



Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD
SEVENTH ASSEMBLY

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

21 OCTOBER 2010

www.hansard.act.gov.au

Thursday, 21 October 2010

Petition: Environment—greenhouse gas—petition No 112	4823
Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010 (No 2)	4823
Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee	4825
Executive business—precedence	4830
Schools—capital works projects	4830
Homelessness—street to home program.....	4835
Order of business	4842
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill 2010	4842
Questions without notice:	
Taxation—housing	4863
Emergency services—waste management.....	4865
Energy—feed-in tariff	4866
Energy—costs.....	4869
Exhibition Park—recycling	4871
Planning—young people	4873
Environment—greenhouse gas	4876
Mental health—homeless people.....	4876
Industrial relations—work safety	4879
Children and young people—education disability services	4880
Children and young people—consultation	4882
Standing order 73.....	4885
Supplementary answers to questions without notice:	
Mortgage relief fund	4886
Industrial relations—work safety	4886
Insurance—common law damages claims	4886
Bimberi Youth Justice Centre—re-offenders	4888
Election commitments—mid-term report	4889
Papers.....	4892
Sport—ACT 4 GWS (Matter of public importance)	4892
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill 2010	4909
Adjournment:	
Hungarian revolution—anniversary	4933
Koolamon Restoration	4934
Schedule of amendments:	
Schedule 1: Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill 2010.....	4935
Answers to questions:	
National Arboretum Canberra—tree thefts (Question No 1049)	4937
National Arboretum Canberra—tree plantings (Question No 1050).....	4937
Housing ACT—properties (Question No 1054).....	4939
Taxation—volunteer fire brigades (Question No 1055).....	4940
Housing—affordability (Question No 1058).....	4941
Libraries—book return chutes (Question No 1071)	4942
Planning—McGregor Hall (Question No 1072)	4943
Yarralumla Brickworks (Question No 1073)	4945
Environment—disused service station sites (Question No 1074)	4945
Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1075).....	4946
Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1077).....	4946
Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1079).....	4947

Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1080).....	4947
Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1081).....	4948
Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1084).....	4948
Budget—savings (Question Nos 1087, 1090, 1103, 1104 and 1105)	4949
Budget—savings (Question No 1089).....	4949
Budget—savings (Question Nos 1095 and 1096)	4949
Budget—savings (Question Nos 1097 and 1098)	4950
Budget—savings (Question No 1102).....	4950
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1107)	4950
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1110)	4951
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1111)	4951
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1113)	4952
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1114)	4952
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1116)	4953
Finance—departmental loans (Question Nos 1117 and 1118).....	4954
Finance—departmental loans (Question Nos 1119 and 1120).....	4954
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1123)	4955
Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1124)	4955
Finance—government programs (Question No 1129)	4956
Finance—government programs (Question Nos 1131, 1134, 1147, 1148 and 1149)	4956
Finance—government programs (Question No 1132)	4957
Finance—government programs (Question No 1133)	4958
Finance—government programs (Question No 1135)	4958
Finance—government programs (Question No 1137)	4959
Finance—government programs (Question No 1138)	4960
Finance—government programs (Question Nos 1139 and 1140).....	4960
Finance—government programs (Question Nos 1141 and 1142).....	4961
Finance—government programs (Question No 1146)	4962
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1151)	4963
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question Nos 1153, 1156, 1169, 1170 and 1171)	4963
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1154)	4963
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1155)	4964
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1157)	4964
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1159)	4965
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1160)	4965
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question Nos 1161 and 1162)..	4966
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question Nos 1163 and 1164)..	4966
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1168)	4967
Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1172)	4967
Taxation—change of use (Question No 1173).....	4967
Canberra Institute of Technology—executive positions (Question No 1177)	4968
Cahill, Mr Ron—judicial review (Question No 1185).....	4969
Emergency Services Agency—headquarters (Question No 1187).....	4970
Health—mental health (Question No 1189).....	4972
Bicycles—parking facilities (Question No 1199)	4972
Environment—fuel storage facilities remediation (Question No 1201).....	4973
Roads—John Gorton Drive (Question No 1202)	4973

Land—Molonglo Valley (Question No 1203).....	4974
Questions without notice taken on notice:	
Environment—tree felling—Wednesday, 22 September 2010	4976
Childcare—staff—Thursday, 23 September 2010	4977
Canberra Hospital—obstetrics unit review—Thursday, 23 September 2010 .	4977
Health—mental health crisis assessment and treatment team— Thursday, 23 September 2010	4978

Thursday, 21 October 2010

The Assembly met at 10 am.

(Quorum formed.)

MR SPEAKER (Mr Rattenbury) took the chair and asked members to stand in silence and pray or reflect on their responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

Petition

The following petition was lodged for presentation, by Ms Le Couteur, from 46 residents:

Environment—greenhouse gas—petition No 112

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

This petition of certain residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that: the Interim Report of the Standing Committee on Climate change, Environment and Water recommended that the ACT Assembly legislates a climate change target of a 40% reduction in overall ACT emissions by 2020, using 1990 as a baseline year.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to: legislate a Greenhouse Gas Emissions reduction target of at least 40% by 2020 based on 1990 levels.

The Clerk having announced that the terms of the petition would be recorded in Hansard and a copy referred to the appropriate minister for response pursuant to standing order 100, the petition was received.

Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010 (No 2)

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

Title read by Clerk.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.04): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

The Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010 (No 2) 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 non-controversial. They are general insufficiently important to justify the presentation of separate legislation in each case and may be inappropriate

to make as editorial amendments in the process of republishing legislation under the Legislation Act 2001. The program is implemented by presenting a statute law amendment bill such as this in each sitting of the Legislative Assembly and including further technical amendments in other amending legislation where appropriate.

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 and is a very practical measure to give effect to the principle that members of the community have a right to know the laws that affect them.

Statute law amendment bills also provide an important and useful mode for continually modernising the statute book. For example, laws need to be kept up to date to reflect ongoing technological and societal change. Also, as the ACT statute book has been created from various jurisdictional sources over a long period, it reflects the various drafting practices, language usage, printing formats and styles throughout the years. It is important to maintain a minimum, consistent standard in presentation and cohesion between legislation coming from different sources at different times so that better access to, and understanding of, the law is achieved.

This statute law amendment bill deals with two kinds of matters.

Schedule 1 provides for minor, non-controversial amendments proposed by a government agency that require approval from the Chief Minister.

Statute law amendment bills generally include a second schedule that contains amendments of the Legislation Act 2001 proposed by the parliamentary counsel to ensure that the overall structure of the statute book is cohesive and consistent and developed to reflect best practice. This bill does not provide for such amendments but the schedule heading is retained to preserve the usual numbering of schedule 3 and a note to that effect is included in schedule 2.

Schedule 3 contains technical amendments proposed by the parliamentary counsel to correct minor typographical or clerical errors, improve language, omit redundant provisions, include explanatory notes or otherwise update or improve the form of legislation.

Statute law amendment bills may include a fourth schedule that repeals redundant legislation. A fourth schedule is not included in this bill.

The bill contains a large number of minor amendments with detailed explanatory notes, so it is not useful for me to go through them all now. However, I would like to take the opportunity to briefly mention several matters.

Schedule 1 of the bill contains amendments to a number of acts in relation to bankruptcy. Members may recall that last year the Statute Law Amendment Act 2009 (No 2) inserted a new definition of bankrupt or personally insolvent in the Legislation Act 2001, dictionary, part 1, that established a single term to cover the range of circumstances by which an individual may be considered bankrupt or insolvent under the commonwealth Bankruptcy Act 1966. The definition includes individuals having a

similar bankruptcy or personal insolvency status in a foreign country and people in any other circumstances seeking to benefit from any law for the relief of bankrupt or insolvent debtors. A number of acts and regulations were also amended in that act, schedule 3, as a consequence of the new definition.

The Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010 (No 2) continues the process with similar amendments being made to the Canberra Institute of Technology Act 1987, the Casino Control Act 2006, the Gaming Machine Act 2004 and the Racing Act 1999. Language in relation to bankruptcy has been replaced with references to the Legislation Act 2001 definition of bankrupt or personally insolvent.

Schedule 1 also contains amendments of the Mental Health (Treatment and Care) Act 1994. The bill amends the act to give effect to two minor amendments to make the process of delegating certain functions under the act simpler and more consistent with other similar delegations.

Section 119 of the act is amended to make it possible for the chief psychiatrist to delegate functions under the act without ministerial approval. It is not usual for ministerial approval to be required before a function is delegated.

Section 120D of the act is amended by omitting section 120D(3) and the following note. This will have the effect of removing the requirement for a delegation of the care coordinator's functions to be a notifiable instrument under the Legislation Act. It is not usual for delegations to be notifiable instruments.

Schedule 1 also amends the Work Safety Act 2008. This bill amends the act at section 36(c) to make it clear that a serious event under division 3.3 of the act includes a serious injury to a worker, as well as to any other person.

Schedule 3 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, improving syntax and omitting redundant provisions.

As always, in addition to the explanatory notes in the bill, the parliamentary counsel is available to provide any further explanation or information that members would like about any of the amendments made by the bill.

I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Debate (on motion by **Mrs Dunne**) adjourned to the next sitting.

Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee Report 5

MS BRESNAN (Brindabella) (10.10): I present the following report:

Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee—Report 5—*Needs of ACT Students with a Disability*, dated 14 October 2010, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

Before talking to the report I would like to thank the committee secretary, Sandra Lilburn, for her hard work, once again, in putting together this report. I would also like to thank my fellow committee members, Mr Hanson and Ms Porter. I think this is a very comprehensive report. It is a tripartisan report as well. I think we all agree on the recommendations that have come through.

This inquiry was referred to the committee in June 2009, along with the educational achievement gap inquiry which was finalised earlier this year. One of the terms of reference for this inquiry concerned the review of special education in the ACT commissioned by the ACT government and led by Professor Tony Shaddock. The report entitled *Disability, diversity and tides that lift all boats* was made publicly available in late December 2009.

The committee extended the deadline for submissions to allow groups and individuals the opportunity to comment on the proposals set out by the review team. The committee met with Professor Shaddock in April this year. The ACT government will respond to the Shaddock review in due course but advised the committee that many of the options proposed are being progressed. The committee looks forward to hearing more about the strategies proposed to improve disability education services in the ACT.

