
- preparation of feature article content;
- Minister approval; and
- upload of the Report to the website.

As work for the QPR is considered 'business as usual' in the ACT Government, comprehensive records are not kept of all staff who contributed to the Report preparation.

(3b) There have been no consultants or third parties (beyond the Directorate and Canberra Health Services) who have worked on the Quarterly Performance Report since 2015-16.

(3c) Not applicable

(3d) Not applicable

(4) There is no intentional lag in releasing the Report. As detailed in (2) the timing of the report's release is due to clinical coding of data and data quality checks, as well as the required clearances of report content. The ACTHD works to the following schedule for publishing reports:

- Quarter 1 July to September report – published end of December
- Quarter 2 October to December report – published end of March
- Quarter 3 January to March report – published end of June
- Quarter 4 April to June Report – published end of September.

Once the Quarterly Performance Report is approved by the Minister for Health, the ACTHD Media team publishes the Report as soon as practicable.

(5) The publication dates for QPRs from 2015-16 to 2021-22 (Quarter 2) are:

	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
<b>2015-16*</b>	9/11/2016	9/11/2016	9/11/2016	9/11/2016
<b>2016-17^</b>	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019
<b>2017-18^</b>	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019
<b>2018-19</b>	7/12/2018	31/03/2019	31/05/2019	13/09/2019
<b>2019-20</b>	18/12/2019	24/04/2020	18/07/2020	04/09/2020
<b>2020-21#</b>	17/12/2020	07/04/2021	09/07/2021	22/12/2021
<b>2021-22</b>	22/12/2021	20/04/2022	-	-

\*ACTHD released all four QPRs for 2015-16 to the public. QPRs for Quarters 1 and 2 were replacements for those reports that had been published on ACTHD's website and Quarter 3 and 4 reports were new reports that had not previously been published.

^ During 2016-17 and 2017-18 the latest publicly available QPR was for Quarter 4, 2015-16, as the production of the QPRs was put on hold pending the completion of the ACTHD System-wide Data Review. Following the completion of the System-wide Data Review, work commenced on the design of a new QPR with a final version publicly released on 7 December 2018 for Quarter 1, 2018-19.

#Quarter 4 2020-21 was delayed due to the impact of the Delta outbreak and COVID-19 lockdown in quarter one and two 2021-22.

- (6) The cost of producing the QPRs has varied over time since 2015-16. As noted in (3), resourcing for the QPR was increased due to the development of QPR datasets and calculation methodology for inclusion in the Repository.

It is estimated that on average QPRs cost the ACTHD around \$15,000 to produce, assessing the standard resourcing detailed in question 3. The cost estimate is based on ACT Health Directorate and ACTHD staffing only. <sup>1</sup>

## **Mental health—services (Question No 737)**

**Ms Castley** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) Can the Minister provide a list of all ACT Government run mental health services, including (a) how much funding each service received in 2020-21 and the forward estimates to 2024-25, (b) a link to a website or information about the service, (c) how many staff work at each service including their job title, employment type and workload and (d) how long the service has been operating and its initial cost.
- (2) Can the Minister provide a list of all mental health services the ACT Government has discontinued since 2016, including (a) how many staff worked at these services, (b) the type of service provided eg, step-up, step-down, recovery, preventative etc, (c) total funding each program received and (d) why each service was discontinued and what, if anything, replaced them.
- (3) Can the Minister provide a list of all services that are not run by the Government but receive ACT Government funding, including (a) how much funding each service receives and (b) the type of service they provide eg, step-up, step-down, recovery, preventative etc.
- (4) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of how many staff work in a mental health capacity for ACT Health and Canberra Health Services, including job title, job location, employment type and salary.

**Ms Davidson:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1a) The below table provides a breakdown of the Mental Health program areas within the Division of Mental Health, Justice Health, and Alcohol & Drug Services (MHJHADS). Individual mental health services are grouped into these program areas within the Division.

It is not feasible to split the program area budgets into the individual services for the whole Mental Health portfolio. Forward estimates are based off 2021-2022 budget plus indexation for outward years.