During the inquiry the committee noted that a number of factors, including educational theory and human rights and anti-discrimination laws, have contributed to the greater inclusion of students in mainstream education settings. The success of inclusive education strategies is contingent upon a number of factors, including the nature of the student's learning needs, the effectiveness of the teaching strategies employed, the adequacy of resources provided to support teaching and learning and the capacity to adapt the delivery of educational services.

An inclusive education approach does not suit all students with disabilities, however. The committee has emphasised in its report the importance of ensuring genuine parental choice in school type. Parents are often best placed to determine their children's learning needs, in consultation with education experts, and parents should have the choice of sending their child to a general school or a disability specialist school. That should be something they have control over.

The capacity of adaptations made to deliver an equitable education experience to all students largely relies on administration and resourcing factors. These factors include the conceptual framework underpinning service delivery, leadership within education systems, teaching expertise and resourcing, clarity about the learning needs of individual students, effectiveness of school-based support services, successful communication with parents and carers and expectations within the school community.

The report proposes 30 recommendations which seek to reinforce the proposals set out in the Shaddock review of special education or improve the effectiveness of

current practice. Two areas of particular concern to the committee were, firstly, more effective monitoring of the outcomes of disability education services. The ACT government should ensure that students' educational achievements are measured, as is expected for all ACT students, and that these results can be used to inform better teaching practice. The measurement of learning outcomes, rather than indicators of disability itself or parent satisfaction, would improve transparency in the delivery of education services to students with a disability. This includes the individual learning plans. A number of people expressed their concern about the development and implementation of ILPs. I understand through evidence that was given by the department to the committee that the ILP process will be reviewed and that is encouraging to hear.

The second particular area of concern was around greater transparency and accountability in the source and allocation of funding for disability education services, and this is also a priority. At the very least, all parents should have clarity about the way services for their children are funded, what they are entitled to in terms of specialist funding and details about how they can expect this funding to be administered within the school environment.

Another area of particular concern was the adequacy of post-school options and the effectiveness of transition planning available. This was a consistent issue that came up not just from parents but from a number of organisations and representative groups. The committee was aware that this can be a particularly difficult time for parents of students with disabilities, with one group describing it as a "fork in the road" decision. The committee considered that more attention needs to be paid to this aspect of students' lives, particularly since the ACT government can predict the number of students graduating from the school system and thus should be able to ensure and plan for adequate resources to be available to meet this need.

Students with disabilities are one group within a diverse student body within both the government and non-government education systems. As such, these students should be confident in the recognition they receive within the education system broadly and be able to anticipate that reasonable adaptations will allow the education services they receive to meet their particular needs and maximise their potential for individual achievement.

In relation to the Shaddock review, the committee was particularly encouraged by the cross-sectoral approach to this issue which had been initiated by the review and has encouraged the ACT government to support collaboration between sectors to improve the capacity of both government and non-government schools to meet the needs of these students and their parents.

The inquiry identified a number of concerns. While I have outlined the key concerns, I would just like to point out another two areas which the committee believes require some attention. The first is in regard to the differences in definitions of disability used in anti-discrimination legislation and for educational funding purposes. The second is in regard to the number of specialist disability teachers and the current level of training and development in disability education practices for teaching support staff.

The committee received submissions to the inquiry from a number of community and non-government organisations and also from parents. I thank them for taking the time to make submissions and also for giving their time in appearing before the inquiry. It is those personal stories from parents and groups that really have a great impact on what we consider as a committee.

I would also like to acknowledge the futures program at Canberra college, Woden, which the committee visited on 22 July. This is an excellent program, supported by very committed teachers and the principal. I thank them for allowing us to visit the program and have the chance to speak to the students in the program. I wish the students all the best for the future. This program provides future opportunities beyond school for students with a disability. These are the sorts of opportunities which we should be providing to young people with a disability. It is appropriate to give them every chance to live fulfilling lives and make contributions to our community. I commend the report to the Assembly.

MR HANSON (Molonglo) (10.19): I would like to echo the sentiment from Ms Bresnan, the chair of the committee. It certainly was an important inquiry that we conducted. I also found it very interesting, and indeed highly relevant, given the cuts that have been proposed by the minister and the department of education in terms of support to children who suffer from disabilities. Given the fact that the Assembly committee was conducting an inquiry into this very issue—that is, the needs of children with disability in our education system—it is ironic that, concurrently, the department was looking at cutting those very services. Whilst on the one hand the committee was being told by the union, the teachers, the parents and those that support those with disabilities that there is a need for an increased provision of services and support for children with disabilities in our school system, on the other hand the department and the minister were looking at how they could cut those very services. I find that quite ironic.

I echo Ms Bresnan's comments about those that participated in the inquiry. An inquiry is only as good, essentially, as the submissions that it receives and those who appear before it. I would particularly like to pay note to Professor Shaddock, who has been a leader in this field. Indeed, his review formed a real basis for much of the work that we did in the inquiry. I also thank the minister for appearing and also the various officials from the Department of Education and Training who gave their time.

We had representations from the ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Associations—a number of their members attended—the ACT Disability Advisory Council, the Australian Education Union, National Disability Services ACT and Autism Asperger ACT. I would also like to express my great admiration for the work being done at Canberra college. I thank the principal, John Stenhouse, and Marie Uren for the work that they are doing to help young men and women who are challenged in our education system. They are helping them meet those challenges. It was a very impressive tour. It was a fantastic visit that we had and I thank the minister for allowing the committee to do that.

What is clear is that the number of children with a disability in our education system is increasing. It is not just in the public education system; it is also in independent

schools, particularly the Catholic system. A number of concerns were raised with us, particularly by parents, unions and those groups that support children with disabilities, about the challenges that they and their children face on a broad range of issues, including access to services and transport to school before they even can access those services. It is outlined in the report and Ms Bresnan has given a summary so I will not go into it in too much detail.

There are 30 recommendations and I look forward to the government's response. I hope that they have in some way learned from the experience of the last week, when they were reviewing cutting disability services within the department, and that they will take the report at face value. I hope that they will continue to look very closely at what Professor Shaddock had to say in his review. The government certainly need to take what this inquiry and Professor Shaddock have said very seriously.

This is an area of growing need in our community. It is clear that for students with disabilities, and a broad range of disabilities—indeed one of the issues in the inquiry concerned the definition of “disability”, and there is no doubt that it ranges from people who are quite severely disabled to those who just have minor learning difficulties—there is a lot of work that needs to be done. I am sure that my colleague Mr Doszpot, who has a passion for this issue—particularly disability within education—will follow up on this inquiry and hold the government to account. I certainly look forward to the government's response. I hope it is a positive one.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee—Ms Bresnan, the chair, and Ms Porter for her role—and also, as always, the secretariat: Sandra Lilburn, who again has done a great job; the research officer, Samara Henriksen; and Lydia Chung for her role in providing administration to the committee.

MR DOSZPOT (Brindabella) (10.24): I thank Ms Bresnan and members of the education committee for their contributions to report 5 entitled *Needs of ACT students with a disability*. I look forward to looking at this report in detail as I consider both of my shadow portfolio areas—that is, education and disability. Some of the issues that have been brought to my attention by concerned parents appear to have been touched on in the report. In a way, it is ironic that we are being presented with this report the day after the serious concerns of parents and educators about the needs of ACT students with disabilities were rejected by the Assembly yesterday. Recommendation 4 states:

The Committee recommends that Individual Learning Plans should be developed as a formal benchmarking tool which will assist in the refinement of teaching strategies at the classroom level and be able to measure the level of success of schools in the delivery of education services to students with disabilities.

Recommendation 5 states:

The Committee recommends that the Department of Education and Training investigate, develop and implement a system of objective educational measures of outcomes for students with a disability that would allow teaching strategies to be refined and system level planning to be undertaken.

While we are faced with the actual facts of what is occurring in the disability sector—and this is what the parents were very concerned about—we are currently looking at the efficiency dividend cuts affecting two disability early intervention support workers, two English as a second language support workers, one support teacher for behavioural management, five classroom teachers for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander literacy and numeracy programs, two disability support workers, the scrapping of the post-school option position, the closure of the centre for teaching and learning resource centre and the closure of the education centre at the University of Canberra. The University of Canberra one is not part of your cuts, Mr Barr. I take that point before you make it.

The issues that we are looking at here are very much the concern of parents. The committee report is obviously looking at the needs of ACT students with a disability. It is ironic that some of these recommendations are coming in now when parents have been highlighting some of the actual developments at the moment which the Assembly has chosen to disregard after listening to them. Recommendation 9 is also an interesting one:

The Committee recommends that the Minister for Education and Training provide an explanation to the Legislative Assembly as to why the estimated average cost of providing education services to students with disabilities in mainstream public schools has not been subject to the same cost pressures as other service delivery costs and why the percentage growth in this cost between 1999 and 2008 is nearly half that of other percentage estimate average cost growth.

In line with that, parents are also very concerned about the fact that the proposed cuts that we are talking about are quite telling—that is, roughly speaking, 40 proposed reductions in departmental branches with support and/or student responsibilities as opposed to 11.5 proposed cuts in departmental branches with non-support responsibilities.

I think this report into the needs of ACT students with a disability is very timely. I look forward to further discussions on the report. Obviously, I am looking for feedback from parents as well. I welcome the report, but again I stress that I find it very ironic that it has been presented when the parents who raised many of the urgent and critical issues that are affecting the needs of their students with disabilities were so callously disregarded yesterday.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Executive business—precedence

Ordered that executive business be called on.

Schools—capital works projects **Statement by minister**

MR BARR (Molonglo—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Planning, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Gaming and Racing), by

leave: I am very pleased to inform the Assembly this morning that the 2009-10 financial year saw the largest ever capital works program in ACT schools successfully completed.

When I became education minister in 2006, we commenced a seven-year reform project for education in the territory. We committed to building schools where they are needed most—in our growth areas, particularly Gungahlin, and also to renew school infrastructure in older areas of the city, such as in north Tuggeranong. We committed to rejuvenating and reviving our old 1950s, 1960s and 1970s school infrastructure.

Today I will be releasing a report on the latest year's school capital works and I am pleased to inform the Assembly that it shows that more than \$200 million has been invested in our schools in 2009-10. To put that figure into perspective, it is 10 times greater than it was four years ago and a 95 per cent spend of the capital works program for the year. It is the largest capital works investment ever made in ACT schools. And this is part of the Labor government's half a billion dollar capital investment in ACT public schools scheduled to run from 2006-07 to 2012-13.

In addition to this half-billion dollar ACT government program, the federal Labor government, through the building the education revolution program, has added over \$150 million to this seven-year investment.

Whilst we all know that the most important ingredient in schools is quality teaching, we cannot attract and retain the very best teachers without the very best classrooms and other facilities, such as information and communication technology. We cannot inspire young inquisitive minds without the very best science facilities and language labs. We cannot encourage healthy living and PE in schools without the very best gymnasiums. We cannot encourage the best performing arts without the best performing arts centres. We cannot foster strong communities without the very best community meeting spaces.

Today I would like to highlight the government's achievements in school capital works. I can advise that, pleasingly, the ACT is leading other states and territories in the completion of building the education revolution projects. All 84 national school pride program projects have been completed. All primary schools for the 21st century program, P21, projects are on track to be completed by the end of this year. Nineteen of the 68 P21 projects were complete at the end of 30 June 2010. And at the end of September, more than 70 per cent of the P21 projects were completed.

Every public school in the ACT has benefited. I do not have time this morning to go through the detail for each school; suffice it to say that across every electorate in nearly every suburb in the ACT there has been a school capital works refurbishment program, funded by either the ACT or commonwealth government, completed or nearing completion.

Earlier this year the Building the Education Revolution Implementation Taskforce, led by Mr Brad Orgill, released its interim report. This report showed that in terms of value for money, the ACT public school system projects were the best in the country.

In addition, the complaints that have bedevilled BER projects across other parts of Australia have been largely absent in the ACT, thanks to the genuine consultation undertaken with school principals, parents and citizens councils and school boards in the lead-up to these projects being undertaken.

The ACT's success in this area is attributable to key policy decisions that we made at the beginning of the program. Templates and prefabricated buildings were not used. De-scoping was not used to control costs. A consultant was employed to ensure that environmentally sustainable initiatives were included in every project. We slashed planning red tape. All of these things contributed to our success. BER has been a significant part of the largest investment in school infrastructure in the history of the Australian Capital Territory. And it supported the territory through the global recession and provided hundreds of jobs.

When I became education minister in 2006, there were thousands of empty desks across the territory. The government undertook the largest education reforms this territory has seen—and we are now able to build brand-new schools where they are needed most. I would like to update the Assembly on the progress of these new schools.

Gungahlin college is being built in the Gungahlin town centre. The college will cater for 900 students in years 11 and 12. It will provide a 21st century teaching and learning experience for staff and students. This complex, with an investment of more than \$70 million, will include a Canberra Institute of Technology flexible learning centre, a joint college-community library, a gymnasium and a performing arts centre. The college is aiming to achieve a five-star green star rating from the Green Building Council of Australia. The college will have best practice education facilities, such as flexible learning hubs, a media centre with television and photography studios, a performing arts theatre comprising dance and drama studios, leading music and arts facilities, a mechatronics suite, a computer networking laboratory, a full commercial kitchen, and wireless technology throughout the school.

Substantial progress was made on the construction of the college hubs and other buildings during the most recent financial year. Completed works include the thermal labyrinth tunnel, which uses air flows to heat and cool the school, saving on their energy bills. The college hubs and performing arts building have been completed, with internal fit-out now well underway. The visual arts building, gymnasium, community library and CIT learning centre are close to completion, with concrete slabs, structural steel work and roof sheeting completed. A temporary principal's office has been established in the Marketplace shopping centre, adjacent to the college site. Prospective students, parents and the Gungahlin community can enrol at this office and get more information about the college. The college will open on time for the start of the 2011 school year.

The new P-10 school in Kambah will cater for 900 students from preschool to year 10 and open in 2011 for preschool to year 7 students. Like Gungahlin, Kambah is aiming to achieve a five-star green star rating from the Green Building Council of Australia. Substantial progress was made on the construction of the new school buildings during the financial year. Completed works include the installation of in-ground hydraulic

and electrical services for all school buildings; structural steel for all school buildings; and roofing, brickwork and cladding for half of the buildings. Excavation work for the BER-funded environment centre has started. A temporary office has been established at Urambi primary school for the co-principals of the new school.

I turn now to Harrison secondary school. The \$47 million secondary component of Harrison school will include specialist teaching areas for the performing arts, technology, science and the arts. The middle school buildings will be delivered by mid-2011 and the remaining buildings will be ready for the start of the 2012 school year. The school will provide an inclusive setting for students with special needs to integrate into mainstream educational programs.

In summary, we are investing in new schools where they are needed most.

The government are also focused on the community and performing arts. We have built or funded three performing arts centres. One is complete, at Lyneham high school. One is currently under construction, at Calwell high school. And a third one, at Canberra college Woden campus, is in the design stage.

I would like to report that the \$6 million performing arts centre at Lyneham high school is now functional. It is open for students and community groups. I and, I understand, a number of other members of the Assembly, have had the opportunity to attend performances at the new performing arts centre. The centre has permanent seating for 275, removable tiered seating for an audience of 500, a hearing loop, a new music room with five practice areas, an open air courtyard and a band room for 110 performers.

The \$5 million performing arts project at Calwell high school is due to be completed at the end of this month. Canberra college's \$7.6 million performing arts centre will be ready for the start of the 2012 school year.

I am looking forward to seeing many community and school performances in these new buildings. I am sure that other members, when they get the opportunity to see these facilities, will realise what a fantastic asset they are for the schools and for the local communities.

Increasingly, environmentally friendly building design and construction are becoming part of the way we do business. Solar panels have been installed at Evatt primary school, Kingsford Smith school, Theodore primary school and Gordon primary school. These schools are already feeding electricity back into the grid and benefiting from the territory's feed-in-tariff. Eighteen schools have also installed water tanks—with more schools to benefit this year from the \$2 million ACT government investment in water conservation. Work was also undertaken during the 2009-10 financial year to protect the heritage trees at the Ainslie school.

Experts tell us that the early years are some of the most important. In 2009-10, building works at the early childhood schools in Lyons, Narrabundah, Isabella Plains and Scullin have been completed. Enrolments are strong and this unique school model is proving very popular with parents in these communities. We have commenced

planning for the Franklin early childhood school and Bonner primary school—new schools where they are needed most.

As I mentioned earlier, we must encourage healthy living and active PE programs in our schools. I have the unique honour of being Australia's only minister for education and minister for sport. It is a pleasure to report today on the completion of an important piece of work at the Erindale leisure centre. This investment has added two new swimming lanes to the pool and upgraded the gymnasium. And \$750,000 has been invested in the Turner school hydrotherapy pool. Solar panels will reduce the heating costs at the Turner school, and students with special needs will benefit from the reconfigured change rooms and new handrails as part of this important capital works program.

I can also advise that new gymnasiums have been constructed at Stromlo and Belconnen high schools—an investment of \$3.5 million for each school. These gyms are open for community use, and I know that a large number of sporting groups are already clamouring to use these outstanding facilities. They are fantastic additions to those high schools and now mean that every single ACT public high school has a separate gymnasium and hall.

Whilst we focus on the new buildings, we should not forget the need for behind-the-scenes refurbishments at schools. A huge amount of work has gone on in this area. Stage 1 of the stormwater and sewer pipe replacement programs has been completed. The roof access safety program has also been completed. Major refurbishment work has occurred at Narrabundah college, Telopea Park school, Canberra high school and Alfred Deakin high school.

We have started work on the virtual learning environments in our eight pilot schools. The ACT government's investment in ICT infrastructure in the last four years has meant that ACT schools will have some of the fastest internet connections in the country. It is worth observing that our public school ICT network, with its one-gigabit bandwidth, is 10 times faster than what is proposed under the initial stages of the national broadband network. And it is in place now in ACT schools because of this government's investment back in 2006-07. We have that network in place now, and it is a massive advantage for ACT schools.

In 2009-10 we achieved the largest investment in school infrastructure in the history of the Australian Capital Territory. I am pleased to advise that this financial year we are doing it all again. I table the following paper:

ACT Department of Education and Training—Report on Capital Works
Expenditure 2009-10.

I take this opportunity to thank everyone involved in this very impressive achievement. It has not always been easy turning every school in the Australian Capital Territory into a construction site. I would like to take this opportunity to put on record my thanks to the department's capital works team. I had the opportunity to host a function to thank the team for their work in the 2009-10 financial year. I know there is still a lot more to do. A number of projects are nearing completion but the forward program is still considerable.

I also take the opportunity to thank all of the builders, project managers, principals, teachers, parents, school boards and parents and citizens councils who have made this record investment in the ACT schooling infrastructure possible. It is a fantastic achievement for our territory. I hope that all members can rise above the politics of the education debate to join with me in congratulating all of those school communities on their efforts to achieve, and to work with government to achieve, fantastic outcomes in each and every ACT school. It is a fantastic achievement for education in the Australian Capital Territory.

Homelessness—street to home program

Statement by minister

MS BURCH (Brindabella—Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, Minister for Children and Young People, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Women): I seek leave to make a statement on the street to home initiative.

Leave not granted.

Standing and temporary orders—suspension

MR HARGREAVES (Brindabella) (10.44): I move:

That so much of the standing and temporary orders be suspended as would prevent Ms Burch (Minister for Children and Young People) from making a statement concerning the Street to Home Program.

We have been through this already this week. In reference to a ministerial statement, it was described by those opposite—I think it might have been Mrs Dunne who said it—that a convention exists. There is not a convention actually; it is an agreement which was struck earlier on in this particular Assembly. I would argue that if it is an accepted practice at the conclusion of one Assembly and it goes into the next then it becomes a convention. But it is still an agreement, and that agreement has been honoured in the most part or penalties have been paid. But this is not a ministerial statement, Mr Speaker. It is a statement by a minister by leave of this chamber.