Mental Health Program Areas within MHJHADS	Budget 2020-2021	Budget 2021-2022	Budget Estimates based off 2021-22 funding plus indexation		
			2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Territory Wide Mental Health Services	11,209,837	11,404,054	11,689,155	11,981,384	12,280,919
Adult Community Mental Health Services	18,501,191	18,966,547	19,440,712	19,926,729	20,424,897
Adult Acute Mental Health Services	37,725,399	42,844,874	43,915,996	45,013,895	46,139,242
Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services	14,329,308	16,351,731	16,760,524	17,179,537	17,609,026
Allied Health (MHJHADS)	5,411,689	6,963,176	7,137,257	7,315,687	7,498,579
Director of Clinical Services (MHJHADS)	9,004,480	9,818,793	10,064,262	10,315,868	10,573,765
Other (MHJHADS)	12,021,625	11,307,024	11,589,699	11,879,442	12,176,428

1b A list of services provided by the Division of Mental Health, Justice Health, and Alcohol & Drug Services can be found here [Services and Clinics - Canberra Health Services \(act.gov.au\)](https://www.act.gov.au/health-services)

1c This information has been provided for the Division as it would be resource intensive to provide the amount of detail requested. Canberra Health Services (CHS) do not have a reporting indicator for position title, rather classification group which has been included below. Salary ranges for these can be accessed through the relevant enterprise agreements.

	FTE					Headcount			
	C	P	T	Total		C	P	T	Total
Administrative Officers	0	58.99	14.16	73.15		0	65	16	81
General Service Officers & Equivalent	0	7	1	8		0	7	1	8
Health Assistants	0.33	19.36	3.81	23.5		1	21	6	28
Health Professional Officers	0.16	162.54	32.25	194.95		1	186	38	225
Medical Officers	0	44.12	38.35	82.47		0	54	42	96
Nursing Staff	10.23	332.91	27.99	371.13		19	354	30	403
Senior Officers	0	16.39	1	17.39		0	17	1	18
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10.72</b>	<b>641.31</b>	<b>118.6</b>	<b>770.59</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>859</b>

1d) To avoid diversion of resources to respond to this question details on historical mental services within the Territory can be found in ACT Budget Papers.

2) The below outlines ACT Government funded mental health services in the community that have been discontinued since 2016. The information is provided noting the following:

- Funding amounts approximate per annum based on Mental Health Establishments reporting where available.
- Staffing profile information is not available for non-government delivered services.

Organisation Name	Service Funded	Funding amount approx. p.a.	Year discontinued	Reason discontinued
Volunteering ACT	Connections Mental Health Volunteer Program	\$194,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS

Organisation Name	Service Funded	Funding amount approx. p.a.	Year discontinued	Reason discontinued
Mental Health Foundation	Rainbow  Skills for Life  Long term accommodation, respite and outreach	\$561,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Belconnen Community Services	Leisure and Arts Programs	\$147,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Inanna	Support groups and life skills	\$99,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
St Vincent De Paul	Samaritan House temporary accommodation	\$323,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Richmond Fellowship	Residential MH Recovery	\$471,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Anglicare	Individual Funding Agreements	\$62,000	2015-16	Psychosocial Supports transitioned to NDIS
CatholicCare	SAILS residential outreach  The Lodge high level supported accommodation	\$378,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Community Connections	Individual Funding Agreements	\$153,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
DUO ACT  Mental Health respite	Respite	\$106,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Everyman Australia	Individual Funding Agreements	\$55,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Wellways	Vista Vocational Services – vocational training and rehabilitation	\$361,000	2015-16	Psychosocial support transitioned to NDIS
Barnardos	Respite (children and adolescents with mental illness, children of parents with mental illness)	\$120,000	2017-18	Contract ceased  Respite services transitioned to the NDIS
Deaf Community MH Program	Counselling - psychological services	\$70,200	2018	Provider withdrew services.  ACT Government undertook to review referral pathways and access to services for this target group

Organisation Name	Service Funded	Funding amount approx. p.a.	Year discontinued	Reason discontinued
Capital Health Network	headspace low intensity service	\$424,00	June 2021	Commonwealth funded program.  A 2016 ACT Labor election commitment to provide funding to reduce headspace waiting times resulted in this time limited 4 year funding agreement.
Mental Health Community Coalition	Recovery College	\$400,000	June 2021	2 year (+6 month extension) trial completed and evaluation being reviewed to inform future budget bids

Organisation Name	Service Funded	Funding amount approx. p.a.	Year discontinued	Reason discontinued
Brian Hennessy Rehabilitation Centre – The University of Canberra Hospital opened with the rehabilitation unit opening.	Rehabilitation	\$5.136M	N/A	University of Canberra Hospital opened with rehabilitation services transferring to the new hospital

- 3) The ACT Government provides a wide range of funding and support for mental health services operated by non-government organisations across the ACT. The list and details of these services for 2021-22 are covered in the table below. The service types listed in the table match the descriptive categories defined by the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare for mental health community services.