Ms Burch has been criticised a number of times by those opposite—there seems to be some sort of a campaign on. I would ask them not to do this, not to use parliamentary process just to continue this particular program of victimisation of Ms Burch. They should just leave it alone. There is no reason why this chamber cannot grant Ms Burch leave to make this statement. I would ask people to give Ms Burch the same courtesy as they extended to the other minister earlier on this week.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (10.46): The Liberal opposition has formed the view—it is consistently our view—that leave will not be given for ministerial statements or statements by ministers unless the appropriate members of the opposition are given notice of the content. It was remiss of me; I was in conversation with Mr Doszpot when Mr Barr stood to seek leave and I actually missed it, because I would have

declined leave for Mr Barr as well. This is not a vendetta against Ms Burch; it is the Canberra Liberals consistently implementing their policy in relation to procedures in this place.

We now have this artifice that there is a difference between ministerial statements and statements by ministers. Our view has been, and it has been consistently expressed at government business meetings, that we will grant leave on the usual conditions which have been agreed across parliaments and across Assemblies in this place. There was an agreement at the beginning of this term. It was adhered to until quite recently. In fact, when the government started making its statements by minister as opposed to ministerial statements, the same courtesy was extended. I recall that Mr Barr gave Mr Smyth a copy of a statement that he was going to make on tourism. You do not have to look in the standing orders; it is not there. This is a convention and an agreement.

Mr Barr: I am just looking at the difference between a ministerial statement and a statement by a minister.

MRS DUNNE: That is not there either.

Mr Barr: That is not there, either? All right.

MRS DUNNE: Yes. If you knew your standing orders, you would know that already. This is something that Mr Corbell, as the manager of government business, has valiantly put together because the ACT Labor Party have no business, and they are trying to pad it out. If they want to pad out their sitting days, that is fine, but they do it according to the ways that we have already agreed on.

The convention in this parliament and others is that when ministers make statements, they extend the courtesy of giving the people in the other parties who have an interest in the matter a forward copy so that they will be informed about matters that are being discussed so they can contribute to the discussion in an effective way. It is not just an opportunity for a minister to get up here and grandstand.

The Canberra Liberals will continue to decline leave until the ministers in this place extend the courtesies that have previously been agreed to. I want to emphasise that it was remiss on my part that I missed Mr Barr asking for leave. It may appear that we are picking on Ms Burch. This is not about Ms Burch; this is about the government and their discourtesy to the members of this place. We do not believe that the minister should have leave until she extends the courtesy of giving a copy of her statement to the appropriate shadow.

MS BRESNAN (Brindabella) (10.49): We will be granting Ms Burch leave. I must say that I did receive a copy of the statement. I do not know if the same courtesy was extended to the Liberals or not. I do think that is an issue. However, I would suggest that, rather than having this debate here now, I think this is an issue which we need to bring up through our administration and procedure committee or through the whips. I was not aware that the Canberra Liberals did not get a copy. If that has not occurred, that is something which needs to be addressed.

Mr Hanson: Well, it needs to be addressed now, doesn't it?

MS BRESNAN: Well, I was not aware that that did occur. And I actually am a bit confused now as to whether we are speaking about Mr Barr, who did not give a copy of his statement to Mr Doszpot, or Ms Burch, who did not give a copy to—

Mrs Dunne: That's right: both.

MS BRESNAN: Anyway, I did receive a copy of the statement. I do think that is a problem if it was not given to the Canberra Liberals.

Just while we are on this—I know it is not relevant to this particular topic—there are issues that have come up in general about the way business is being conducted in the chamber at the moment. We have had instances where amendments to motions are not being circulated and also are not being circulated to members who have actually moved the motions. I think there are some overall issues about the way business is being conducted in the Assembly at the moment and not just with ministerial statements. That is quite a big problem if they are not being sent to the respective members, but if people are not being informed about particular amendments or motions, that sort of practice is an issue as well. We probably have an overall issue with the way business is being conducted, and I did actually want to make that point.

We will grant leave on this occasion. I do not think we should be punishing a particular minister because someone else has not circulated information or because of a past situation that has occurred. But I think we need to have an overall discussion about the way business is being conducted at present in the Assembly. We will be granting leave on this occasion, but I think this is an issue which we have to discuss further to make sure we do not have these sorts of debates in the chamber in the future.

MR HANSON (Molonglo) (10.52): I will speak briefly, Mr Speaker. The point is that the government are repeat offenders on this issue. We have tried to make the point here in the Assembly before. We have made the point to the Greens. Ms Burch is a repeat offender on this, and this point was made on Tuesday by Mrs Dunne, where she had actually changed her speech. There is a sort of tricky game going on about the difference between a ministerial statement and a statement by a minister to try and avoid what has been a convention that was agreed by all members in this place.

The point is that it is not unreasonable for the opposition and for the Greens to expect a copy of the speech that is to be made two hours prior to that speech being made. I do not think that that is an unreasonable request. Indeed, the government and the Greens have both agreed to that. What we are actually finding out today is that the Greens are getting copies of these ministerial statements or statements by a minister, whatever they are, but the Liberal Party is not.

Now, the Greens say, "Let's look at this behind closed doors. Let's take this away." But this is the place where we adhere to the rules, where we enforce the rules. If there are mistakes made then I think that the Liberals and the Greens and the government understand that. But this is not a simple issue of a mistake. This is a continued and

deliberate strategy by the government to avoid the convention that has been agreed to, to provide speeches to both the Greens and to the Liberals prior to ministers making statements. This is a quite deliberate ploy; it is not some simple oversight.

So I would ask that the Greens consider what is occurring here. They are being essentially taken for a ride; they are their being manipulated by the government, as are we in this place. We want to make a very clear point that we will demand that the government continue to provide members of the opposition statements. Whether they call them ministerial statements or statements by a minister is not the issue. The issue is that we need a copy of those speeches. We will continue not to support leave until we actually get that issue resolved.

I am very disappointed that the Greens will not actually stand up to the government, but I suppose I am not entirely surprised that they are going to fail to do so. But let us make it very clear: the government need to stop playing games, they need to stop being tricky and they need to provide to the opposition and to the crossbench copies of statements, regardless of what they will be calling them.

MS HUNTER (Ginninderra—Parliamentary Convenor, ACT Greens) (10.55): I just want to reiterate my colleague Ms Bresnan's comments on this matter. Those comments were around the fact that it is not okay that it appears that the opposition did not receive these statements before they were made, regardless of whether it is a statement by a minister or a ministerial statement.

My colleague quite clearly outlined that we are not happy with this situation. It does need to be sorted out, and she put forward a couple of ways that this needs to happen—either through the administration and procedure committee or through the whips. There are a number of games being played in this place at the moment. She outlined the issue around amendments that are not being circulated or are being landed at the last minute. There are a number of matters that we do need to sort through. It is unseemly for this sort of behaviour to be going on in the parliament, and we do need to get to the bottom of the matter.

It is not necessarily the best position to be in, but at this stage we have received the statements this morning. We do acknowledge now, after hearing from the Canberra Liberals, that it appears they have not received the statements. It is not the way to go. It will not be behind closed doors, Mr Hanson. We said quite clearly that it should be done through the administration and procedure committee or the whips. But let us get a number of issues out on the table. Let us work through them. If there are conventions in place that need to be followed, let us get back to that path and let us follow that path.

MR HARGREAVES (Brindabella) (10.56), in reply: A couple of points very quickly. We talked about conventions, but this is not a convention. This is an agreement. I need to underscore that. We have the agreement and it relates to ministerial statements. When it comes to statements by leave, that is a completely different issue. I understand and respect the position that—

Mr Hanson: You are being tricky.

MR HARGREAVES: I am speaking through the Speaker, Mr Hanson. Would you please be a little bit more courteous? I heard you in silence, and it will be for the last time today if you keep this up. Ms Hunter, I think, has a point that things need to be worked out, because there is a definitional difference. Part of the definitional difference is because it is based on trust. This side of the house cannot trust that side of the house to honour any convention, because they have broken conventions.

Mr Hanson: Ms Burch was the one who changed her speech. Why should we be trusting you?

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR HARGREAVES: Thank you. They have broken conventions in the past. Mrs Dunne refused the Chief Minister a pair to go to a ministerial council in a previous Assembly. That was the breaking of a convention. These people make up conventions any time they feel like it.

Mr Hanson: He's on holiday. You wanted to break a convention—

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mr Hanson!

MR HARGREAVES: In fact, Mr Speaker—

Mr Hanson: You wanted to break a convention that he gets a pair for going on a holiday.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Hanson, be quiet!

MR HARGREAVES: In fact, Mr Speaker, Mrs Dunne says, "This is a convention across parliaments and Assemblies." That is very glib. I do not know of any, and I have been around a bit longer than Mrs Dunne has. She says it is a convention in this parliament and others. It is not a convention in this parliament, and it is not a convention in other parliaments.

What we see here, I believe, is a difference in definition, and certainly we can work through that. Whether the administration and procedure committee is the place to do it, I do not know. Whether it is the whips who do it, I do not know that either. Perhaps, in fact, all three of us need to go back to our groups and say, "Okay, which is the best mechanism to actually clear this up?" I do not mind doing that at all, and I do not mind being party to that conversation. But we need to be consistent in this place.

Now, if Mrs Dunne is sitting there not paying attention to the business of the Assembly and misses something, she cannot use that as an excuse. She cannot use her own incompetence or deafness as an excuse when she is talking in another debate. Second of all, we had this very same issue raised with respect to Mr Corbell or Mr Barr—I have forgotten which—earlier on this week, and we processed that matter through.

When it comes to the provision of the so-called courtesy, the reason the courtesy is extended to the Greens is that the Greens honour agreements and conventions in this place. We have no such trust in those opposite. We actually believe, in fact, that they will break any convention, they will make up any rule and they will do anything they want. I say thank you very much to the Greens for their support this time, and I take up their suggestion and I will take it up with the party.

Question put:

That so much of the standing and temporary orders be suspended as would prevent Ms Burch (Minister for Children and Young People) from making a statement concerning the Street to Home Program.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 10		Noes 6	
Mr Barr	Mr Hargreaves	Mr Coe	Mr Smyth
Ms Bresnan	Ms Hunter	Mr Doszpot	
Ms Burch	Ms Le Couteur	Mrs Dunne	
Mr Corbell	Ms Porter	Mr Hanson	
Ms Gallagher	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Seselja	

Question resolved in the affirmative, with the concurrence of an absolute majority.

MR SPEAKER: I call on Ms Burch to make her statement.

MS BURCH (Brindabella—Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, Minister for Children and Young People, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Women): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Look, I am quite happy to provide a copy right here and now.

Opposition members interjecting—

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MS BURCH: What I am talking on is street to home initiatives. It will save you reading *Hansard*. My statement relates to street to home initiatives for chronically homeless people or rough sleepers. Mr Speaker, as this is Anti-Poverty Week, it is appropriate that we take this opportunity to remind ourselves and the wider community that poverty and homelessness go hand in hand.

Being homeless undermines your health. It impacts upon a person's ability to find employment and engage in education and training opportunities. It is for those reasons that we, as a Labor government, are determined to do all we can to break the cycle of poverty that homelessness causes.

This government has overseen a systematic approach to both reforming and improving the support given to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness,

commencing in 2004 with the implementation of Breaking the cycle: the ACT homelessness strategy. Earlier this year in the Assembly I spoke of the importance of a comprehensive strategy to address homelessness in the ACT. Today I would like to give the Assembly an update on one of our new initiatives to address homelessness, and that is the street to home program.

This service is targeted at people in our community who are sleeping rough, whether they be on the streets, in our parks or in cars. This important initiative is one of the commitments that this government has made under the national affordable housing agreement and national partnership agreement on homelessness. Setting up the street to home program was also recommendation 1 of the ACT affordable housing action plan phase II, which recognised that addressing homelessness needed far more than just providing a bricks and mortar response.

Street to home recognises the need to engage with people who are homeless in a way that is meaningful to them. That includes supporting them through the provision of appropriate, responsive and timely services, including when they are living in the street. The street to home service is operated by one of our largest community service partners, St Vincent de Paul. Commencing operation in 2010, the government committed \$898,000 over four years for this important initiative.

Members would be well aware of the wonderful work St Vinnies have done through the years with their night patrol. It goes all over Canberra providing a sandwich, a hot drink and a listening ear through the long and often lonely nights, sometimes very cold nights.

I am very proud that St Vinnies has been able to build on this overnight voluntary service with the new service which involves an impressive range of additional services and supports. The street to home initiative coordinates the delivery of services to people on the streets, not just by connecting them to accommodation but also by keeping up that support in order to help them sustain their accommodation into the future.

What we as a community are saying with the introduction of this service is that it is not acceptable to sleep rough on the streets. We understand that anyone who seems to be making a choice to sleep rough is probably doing so from a very dark and damaged place. Madam Deputy Speaker, you and I do not even need to consider making such a choice, and people who are treated well and supported do not make that sort of choice either.

As a community, we need to recognise that not everyone has real choices. Poverty, violence, abuse, addiction and homelessness remove real choices in people's lives. Street to home will start to address these extreme life events by working towards finding a real home for those people who, through no fault of their own, currently call the streets their home.

This program was designed to provide support for up to 20 rough sleepers, wherever we find them. Why can't you have a counselling session in the park, Madam Deputy Speaker? Why can't you apply for housing in your car or in a warm shopping centre where you try to spend time on a cold winter's day?

Although it is early days, the scheme has already had a significant impact. Already the street to home program has supported 21 long-term rough sleeping homeless people including three young people. Other transient homeless people have also been assisted with support, emergency food packs and connections to other supports.

The program provides trained, experienced staff who engage in active outreach with rough sleepers, many of whom do not usually engage well with mainstream services. The program provides services to people wherever they are. As we know, being homeless or at risk of homelessness does not just mean you require accommodation. Street to home provides assertive case management support for people who need it and connects them with other services available in our community.

Street to home has formed strong partnerships with other service providers and Housing ACT to provide an appropriate service mix, including housing, mental health, primary health and other support services. The service engages with a “who’s new on the streets” committee to help identify and monitor people who are homeless, particularly those new to the streets. Membership of this group includes the city parks rangers, the Australian Federal Police, Youth Support Services, the National Capital Authority, ACT Mental Health, the Drug and Alcohol Foundation Centreline and the emergency relief providers.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in summary this initiative represents an opportunity to provide real benefits to people who are homeless and vulnerable in our community. For those who have been rough sleeping for some time, this service will provide the long-term support required to turn their lives around.

As Anti-Poverty Week highlights, there is no dignity in poverty and disadvantage. Street to home represents an opportunity to restore dignity. Its potential should not be underestimated. On behalf of the whole community, I thank the St Vinnies group for the valuable work that they are doing in the street to home project and for our vulnerably broadly across the community.

Order of business

Ordered that notice No 2, executive business, relating to Carers Week, be postponed until a later hour this day.

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill 2010

[Cognate bill:

Climate Change (Greenhouse Gas Emission Targets) Bill 2008 (No 2)]

Debate resumed from 19 October 2010, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind members that the Assembly has agreed to debate this bill cognately with order of the day No 2 private members’ business, Climate Change (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Targets) Bill 2008 (No 2). That being

the case, I also remind members that in debating order of the day No 1, executive business, they may also address their remarks to order of the day No 2, private members' business.

MR HARGREAVES (Brindabella) (11.11): I thank Ms Bresnan for allowing me to jump to my feet first. The ACT government is determined that the ACT set itself up to be a dynamic and sustainable economy and society for the future. To do this effectively, we need to be actively responding to the changes that climate change considerations are driving at the social, economic and environmental frontiers of development. Importantly, the ACT is well placed to show leadership at the local and regional level.

In November 2009 the ACT government set a clear policy direction when it announced a target of achieving a carbon neutral ACT by 2060. By legislating the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets proposed in the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill, the ACT government is setting a clear path for achieving the aim of zero net emissions and providing further security for investment in technologies and industries that can uphold a clean economy and a sustainable future for the ACT.

Our proposed targets are ambitious but they have the strong support of the ACT community—both the residential and the business sectors. We know that the ACT's key sources of emissions are stationary energy and transport. Both these sectors have been the focus of key mitigation policies. Through initiatives under the government's climate change strategy, weathering the change—the ACT climate change strategy for 2007-2025, action plan No 1 and the sustainable transport plan, the government has already embarked on reform in these sectors.

The government has had some big wins that are worth noting here. They include the country's most advanced feed-in tariff, transport infrastructure to support modal shifts to sustainable transport options including increased uptake of public transport, cycling and walking, which continue to be rolled out, not to mention the ongoing programs focused on households, schools and businesses that are changing behaviours.

I would like to expand on some of those successes, starting with the feed-in tariff. Since its launch in March 2009 it has laid the groundwork for Canberra becoming the solar capital of Australia. Since commencing it has contributed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by around 3,000 tonnes. There has been a 520 per cent increase in householders with solar PV installation since March 2009.

It has been welcomed by industry and businesses, thanks to the increased demand for professional skills, products and knowledge. To build on this success the government, following consultation though, recently announced a proposal to expand the scheme. Under the new arrangements, the existing capacity limit will form the micro category, with a cap of 15 megawatts. There is a new medium category for installations between 30 kilowatts and 200 kilowatts, with a total cap also of 15 megawatts.

In addition, there will be a large category for installations of more than 200 kilowatts and capped at 210 megawatts. This is the first time an Australian feed-in tariff has

deliberately targeted medium and large scale generators and it is an example of the ACT leading the charge on energy sector reforms. It is groundbreaking legislation setting benchmarks for the rest of the country follow.

I digress briefly. I raised this very subject at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association annual conference in Kenya. There was an incredible amount of interest from the smaller nations, particularly the Pacific Island nations who rely on diesel for the generation of their electricity. They were very interested to see how they could actually get the feed-in tariff and solar energy in their particular jurisdictions.

The government, importantly, does not shirk its responsibility to lead Canberra's change to a low carbon future. Equally, reducing energy use at home and at work must be done in partnership with all sectors of the Canberra community. Chief among these is the home energy advice team, called HEAT, which has fielded more than 11,000 calls since 2008. For homes built before 1996, HEAT can carry out home visits to conduct a detailed two-hour examination of a property to assist in cutting energy costs.

As for the non-residential sector, two main programs are the focus of assistance. CitySwitch green office is a national tenant energy efficiency program that provides tenants with advice on ways to improve their energy efficiency. In addition, the government has partnered with building owners to provide the \$4 million tune-up Canberra program to make existing commercial office buildings in Canberra more environmentally friendly. It provides grants with matching funding of up to \$108,000 to help local businesses.

We all know that Canberra is a city in love with the car. However, the sustainable transport plan seems to deliver balance in transport options. It seeks to increase the percentage of people walking, cycling and using public transport to and from work from 13 per cent in 2001 to 20 per cent in 2011 and 30 per cent in 2026. Data from the Australian Bureau of Statistic indicates that we are on the way to achieving these targets.

Along with providing better lower emission buses, the government is also investing significantly in bicycle networks. Just this month the Acting Minister for Transport announced a new working group for walking and cycling infrastructure to provide advice on providing more pedestrian and cycling options. The working group's main priority will be the Civic cycle loop, examining shared space on Bunda Street from Genge Street to Akuna Street and also on-road, possibly separated, cyclepaths from Allara Street to Bunda Street via Parkes Way, Marcus Clarke Street, Rudd Street and Allara Street.

The community has an appetite for this type of innovation, as is evidenced by the success of a recent ride-to-work day on 13 October—in appalling weather too, I might add. Despite the wind and rain, attendances were good, with over 100 people attending a government organised breakfast at the ABC 666 studios.

As champions of sustainability, all ACT public schools are committed to carbon neutrality by 2016 through the Australian sustainable schools initiative ACT. This is a

whole-of-school approach that is raising awareness among the next generations about climate change. Focusing on our school management of resources and facilities, significant improvements have been delivered. For example, Bonython primary have increased the amount of waste recycled from 18 per cent to 50 per cent while St Francis Xavier College has gone from no recycling to 69 per cent of waste being recycled. The AuSSI team, the Australian sustainable schools initiative, is conducting energy audits to help improve energy efficiency and usage. Further, this Labor government is investing \$4 million in rainwater tanks and solar panel installations on schools.