The ACT Government also receives funding from the Commonwealth that it directly applies to fund non-government services in the community, such as the Youth Aware of Mental Health education program and the MindMap Youth Portal. However, these programs are not covered below because they stem from Commonwealth funding.

Organisation Name	Mental Health Service	Mental Health Service Type	Funding
A Gender Agenda	Mental Health Program	Mental Health Promotion	<b>\$355,516.04</b>
ACT Disability Aged and Carer Advocacy Service (ADACAS)	Mental Health Program	Individual Advocacy	<b>\$177,173.77</b>
ACT Mental Health Consumers Network	Peak Body	Sector Development and Representation	<b>\$513,875.80</b>
Australian National University	ACT Carer and Consumer Mental Health Research Unit (ACACIA)	Education and Training	<b>\$185,866.29</b>

Organisation Name	Mental Health Service	Mental Health Service Type	Funding
Beyond Blue	Jurisdictional Contribution	Sector Development and Representation	<b>\$78,045.00</b>
Brindabella Women's Community Group	Self-help wellbeing group	Group Support	<b>\$40,887.70</b>
Capital Health Network	Psychosocial Support Measure	Personalised Support	<b>\$500,000.00</b>
Capital Health Network	Safe Haven	Counselling	<b>\$352,000.00</b>
Capital Health Network	Wayback Support Service	Counselling, face-to-face	<b>\$300,000.00</b>
Capital Region Community Services	Bungee Youth Resilience Program	Group Support	<b>\$537,032.96</b>
Carers ACT	Peak Body	Sector Development and Representation	<b>\$512,190.05</b>
CatholicCare Canberra and Goulburn	STEPS – Supporting young people Through Early intervention and Prevention Strategies	Staffed Residential Services, Step-Up Step-Down	<b>\$1,577,132.76</b>
CatholicCare Canberra and Goulburn	Youth and Wellbeing Program	Personalised Support	<b>\$389,662.17</b>
Canberra Institute of Technology	Mental Health Consumer Scholarships	Education and Training	<b>\$42,042.17</b>
GROW	GROW House	Staffed Residential Services	<b>\$250,070.73</b>
Majura Women's Group Incorporated	Self-help wellbeing group	Group Support	<b>\$40,887.70</b>
Menslink	Counselling for young boys	Counselling	<b>\$135,000</b>
Mental Health Community Coalition of the ACT	Peak Body	Sector Development and Representation	<b>\$723,753.39</b>
Mental Health Community Coalition of the ACT	Mental Health Week	Mental Health Promotion	<b>\$54,152.57</b>
Mental Illness Education ACT (MIEACT)	Mental Illness Education Programs	Mental Health Promotion	<b>\$725,505.21</b>
OzHelp Foundation Ltd	Industry and Community Suicide Prevention and Social Capacity Building Program	Mental Illness Prevention	<b>\$758,576.06</b>
Perinatal Wellbeing Centre	Perinatal Anxiety and Depression Support	Group Support Activities and Counselling	<b>\$760,298.58</b>
Relationships Australia	Coronial Counselling	Counselling	<b>\$175,103.43</b>
Relationships Australia	Grief Counselling	Counselling	<b>\$100,000</b>

Organisation Name	Mental Health Service	Mental Health Service Type	Funding
Society of St Vincent de Paul	Compeer	Counselling	\$155,057.12
Stride	Southside Step Up Step Down	Staffed Residential Services, Step-Up Step-Down	\$969,236.95
Wellways	Adult Step Up Step Down	Staffed Residential Services, Step-Up Step-Down	\$1,457,730.41
Wellways	Youth Step Up Step Down	Staffed Residential Services, Step-Up Step-Down	\$1,189,970.96
Wellways	Detention Exit Community Outreach	Personalised Support	\$331,974.00
Wellways	Women's Program	Personalised Support	\$613,522.93
Woden Community Services	Transition to Recovery	Personalised Support	\$1,056,633.97

- 4) Please see a summary of the current ACT Health Directorate mental health staff in the tables below. All staff below are working in a hybrid working environment, a combination of working from home and at the ACT Health Directorate Building, 4 Bowes Street, Woden. Salary information for the staffing classifications can be found in the ACT Government Enterprise Bargaining Agreements.

Please note that through all other ACT Health Directorate Divisions, there is not a delineation of health and mental health staff as Health Directorate staff contribute and support both health and mental priorities during the course of their work.