The Stanhope Labor government is in the process of developing action plan No 2 of its climate change strategy. Partnerships will be central to the implementation of action plan No 2.

All sectors of the ACT have a part to play in ensuring that we are equipped to face a low carbon future. We will need to implement strategies to reduce our emissions further, to adapt our infrastructure and services to unavoidable climate change, to equip the ACT government and businesses to operate in a carbon-constrained economy, to profit from the development of new and emerging industries and sectors, and to raise awareness and understanding through the community about what can be done at the individual household, organisation, business and government levels to effect positive change. Action plan 2 will also put in a robust reporting system to enable better informed decision making and to increase accountability and transparency.

In conclusion, climate change is happening. I do not recall it being a very big issue of discussion when I first was elected to this place in 1998. We would talk about some things which we now know contribute adversely to climate change—for example, the inversion layer across Tuggeranong in the wintertime. That is why the government actually moved fairly early on to address wood smoke from wood heaters, allowing for the fact that we had to manage people out of a business. You cannot just kill it overnight. We knew that.

That is why Mr Corbell, in his original capacity, was the one who delivered the cyclepaths and the on-road cyclepaths. I remember actually promising on behalf of the then Labor opposition in 2000 for the 2001 election that we would provide these on-road cyclepaths. I have to tell you that Mr Corbell and I shared responsibility for certain elements of the DUS but it was Mr Corbell's initiative and it was his vision that enabled me to go forward and promise this to the Canberra community, and it was delivered. That was the good news.

Not only has it been delivered; there is now an expectation on the part of the community that it will be expanded. I said at the time that we would make it policy that any new roads and any major refurbishments would naturally enough include cyclepaths. I tried to paint the mind picture of the old days when you would be driving your car down the road to be confronted by three Lycra-clad cyclists in the middle of the road. It is a very dangerous place to be if you are on a bike. The cyclepaths not only meant that it was an enjoyable ride; it was a quicker ride and it was also a safer ride.

We now have the community expecting us all to improve and to extend the recreational shared paths and we are delivering it. It was this government that actually started to signpost them and started to have campaigns about them. I remember in the first year being congratulated by Pedal Power. I would like to return the favour. It was also Pedal Power's lobbying over a series of years that actually got us in it and also Mr Corbell seeing how these cyclepaths could work well.

I think it was on his visit to Brisbane, in fact, if my memory serves me correctly, that he got that inspiration and brought it back. Of course, in the first year we found through some monitoring by Pedal Power that cycling had increased by 17 per cent. That is a huge increase when you think about it, and if we can continue that sort of thing that would be just fantastic.

I can remember what Mr Corbell said quite early in the piece when there was no conversation in the community at all. I do not know whether that was the media's fault or the general community's fault, but there was not a conversation out there when Mr Corbell started talking about it. He referred to the integrated approach to transport, forgetting this notion of Canberra being a car city. It had to be a shared city and we had to make sure we got more people on the buses. He came up with strategies to get more people on the buses as well as on their bicycles.

Why have we continued through every year of the Stanhope government to improve on our delivery in these things? Why is it so? It is because of our contribution to tackling climate change. It is not about giving people a fun ride to work. It is about climate change. It is about what happens into the future. What is it that we are actually going to deliver into the future?

I have to say that it has been an absolute delight for me and a source of great pride that I was able to deliver some small part of the vision that Mr Corbell came up with back in, if my memory serves me correctly, about 1999. That was when we actually first started talking about it in our caucus room. That is how far back this minister has been trying to convince his colleagues that this is the right way to go. He has done so and you have seen it manifest itself in our budgets over successive years.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this vanguard legislation provides our community with further opportunity to reinforce our commitment to what type of future we bequeath to our children. We often say in this place that the reason we are here is to give our kids a better opportunity than we had when we were kids. If we can do that, we are successful. The same thing has to apply to our environment, except that we have an added burden. We not only have to make sure we leave it as pristine as we can when we go; we also have to repair the damage that our predecessors have done to it. I applaud this legislation.

MS BRESNAN (Brindabella) (11.25): I rise in support of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill and the 40 per cent target. It has taken years of campaigning from the Greens and many community groups to get to this point, and it should be a very proud moment for our Assembly.

Concerns regarding the impacts of climate change are not just about our natural environment. Climate change also threatens to have a significant impact on matters of social justice, for it is those who are most vulnerable who will be likely to suffer the most.

Taking health as an example, we know that climate change may lead to more dramatic weather patterns, affecting people's health and their demand for health services. Possible heatwaves affect those who are older or have chronic disease, as they are at threat from heat exhaustion. And if Canberra becomes hotter and drier, our water resources could also be affected. Food production in our neighbouring states is likely to change, and we must look to ways in which we can ensure there will be a sustainable supply of key food groups.

By taking positive steps towards reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, there will be positive public health outcomes for our population. For the first time ever, it is said that the generations beyond ours will experience a decrease in life expectancy, so the benefits of the strategies we use to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions also have the ability to affect intergenerational health outcomes.

Improving our built environment, for example, will lead to improved mental health outcomes. A decrease in air pollution can ease chronic lung conditions. More active transport improves heart health and, when combined with improved local food production, leads to healthier weights and overcomes the likelihood of diabetes.

Going to the issue of housing, the government must broaden its understanding of what housing affordability means and recognise that the running costs of a house, with aspects such as utilities bills, are a part of how affordable a house is. These are, of course, issues that I addressed in my motion yesterday in the chamber.

Building standards must improve, not just for the sake of limiting greenhouse gas emissions but also to assist households with managing the cost of living. If energy and water bills increase, so too will the pressure on low income households to choose between paying the bills or buying food.

The government's community service obligation must continue to increase in line with the increase in bills. It was disappointing to see recently that ActewAGL had put more resources into turning off people's electricity rather than working with them to reduce their energy use. The number of disconnections this year has approximately doubled from the year previously. I would encourage Actew to put more focus on preventing disconnection through its stay connected program.

I also note that those people living in Housing ACT properties make up the bulk of ActewAGL clients that are having difficulty in paying their bills. This says much about not just the poverty level but also the types of houses they are living in and their ability to heat or cool them.

Having a 40 per cent target is an opportunity to make the houses we live in, particularly for those on lower incomes, more efficient and therefore more comfortable and affordable for the long term. I would encourage the government to

focus attention on making sure energy efficiency programs are prioritised towards those who need the assistance the most—often also those who are living in the least efficient houses. As Ms Le Couteur spoke about, houses with high energy efficiency are much cheaper to live in and have very low energy bills.

With regard to refugees—because I think this is something which we will all need as a region to take on—in the face of climate change we must also consider not just as a territory but as a nation how we provide assistance to those people who are climate refugees. Many people here in Canberra pride themselves on their social justice platform when it comes to refugees, and I believe this platform extends to those disadvantaged and poorer nations which find their land physically at threat from rising sea levels. Many of the countries impacted in the immediate future will be those in the Pacific region, who are our neighbouring countries. Therefore countries such as Australia and New Zealand will need to take responsibility for assisting people impacted in the region.

I know that, for the CPA, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, this has been a key issue which they have looked at. Obviously, we are all members of that organisation. We know there are nations already being impacted by climate change. Particularly in the region of Papua New Guinea, there are already people who have had to leave their homes because of rising sea levels. This is something we do have to consider as a region, and here in the ACT also, and take responsibility for.

In terms of transforming our transport system for a low-carbon future, there will be a substantial challenge if the ACT is to meet our 40 per cent goal. Canberrans produce more transport emissions per capita than any other urban jurisdiction in Australia. We have been, for many years, a city built around the use of cars as the main mode of transport. The government has in the most recent budget increased the amount of funding spent on capital infrastructure for public transport. However, more was still spent on roads than on services for buses.

This is a phenomenon that the government has a responsibility to change. We have a responsibility, not just the collective responsibility to reduce carbon emissions for our planet's future but to provide the economic benefits and savings that come with the provision of a world-class public transport system. This is about creating a city that is not reliant on cars but gives people a choice in the type of transport they use.

We want all Canberrans to have the opportunity to take public transport. We should be creating a system that is fast, frequent and reliable, in order to ensure that families in the ACT can make the economic decision to go from a two or three-car household to a one-car household. Focusing on public transport can enable people to save thousands of dollars each year.

I have already talked about the affordability of housing in a low-carbon economy, but consider this one additional piece of information: the weekly whole-of-life costs for a medium-sized car are equivalent to repayments on an additional \$125,000 on a mortgage.

The ACT Greens recognise that the most effective means to promote modal shift to healthier, cleaner modes of transport are economic ones. By lowering the costs of

environmentally responsible modes of transport, in terms of financial, time and comfort costs, we can facilitate a situation where people will freely choose public transport for their commuter needs, rather than needing to be compelled to use public transport.

A pricing system that accurately reflects the true costs of private transport, including the environmental and economic impacts of congestion and emissions, tied with a competitively priced and effective public transport alternative, should be a goal for Canberra, and is what we need if we are to achieve our goal of leading the way in emissions reduction.

However, we recognise that personalised transport will continue to be a reality for many Canberrans, which is why we welcome the decision for Canberra to lead the way in adopting electric vehicle infrastructure. Providing the infrastructure and the economic environment to replace the internal combustion engine with newer, cleaner technologies is one of the greatest challenges facing both governments and the automobile industry, and we are happy to see both Australian companies like Blade Electric Vehicles and international companies like Better Place choosing Canberra to become a world leader in renewable-powered electric vehicles. Electric vehicles are constantly evolving, becoming more powerful and efficient, and able to cater more and more to the motoring market.

Just on the Canberra Liberals' bill and the target of 30 per cent, we have heard the Liberals deride and label as draconian proposals to work towards a 40 per cent target put forward by the Greens, such as issues around public transport and improving the energy efficiency of homes, and also the feed-in tariff. These proposals would be required to reach any sort of target, including the 30 per cent put forward by the Canberra Liberals. We have yet to hear any sort of proposals or ideas from the Liberals, only criticisms. They say we should take strong environmental action, just not how. I commend the 40 per cent target and the bill to the Assembly.

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (11.34): I was, I have to say, amused when the *Hansard* of Tuesday's debate came out and one could fully read some of the statements made by Mr Barr in this debate. There is a lovely line where he says:

We should be looking forward to new solutions and not casting back a century for answers to Canberra's challenges.

That is interesting. New solutions? We used to have new solutions. We used to lead the country in new solutions, under a Liberal government. For the first seven or eight years of the Stanhope government, of course Mr Stanhope was not aware that climate change actually existed. It was, what, March 2008, when he suddenly came to realise the greatest moral dilemma of the century existed. It is interesting that since then it has been catch-up by this government. When they do get a little adventurous and decide to set a target, they cannot tell us how they will get there, they cannot tell us how much it will cost and they cannot tell us who will pay.

In effect, what is happening here today is that we will set a target. We do not know how we will achieve it. We are writing a blank cheque for the government that will be

paid for by the residents and the businesses of the ACT without any certainty at all, because we do not know how to achieve this.

We are not against setting targets. Indeed, we got there first in terms of being the first jurisdiction in Australia to sign up to Kyoto in 1997. We were the first jurisdiction, a decade ago, to actually put a greenhouse gas strategy in place. We used to lead the country on these issues but we also had the policies to deliver.

As an example, you do not have to go much further than no waste by 2010, which successive Stanhope governments have abandoned, watered down and ignored, such that they got a damning report from the Auditor-General saying, "You're going to have to pull up your socks if you're going to achieve this target," which they ignored. Here we are in 2010 and we have not met that target. It was an achievable target. I know those opposite will say, "It was only ever aspirational." No, it was not. The people of the ACT, when we consulted them, said they wanted real, practical solutions that they could be a part of. And we gave them those real, practical solutions.

In regard to things like the Earth Charter, again I think we were the first jurisdiction in the country to sign up to that, led by the Liberal Party. I agree that Kerrie Tucker assisted in that but it certainly was not the Labor Party leading the charge on that.

The issue of bio bins is another example. We have not got a bio bin in the ACT. Why? Because the Labor Party dragged the chain on this issue because they do not have the will and the wherewithal to do simple, real, practical things. I set up a bio bin trial in Chifley. The result said, "Go right ahead." This was something the people supported, and it worked. But nine years later we still do not have practical means on the table to do these things, as we used to do under a Liberal government—not under a Labor government. It never happens under the Labor Party, I can assure you.

Go back to the history. We used to lead on these things. We had high-quality design and sustainability guidelines. Indeed, at one stage we moved a town centre to protect the environment because we had the will, we had the wherewithal and we had the policies to do it and, through prudent economic management, were able to do it. We could fund the way forward but we cannot do it now. If we could do it now, the government would be outlining how they would be doing this.

It is easy to set a target. "I am brave. I am going to go to 40 per cent. I will see your 30 per cent and I will raise you 10. I will see your 40 per cent and I will raise you 10, to 50." We can go on like that all day. It is easy to be brave when you are not telling people how and who pays. And that is the problem with what we are doing today. We do not know how we are going to get there and we do not know who is going to pay for it and how we are going to pay for it.

Indeed, since the debate started on Tuesday there were predictions of what this would cost, and those predictions are coming true. I understand the South Australian regulator has been approached by AGL Energy to cover their feed-in tariff. They want to increase power bills by \$7.58 per megawatt hour next year. It is already happening.

The evidence is that this will affect ordinary families and their power bills. But we are not thinking of the people. There it is behind your head, Madam Deputy Speaker, "For

the Queen, the law and the people.” And the people are the important thing here. Forget the glory that ministers and parties will want to claim on this. Think about what you are here for. You are here to protect the people. The people have a right to know how you will do this and who is going to pay for it. But I do not notice anyone else, except for those on this side of the chamber, talking about the real effects on people.

Climate change is occurring. Climate change always occurs. It has done for thousands and thousands of years. Indeed, you only have to look at the Wilsons Promontory lighthouse annual mean temperature. The annual mean temperature at the Wilsons Promontory lighthouse in 1880 was 20 degrees Celsius. By 1885 it was about 18 degrees Celsius. By 1935 it was 17 degrees Celsius. In between it was just a jagged peak. It was about 17 degrees in 1988. In 1995, the mean was 16.2 degrees. Has it got hotter since? Yes, it went up in 2000 but then it dropped again. The climate does change all the time. But the mean for the Wilsons Promontory lighthouse is pretty consistent at about 16.3 degrees.

So we need to know what we are talking about. But we also need to know the consequences. As the first minister in Australia to put out a draft greenhouse gas reduction paper and the first one to put a strategy in place to tackle the problem, I know what I am talking about in this regard. What we have to do is temper this debate by asking questions about the consequences of any proposal for the environment but also for ACT families, for ACT businesses and for the ACT economy.

You only have to look at the recent example of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority releasing its guide to reducing demand for water within the basin, which raised considerable anxiety and anger because of a lack of analysis of economic and social consequences. And we have now got the authority and the federal government having been forced to undertake additional analysis of water management proposals.

Why do we not learn? Why do we continue to repeat these mistakes? Why are we so arrogant that we think we can get away with such proposals when we really need to consider very carefully any proposal to respond to climate change? I would like to see the proposal from the government through the business impact statement. I would like to see the financial impact statement that they did to back up this proposal. It would make very interesting reading. I doubt it exists.

Perhaps when the minister closes he will tell us what the economic impact on the economy and on the ACT budget's bottom line will be. If he has not done that work, let alone on the social impact, he should. Everybody talks about the triple bottom line but, when you ask people to supply the rest of the detail, you get caught up in one sector when you have to address all three if you are going to make these changes achievable and, indeed, sustainable into the future.

I note concerns at the international level about published research on climate change matters. Indeed, if you look at the article published in the *Climate Spectator* on 5 October called “Avoiding Europe's mistakes”, it shows what happens when they go down strategies like this. It talks about the fact that you need private sector investment

to make this work. But the private sector is avoiding such investment because they are concerned about the future of it.

There was a recently released report on Australia, *Beyond zero emissions*, dealing with the totally sustainable energy, that said to go to totally renewable energy in Australia would cost about \$370 billion. That is not going to come from governments. If you want to follow that approach, it will come from private sector investment. The article on climate change said:

The research found that 90 per cent of investment managers were deterred from investing in low carbon projects by the lack of long-term policies and by retrospective changes to member states' climate change guidelines, while grid access and grid infrastructure issues were seen as a deterrent by 45 per cent.

One of the deterrents is the lack of long-term policies. How are we going to achieve this? If you want investors in the ACT, based on the European experience, they need to know how the government is going to do this. The government cannot tell us. If you want real change, you have got to have a plan to achieve it. It is well and good to pat yourself on the back and beat your chest and say, "We have set a target." Tell me how. Tell me when. Tell me how much it will cost. Tell me how much it will affect families. Tell me what the effect of this is.

This article from the *Climate Spectator* goes on to say:

Nearly two thirds of the funds managers said setting tougher targets and sending the carbon price higher would incentivise low-carbon investments, while 50 per cent saw a long-term and detailed roadmap out to 2030, even in the absence of international action, as one of the most important drivers for incentivising a shift in investment sentiment.

Where is the road map? We know where we want to go but nobody can tell us how we are going to get there. I have not heard anything in this debate about how we will get there. With due respect to my father, who picks me up every time I use this line in this place, it is like that old Irish act: "If I was going there I wouldn't be starting from here." Where are we starting from, how are we going and when will we know that we have got there? This is the problem with this proposal. As we have said, we are not against what is being proposed. We do have some concerns about how we will get there and how much it will cost.

There is no denying the changes but, as I have said, you do have to temper them with the fact that the climate changes over every time period. I saw a chart on the Greenland ice cores for the last 1,000 years. It plotted the average mean temperature. Europe was this hot back in about 1350, then it got colder, then it got hotter. Indeed, there is some evidence that we cooled off in the 1970s and got a bit warmer in the 1980s. So we need to know what it is that we are talking about.

Mr Rattenbury talked about a long-term view. A long-term view should be just that—a view developed after appropriate decisions, research and analysis—not a short-term review, not a reactive approach that ignores the realities of the long term, that seeks short-term outcomes which may appear easy to achieve but are not appropriate for the long term.

You only need to look at, for instance, the debate over the Prius and environmentally friendly cars. I think everyone is in favour of having more environmentally friendly cars. But has the whole-of-life cost of cars like the Prius been incorporated into the analysis? The answer is no. No-one knows what the long-term costs will be, what the costs of the disposal of the batteries will be, what the long-term effects will be. And that is why we should be very cautious.

There should be appropriate economic analysis of this proposal. How can we, as a very small economy, achieve substantial reductions in carbon use? What consequences will result for our community from carbon reduction proposals? What consequences will result for our businesses from carbon reduction proposals? And what will happen to our economy following on from carbon reduction proposals?

It is very easy to develop targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and perhaps to develop proposals for carbon reduction strategies. It is much harder to develop proposals that are realistic responses to these targets and proposals. You cannot ignore the here and now. What this is is a blank cheque for the government, paid for by the people and the businesses of the ACT. We do not know how much this will cost and we should be asking those questions. Before we endorse this, we should be getting answers from the government about how they will achieve this.

This is not the way to make policy where no-one can stand—and I am hoping the minister will stand when I finish—and answer the questions. What are the practical things you will do? Who will pay for them? How do you prove the efficiency of these things? Are they sustainable, not just for the next 10 years but for the next 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 100 years? And will they bring the benefits that you say?

There are enormous opportunities here for sustainability industries that I have spoken of for a long time and that the Liberal Party have been speaking of since 1996. I bring forward Spark Solar again, an ACT firm with a great idea, an excellent product, a great prospect, which is receiving, the last time that I spoke to them, little or no assistance from the ACT government so that we can set up a sustainability industry in the ACT. This has been going on for two years now. It has been going on since before the 2008 election and yet the Greens-Labor coalition have not found a way to help this firm yet. That does not give me the confidence that you know what you are doing and you can achieve these targets. (*Time expired.*)

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (11.49), in reply: To respond to Mr Smyth's challenge off the bat, of course Mr Smyth criticises the Labor government, and indeed the Greens, for what he alleges is a lack of analysis to determine how to achieve these targets. The Liberals are proposing a 30 per cent target. What are their strategies? What are their policies? What measures are they going to implement to achieve those targets? They have committed themselves to a target of 30 per cent. Indeed, they committed themselves to that target nearly two years ago. So where are their strategies? Where are their policies? Where are their measures and where are their costings that warrant their strategy? What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

The Labor government has outlined the measures that we believe can allow us to achieve these targets. Indeed, if Mr Smyth had done his research, he would have noted that at the time I introduced this bill I also released two key pieces of analysis outlining how we can achieve these reductions. That was through a document prepared on behalf of the government by the consultancy Kinesis, showing the opportunities for addressing growth in our emissions and achieving reductions, and a further piece of work by the consultants Heuris Partners, also commissioned by my department, that identified ACT zero net admissions, gap analysis and opportunity identification. These analyses identified very clearly where we can achieve the savings and where the opportunities are.