#### **Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Division.**

Title	Classification	FTE
Coordinator-General	CE	1
Executive Branch manager	EX1.4	1

OMHW Staffing Profile		
Title	Classification	FTE
Mental Health Business Advisor and Change Leader	SOGB	1
Change Leader	SOGB	0.81
Director, Suicide Prevention	SOGB	1
Suicide Prevention Officer	HP5	1
Suicide Prevention Officer	SOGC	1
Executive Assistant	ASO6	1
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Suicide Prevention Officer	ASO6	1
Communications and Coordination Officer	ASO6	1
Project Officer	ASO6	0.65
Team Support Officer	ASO4	1

Mental Health Policy and Strategy		
Title	Classification	FTE
Senior Director	SOGA	1
Director	SOGB	0.8
Director	SOGB	1
Assistant Director	SOGC	1
Assistant Director	SOGC	1
Assistant Director	SOGC	1
Assistant Director	SOGC	1
Assistant Director	SOGC	0.6
Policy Officer	ASO6	1
Graduate Officer	ASO4	1

**Office of Professional Leadership.**

Office of the Chief Psychiatrist		
Title	Classification	FTE
Chief Psychiatrist	Senior Medical Staff Specialist	0.5
Assistant Director	SOGC	1
Assistant Director	SOGC	0.5
Executive Assistant	ASO5	1

All staff at CHS provide mental health support to patients regardless of the patient's reason for seeking care at CHS. The question does not articulate direct or indirect mental health care workers and as such numbers detailed below represent staff that were employed and paid within the division of Mental Health, Justice Health and Alcohol and Drug Services as of 30 March 2022.

As mentioned in response to question 1c) CHS do not have a reporting indicator for position title, rather classification group which has been included below. Salary ranges for these can be accessed through the relevant enterprise agreements.

Canberra Health Services, Mental Health, Justice Health and Alcohol & Drug Services	
Classification	Total FTE's
Administrative Officers	73.15
General Service Officers & Equivalent	8
Health Assistants	23.5
Health Professional Officers	194.95
Medical Officers	82.47
Nursing Staff	371.13
Senior Officers	17.39
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>770.59</b>

## Mental health—primary school programs (Question No 740)

Ms Castley asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) What mental health programs are provided in government primary schools.
- (2) Can the Minister provide details about those programs (eg, how long have they been provided, by which organisation, in which schools, for how many children, total cost, etc).



- (3) Has the Government ever provided funding for Mental Illness Education ACT's (MIEACT) program for 8-12 year olds called Thriving Minds: Empowered Futures; if so, can the Minister provide details (eg, how much funding, for how many schools/students).
- (4) Is the Government currently funding the Thriving Minds: Empowered Futures program; if not, why not.
- (5) What is the Government's response to the ANU evaluation in 2020 of this MIEACT mental health program.
- (6) Does the Government believe mental health programs should be provided in primary schools.
- (7) What has been the impact of the pandemic on the mental health of primary school children.
- (8) Does the pandemic's impact on the mental health of primary school children provide further reason why mental health programs are needed in primary schools.
- (9) Has the Minister received any correspondence from schools, teachers, parents or any organisations about providing mental health programs in primary schools.
- (10) What is the Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing doing about providing mental health programs in government primary schools.
- (11) What research has been done about the current state of mental health of children aged 8 to 12 years old and is the Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing doing any work in this area; if so, can the Minister provide details.

**Ms Davidson:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) ACT public schools provide mental health education through a range of programs, including Social Emotional Learning (SEL) programs. SEL is an essential component of student mental health and wellness, cultivating important protective factors to buffer against mental health risks. SEL is a part of the Australian Curriculum, taught in ACT public schools, which develops students' knowledge and skills to understand themselves and others, manage emotions, maintain positive relationships, and set and achieve positive goals. Schools select programs that are best suited to meet the needs of their students.

The ACT Education Directorate (the Directorate) promotes the national mental health in education initiative *Be You*, delivered by Beyond Blue, in collaboration with Early Childhood Australia and Headspace. Be You provides professional learning, tools, resources, programs register, advice and support that is evidence based to educators. The Education Directorate supports schools in selecting SEL programs for delivery within schools that meet the specific needs of that school community.

The Directorate's Psychology Service offers the services of an Early Intervention Team that delivers group programs to young people in secondary schools. 2021 programs included: For students - Chilled Skills, ACT with HeART, and Flexible Minds. For parents - Overcoming Anxious School Refusal, and Boundaries Without Conflict. Additionally, the Directorate's Psychology team also provides targeted programs for students, staff and parents including e.g. Youth Aware Mental Health (YAM) which is for students.

The Directorate has strong partnerships with community stakeholders to raise awareness of mental illness and promote help seeking behaviours. Programs include *Mental Health and Me* and *UR FaB*.

ACT public schools can also access a range of mental health programs through organisations such as Menslink, the Canberra Police Community Youth Club and Mental Illness Education ACT (MIEACT).

- 2) Schools have the discretion to choose the programs appropriate to the identified needs of their students. Centralised data on programs is not collected.
- 3) The ACT Government holds a range of service funding agreements with MIEACT to provide mental health education and promotion programs for schools, higher education institutions and for adults, targeted at workplaces and community groups.

In 2021-22, ACTHD will be providing \$875,505 to MIEACT for mental health education and promotion programs for youth and adults. However, this funding does not specifically include funding for Thriving Minds which is a child focussed program.

- 4) The ACT HD does not provide specific funding for Thriving Minds but does provide funding for MIEACT with a range of mental health education and promotion programs delivered in high schools.
- 5) The ACT Government considers that the ANU evaluation of the program demonstrates the promise of the Thriving Minds program.
- 6) The ACT Education Directorate is committed to supporting the mental health and wellbeing of all students. Social Emotional Learning programs are part of curriculum which give students skills to manage emotions, maintain positive relationships and set and achieve positive goals. Schools can select which programs are best suited to the needs of their students. ACT public schools are also provided supports through the school psychology service.

Following the Review of Children and Young People in the ACT, the ACT Government is committed to advocating for mental health programs in primary schools. To commence this and to understand the evidence for mental health programs targeting 8–12-year-olds, the Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing undertook a Literature Review which is currently being finalised.

- 7) The Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing works closely with the ACT Education Directorate and organisations such as Be You to consider the potential impacts of the pandemic on young people in the ACT for future collective planning. Presently, there is limited scientific evidence on the long-term impacts to support long-term, evidence-based decision making regarding the impacts on the Pandemic on the mental health of students.
- 8) COVID-19 has impacted each of our schools and students in various ways. The Education Directorate continues to provide support to individual students as required through members of the wellbeing teams, which includes a school psychologist. Presently, there is limited scientific evidence on the long-term impacts to support long-term, evidence-based decision making.
- 9) Yes.

- 10) Through the Review of Children and Young People, the Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing made a commitment to enhance evidence-informed mental health and wellbeing education programs in schools.

As part of this commitment, the Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing agreed to undertake a review of the mental health and wellbeing programs offered to primary school aged children, 8-12 years. This review was to include government, non-government and independent schools and was scheduled to take place in 2020, however due to the global pandemic this was put on hold. The Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing are currently working with the Australian National University to undertake this commitment.

- 11) In 2021 Office undertook a Literature Review to analyse best practice programs for 8-12-year-olds. This Literature Review will be released in mid-2022.

In 2021 the National Mental Health Commission published The National Children's Mental Health and wellbeing Strategy which brought together expertise from around Australia and considered the range of research on children's mental health. The ACT was represented on the Steering Committee.

The 2022 Bilateral Agreement on Mental Health and Suicide Prevention included the enhancement of child mental health supports. A further analysis of the mental health needs of 8-12-year-olds in the ACT will be undertaken to support the development of an enhanced child mental health response in the ACT.

---

### **ACT Corrective Services—spit hoods use (Question No 743)**

**Mrs Kikkert** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) Does ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) maintain a stockpile of spit hoods; if so, how many does it have.
- (2) In what situations would ACTCS staff use a spit hood.
- (3) When was the last time ACTCS used a spit hood on a person.
- (4) Does ACTCS staff have any restrictions on who a spit hood can be used on.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) No, ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) does not maintain a stockpile of spit hoods.
  - 2) Not applicable (ACTCS does not use spit hoods).
  - 3) Spit hoods have not been used for at least four years. To determine if they have been used prior to this period would be an unreasonable diversion of resources as this would require manual inspection of a large number of documents.
  - 4) Not applicable.
-

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—security  
(Question No 746)**

**Mrs Kikkert** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

Is there a sterile perimeter (eg a buffer zone around the entire outward facing side of the perimeter fence in which only authorised personnel can enter) around the Alexander Maconochie Centre; if not, why not, and is a sterile perimeter being considered.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

There is a sterile zone on the inside of the perimeter fence of the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC), which is only accessible to authorised personnel. The area around the outside of the perimeter fence is not considered sterile but is well lit and unobstructed to allow for detection, patrolling and emergency vehicle response. The area is well sign posted with warnings not to approach the fence.

---

**West Belconnen tip—landfill capping  
(Question No 754)**

**Mrs Kikkert** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 8 April 2022:

- (1) On what date will the capping of the old Belconnen landfill commence.
- (2) What is the estimated timeline for when the landfill capping will be completed.
- (3) If the capping has already begun, when will it conclude.
- (4) Is the uncapped landfill delaying the land release of nearby blocks; if so, why is it delaying the release.
- (5) Has section 60 in Strathnairn been released for sale by the Government; if so, have all blocks been released; if not, why not, and when will they be released.
- (6) Has section 57 in Strathnairn been released for sale by the Government; if so, have all blocks been released; if not, why not, and when will they be released.
- (7) Did the Government inform developers working in the Ginninderry area that the landfill site capping would impact land release timeframes; if so, when were developers informed.
- (8) What compensation are buyers entitled to, from the developer or the Government, for the delay in the land release in case the buyers suffer financial harm.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) I am advised by Transport Canberra and City Services that the current program sees construction of the capping on the landfill commencing in August 2022. This date is dependent on approval of the capping design by the independent auditor.

- (2) The current program sees the construction phase completed by March 2023, based on commencement in August 2022.
  - (3) See responses to Questions 1 and 2.
  - (4) The landfill capping forms part of the TCCS program for rehabilitation of the landfill site. The development of nearby blocks (taken to mean the future urban area surrounding the landfill site) is only permissible subject to an adjustment of the Landfill Environmental Clearance Zone (ECZ). Under the West Belconnen Concept Plan an adjustment of the ECZ is to be supported by an appropriate audit process and approval from the Environment Protection Authority. The design and placement of the cap are key considerations with respect to the likely effectiveness of any contamination containment, which needs to be assessed as part of the final audit process before seeking an adjustment of the ECZ. Once the ECZ adjustment takes place, development of the adjacent blocks will be permissible.
  - (5) All blocks from Section 60 have been released. 10 blocks in Section 60 that were released and exchanged have not yet been settled as they are located within the landfill ECZ.
  - (6) All blocks from Section 57 have been released and settled.
  - (7) Riverview Projects (ACT) Pty Ltd is the development manager working for and on behalf of the Ginninderry JV. The Development Manager has been in regular communication with TCCS on this project.
  - (8) This would depend on the individual circumstances of each buyer.
- 

### **Waste—recycling (Question No 765)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 6 May 2022:

- (1) How much (a) dirt, (b) drillers mud, (c) virgin excavated natural material, (d) stormwater waste/sediment from ponds, (e) dredging spoil and (f) contaminated soil, was reused or recycled in the ACT in 2021.
- (2) How much does it cost, in the ACT, to reuse or recycle a tonne of material of each of the items listed in part (1).

**Mr Steel:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) In 2021, the quantity of material recycled or reused through ACT waste facilities was as follows:
  - (a) 150,945 tonnes;
  - (b) 5,692 tonnes;
  - (c) 4,663 tonnes;
  - (d) this information is not captured;
  - (e) this information is not captured;
  - (f) 2,885 tonnes.

This data is not comprehensive as it only captures material that goes to ACT waste facilities licensed under the *Waste Management and Resource Recovery Act 2016*. Materials may be reused and recycled in many ways without going through ACT waste facilities (i.e. being transported to NSW or being used for alternative purposes on job sites).

- (2) Beneficial Re-use Material and Virgin Excavated Natural Materials accepted at ACT landfills are re-purposed at the landfill, notably for daily landfill capping. The capping of landfill is part of the contractual requirements of each site.

In relation to materials from licensed waste facilities, the monetary amount for the reuse or repurpose of each material by tonnage is a commercial in confidence business decision that ACT NoWaste does not have access to.

---

### **Planning—Taylor playing fields (Question No 767)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 6 May 2022 (*redirected to the Minister for Sport and Recreation*):

- (1) Have plans been developed for the Taylor playing fields; if so, are these plans available to the public.
- (2) Can the Minister advise what infrastructure will be built.
- (3) Is the Minister able to provide a timeline for these works/plans, if not already completed.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A master plan for the Taylor District Playing Fields was developed as part of the Taylor Estate Masterplan – refer to [TaylorEstateMap\\_2021-05-28.pdf \(act.gov.au\)](#).
- (2) Stage 1 of the Taylor District Playing Fields was completed in 2019, which includes the provision of two combination football fields, a cricket field and sportsground lighting. In accordance with the Taylor Estate Masterplan, land has been allocated for the provision of a further four combination football fields, a sportsground pavilion and outdoor cricket nets.
- (3) The new outdoor cricket nets are scheduled for construction by Transport Canberra and City Services in 2022. The timeframe to deliver the remaining elements of the Taylor District Playing Fields will be subject to future detailed design and budget appropriation.

---

### **Municipal services—spending (Question No 768)**

**Ms Castley** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 6 May 2022:

- (1) How much has been spent each year since 2020 for city maintenance and services (Output 2.4) in the ACT.
- (2) How much has been spent on city maintenance and services in each suburb of Yerrabi each year since 2020.
- (3) Can the Minister provide the categories of jobs and how much has been spent for each category of jobs by city maintenance and services since 2020.
- (4) How much has been spent each year since 2020 for roads and infrastructure in the ACT (Output 2.1).
- (5) How much has been spent on roads and infrastructure in each suburb of Yerrabi each year since 2020.
- (6) Can the Minister provide the categories and how much has been spent for each category of jobs that have been completed for roads and infrastructure since 2020.

**Mr Steel:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Statement of Performance is published in the TCCS Annual report each year. Total cost for Output 2.4 – City Maintenance and Services can be found in the published annual reports for 2019-20 (page 297) and for 2020-21 (page 267).
- (2) This information is not available.
- (3) This information is not available.
- (4) The Statement of Performance is published in the TCCS Annual report each year. Total cost for Output 2.1 – Roads and Infrastructure can be found in the published annual reports for 2019-20 (page 291) and 2020-21 (page 261).
- (5) This information is not available.
- (6) This information is not available.

---

### **Health—walk-in centres (Question No 774)**

**Ms Castley** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 6 May 2022:

- (1) Can the Minister provide an update of the five new walk-in health centres outlined in the parliamentary agreement in (a) South Tuggeranong, (b) West Belconnen, (c) North Gungahlin, (d) Molonglo and (e) Inner South, including details of potential locations, size, staff and budget.
- (2) When will the roll out of these centres be complete and can the Minister provide details of the timeframe.
- (3) How much has been spent on planning for these new walk-in health centres so far and can the Minister provide details.

- (4) How many staff are working in the directorate on these new centres.
- (5) Will there be public transport available to these centres.
- (6) Will the new walk-in health centres be different to current centres; if so, can the Minister provide details.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. A feasibility study has commenced into the establishment of the Inner South, South Tuggeranong, North Gungahlin and West Belconnen centres.

The Molonglo centre commenced on 28 April 2022 operating as Canberra Health Services at Molonglo (CHS at Molonglo). It is co-located within the Molonglo Valley Medical Centre at 110 Woodberry Avenue, Coombs, with Canberra Health Services (CHS) managing six consultation rooms.

Current services provided at CHS at Molonglo include a range of women's and family health care services led by CHS nurses and midwives.

2. The first new centre is open and operating at Molonglo. The roll out of the four additional health centres will be subject to consideration of the feasibility study.
3. As of 30 April 2022, capital costs of \$0.7 million (GST exclusive) have been spent on planning and construction activities.
4. CHS has allocated a multi-disciplinary project team with up to five staff from different areas working on this project.
5. Yes. Public transport is one of the criteria proposed for assessment of preferred sites.
6. The new centres will provide publicly accessible healthcare across Canberra's suburbs. These centres will build on the existing health network including the Walk-In Centres and the Community Health Centres and will be informed by consultation with each community and key stakeholder groups. The objective of these centres will be the delivery of person-centred, integrated care with a multidisciplinary approach.

---

### **Municipal services—crematorium facilities (Question No 783)**

**Ms Clay** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 6 May 2022:

- (1) Can the Minister confirm whether the figures provided by the Australasian Cemeteries and Crematoria Association (ACCA) in their National Cremation Capacity Survey 2020, in relation to the number of cremation services currently performed in the ACT (as an annual average), are correct; if not, what are the number of cremation services currently provided on average in the ACT, and what is the current capacity of our crematoria services in the ACT.
- (2) Is the ACT Government aiming for a quota of one crematorium per 155,000 people; if not, what is the quota that the ACT Government is aiming for.



- (3) Is there a current shortage of crematoria services in the ACT; if so, what is the current shortfall.
- (4) What is the timeframe for development of the Southern Memorial Park.
- (5) Is the development of the Southern Memorial Park likely to satisfy any shortfall we have in crematoria in the ACT.

**Mr Steel:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The figures provided by ACCA in their National Cremation Capacity Survey 2020 come from industry participation. Exact numbers of cremations in the Territory cannot be confirmed as Norwood Park Crematorium is a privately run business and the government does not have access to data relating to their business. Canberra Memorial Parks operates a single cremator that has capacity to undertake 24 cremations per week.
- (2) No. The ACT Government aims to provide adequate services to the people of Canberra. There are a range of factors which determine what level of service provision is required to meet the community's needs, including individual and family preferences in relation to burial or cremation options.
- (3) While cremation capacity exists to accommodate Canberra's current death rate, there is a shortage in associated services that contribute to providing a full service to our community at one location. Canberra Memorial Parks is currently in the planning process of a Memorial Hall development and is looking at introducing new memorialisation products to their current services to meet the needs to the Canberra community.
- (4) Tenders to prepare detailed designs in preparation for Southern Memorial Park Stage 1 construction have been awarded. Southern Memorial Park will become operational when Stage 1 construction is completed.
- (5) It is expected that Southern Memorial Park will meet the needs of the Canberra community in relation to crematoria, burials and memorialisation in the future, noting that a crematorium is not proposed in Stage 1 of the project.

---

**Ginninderra electorate—stormwater drains  
(Question No 791)**

**Mrs Kikkert** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 6 May 2022:

- (1) How many storm water drains are in the electorate of Ginninderra.
- (2) Does the Government keep a log or database on storm water drains that are blocked or obstructed; if so, (a) how many drains in the Ginninderra electorate are blocked or obstructed and in which suburbs are they located in and (b) what is the name of that log or database; if not, why not.
- (3) How many storm water drain clearing jobs have been logged since 1 January 2021.

- (4) How many storm water drain clearing jobs have been completed by government workers since 1 January 2021.
- (5) What are the negative effects of blocked storm water drains on our waterways.

**Mr Steel:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) In the electorate of Ginninderra there are 17,972 Stormwater inlet sumps. The length of Stormwater Pipes in the Ginninderra Electorate is 821.697 km and the length of Open Stormwater Drains and Channels in the Ginninderra Electorate is 25.48 km.

- (2) The ACT Government keeps a database on stormwater drains that are blocked or obstructed.

- a) As of 16 May 2022, the current number of stormwater issues that have been reported and are to be cleared from blockages or obstructions in the Ginninderra electorate are:

- Fraser – 1 job for tie replacement (0 for mains);
- Macgregor – 2;
- Flynn – 1 tie clean and 3 mains clean;
- Spence – 1 tie replacement and 2 mains clean;
- Melba – 1 tie replacement;
- Latham – 1 tie replacement;
- Holt – 1 tie replacement;
- Higgins – 1 tie replacement;
- Florey – 1 tie replacement;
- Scullin – 1 tie clean and 1 mains clean;
- Page – 1 tie clean and 1 tie replacement;
- Bruce – 2 mains clean and 1 pipe replacement;
- Hawker – 2 tie cleans;
- Weetangera – 3 mains clean;
- Macquarie – 1 stormwater emergency flooding and 1 pipe replacement;  
and
- Cook – 1 tie clean.

- b) TCCS has two databases: customer relationship management software (Salesforce) and asset management system (Assetic). Salesforce is used for receiving and managing enquiries from the public and Assetic is used for managing work orders undertaken on TCCS assets.

- (3) Since 1 January 2021, the Stormwater maintenance unit has issued 566 work orders to clear stormwater pipes and inlet sumps.
- (4) Since 1 January 2021, the stormwater maintenance unit has completed 426 work orders to clear stormwater pipes and inlet sumps.
- (5) There are a range of impacts from blocked stormwater drains, which may include minor localised flooding and the bypass of some water quality assets.
-

## Questions without notice taken on notice

### Alexander Maconochie Centre—detainee rehabilitation

**Mr Gentleman** *(in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Braddock on Wednesday, 6 April 2022):*

The first cohort of detainees commenced the EQUIPS program in March 2022. The program has delivered over twenty (20) sessions in ten (10) weeks and it is anticipated the first group will conclude at the end of May 2022. As such, completion rates are not yet known.