Mr Smyth: How much will they cost?

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr Smyth, you have had your opportunity to speak.

MR CORBELL: The government has always been very clear that the government will use those analyses to finalise its approach in action plan 2, weathering the change, which will be released next year. So the government has been very clear about the process moving forward. This is not a figure we have plucked out of the air. This is a figure based on detailed analysis, based on the science and based on a clear understanding that the target is achievable.

Climate change is redefining the trajectory of what we understand as growth and development. It is also giving us the opportunity to realise win-win outcomes where the economy, the environment and societal wellbeing can be achieved through mutually inclusive means. The government is proud to be a champion of this change. We want to support a sustainable ACT, to establish a solid platform for a low-carbon economy, so that the ACT, our children and their children will be well placed to meet the challenges of the future.

To achieve this, we have introduced this bill. The bill sets out ambitious targets for the territory, but we know they can be reached if collectively we are committed and if we act, and act now. Each of us doing our part as individuals, businesses, organisations and as a government can achieve carbon neutrality for the territory. And as we embrace a new era of growth and development we will create the need for new skills, clean jobs, sustainable practices supported by energy efficiency and renewable technologies. Acting now is an investment in our future. We will be setting the ACT up to meet the opportunities and challenges of the future.

In the midst of the challenges that climate change has created, I believe it has given us an opportunity to review fundamentally how we go about our day-to-day lives. Internationally, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change recommended a 25 to 40 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 compared to 1990 levels by developed countries. The Stern review on the economics of climate change stated:

Delaying action risks getting 'locked into' long-lived high carbon technologies.
It is crucial to invest early in low carbon technologies.

This supports the case for early and deep cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. The Chief Scientist of Australia, Professor Penny Sackett, has said:

Australia must develop individual and community-based pro-active, bottom-up practices that will enhance our national and global responsibility on the issue of climate change.

The Chief Scientist has also observed that “not all required action will be taken through national government policy” and that “in the face of slow changes at national levels it is all the more important that forward-looking industries, states, individual cities and towns, community groups and families continue to network together to reduce their carbon footprints and assess the impact of climate change on their activities”.

The Chief Scientist has got it right. Cities’ communities can play a key leadership role on this issue, and the ACT is proud to be one of those communities today. We know that action at the local, state and territory level is pivotal to achieving sustainable development outcomes. We know that we are well positioned to establish an assertive but responsible leadership position on facing this challenge. This has already been demonstrated by the government’s policy to adopt the goal of zero net emissions, of carbon neutrality, by 2060 and in our commitment as a Labor government to becoming the solar capital of Australia. It is clear that this momentum must be maintained through the setting of ambitious but ultimately achievable targets.

The recent World Wildlife Fund’s *Living planet report 2010* ranked Australia as the eighth most destructive country towards the world’s natural resources. Of the 152 countries that were considered by WWF, the United Arab Emirates, the USA and Canada were amongst the worst offenders.

In 2007-08, the ACT’s net greenhouse gas emissions totalled 4.18 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent, excluding emissions and removals from land use, land use change and forestry. The burning of fossil fuels through stationary energy use, which represented 62 per cent of our total emissions profile in 2008, and transport, which represented 23 per cent of our total emissions profile, were the two largest emission sources in the territory.

Australia has an average per capita greenhouse gas emissions rate of approximately 25 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent. And the ACT has the highest per capita emissions of all Australian states and territories in energy use for the non-residential sector. The ACT also has one of the highest per capita residential energy use rates in the country, along with Victoria. So we are part of the problem and we have an obligation to do our part, to contribute to the effort, to tackle climate change by reducing our own carbon footprint. And we can do this leading by example. The bill is about taking responsibility for our actions and creating a better future for us all.

The government adopted its goal of zero net emissions for the ACT by 2060 and this bill establishes a principal target for the ACT to achieve zero net emissions by 30 June

of that year. To achieve this long-term goal and our transition to a low-carbon economy in a smooth fashion, there is also the need for interim targets. Interim targets help inform relevant policy and program development and create awareness of the significance of the change that needs to be achieved.

The government, with the support of the Greens, instigated and supported the Legislative Assembly inquiry into greenhouse gas reduction targets. That inquiry has received 38 submissions, including from many community and business organisations and individuals, and made 31 recommendations that have played an important role in shaping this legislation. I thank those members of the committee for their work.

As recommended in the draft report of the inquiry, the bill sets the following interim targets for 2050 and 2020: 40 per cent less than 1990 emissions at 2020 and 80 per cent less than 1990 emissions at 2050. The bill also sets an average per person greenhouse gas emissions target to peak by 2013, which recognises that the immediate challenge for the ACT is to halt the growth in per capita and total greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible. This target reminds each of us of our contribution to the territory's greenhouse gas emission profile and encourages individuals to take action to reduce their impact on the climate.

The Labor government made a commitment in its parliamentary agreement with the ACT Greens to legislate a greenhouse gas emissions reductions target for the territory. With endorsement by the Assembly, this bill will fulfil that commitment.

The goal of carbon neutrality is strongly supported by many in our community. There has been active interest from the community in the establishment of the emissions targets since the government announced its goal of zero net emissions earlier this year. Individuals, organisations and groups have lobbied hard for these targets.

I have had the pleasure, as have other members of this place, to have the opportunity of addressing a number of community meetings to discuss the setting of these targets. Support for action on climate change is further demonstrated by the success of a range of other schemes, including our feed-in tariff scheme, which pays householders and businesses a premium price for clean energy generated at their premises. The scheme has been enthusiastically embraced by the community, with 520 per cent growth in the uptake of renewable energy generation since it was first implemented. This highlights clearly how the community are prepared to respond to strong leadership from the Assembly and the government.

To support legislated targets for greenhouse gas emissions reduction we need a transparent, cost-effective and reliable emissions accounting and reporting system. This will enable the government, businesses, organisations, households and individuals to keep track of the progress that we are making towards our shared objective of carbon neutrality. Since 2005-06 the government has commissioned independent greenhouse gas inventories, separate from state and territory greenhouse gas accounts prepared by the commonwealth. The ACT inventory includes emissions data on energy and fuel use that better represent the overall levels of consumption in the territory. It reports on emissions disaggregated into the following sectors: stationary energy, transport, natural gas, waste, and others.

This bill supports ongoing independent reporting on our greenhouse gas emissions profile. It ensures that the methodology used in reporting is consistent with national and international good practice and meets the territory's specific reporting requirements. In addition, it proposes that the independent body responsible for undertaking the reporting will be the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission into the foreseeable future.

This bill is strong on accountability. Verified reporting on our greenhouse gas emissions is part of the equation, one of the tools employed to meet our reduction targets. In addition to providing us with an accurate picture of our situation, it will enable us to track progress in meeting the targets.

The bill contains provisions to ensure that policies, programs and progress towards emissions reductions are reported on regularly to the Assembly and the public to keep everyone informed so that we all know what is working, what is not working and so that we can work out what we need to do next. The minister will be required to report to the Assembly on this progress to ensure that it is kept informed.

The bill also endows the minister with the following functions: to regularly review issues relating to climate change; to promote action to meet the targets; to develop, adopt or promote policies and programs relating to climate change; to consult business and community entities about issues relating to climate change; to consider and promote actions or strategies by business entities, including technological developments, to address or adapt to climate change or to reduce emissions; to promote the territory's involvement in state, national and international climate change fora; to promote the commercialisation, generation and use of renewable energy in the territory; to promote the commercialisation and use of other technologies to reduce emissions; to promote research and development consistent with the objectives of the act; to support and develop regional, national and international approaches to addressing climate change; and to consider and recommend amending a territory law or government policy or practice if the minister reasonably believes an amendment is necessary to achieve the objects of the act.

The functions provided to the minister in this bill underline both the importance the government places on this legislation and the collective approach we want to be at its heart. As I have said in this and other arenas, real progress in addressing climate change is being made at a local level. Indeed, it is one of the most practical levels that we can engage in. One of the main reasons for this is that at this level genuine innovation can be fostered and genuine engagement undertaken. Already in the ACT significant work is being undertaken to create a more sustainable future in our schools, our homes, at work and politically.

This bill builds on this work and sees this government do what all governments should do—lead change, set benchmarks and work to deliver. We are already well on our way to achieving this. This bill is an important opportunity for the ACT to once again establish itself as a leader on these issues because the time to act is now. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question put:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 10

Noes 6

Mr Barr	Mr Hargreaves	Mr Coe	Mr Smyth
Ms Bresnan	Ms Hunter	Mr Doszpot	
Ms Burch	Ms Le Couteur	Mrs Dunne	
Mr Corbell	Ms Porter	Mr Hanson	
Ms Gallagher	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Seselja	

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Detail stage

Clauses 1 to 6, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Clause 7.

MR SESELJA (Molonglo—Leader of the Opposition) (12.08): I move amendment No 1 circulated in my name [*see schedule 1 at page 4935*].

This amendment which I am moving is, I suppose, at the heart of the difference in approach to this. This amendment would omit 40 per cent as the target and replace it with a target of 30 per cent. We believe that this would be the sensible way forward, the correct way forward. It would be a target that shows leadership, that sees the ACT make some changes to the way we do business. We would increase energy efficiency; we would improve public transport. We would change the way we plan our city in terms of having more density in our town centres and our transport corridors.

We do not believe that Canberrans should be subjected to a regime which would deliver the kind of pain which the 40 per cent target will deliver for the environmental benefit which we do not believe will flow as a result. It is all well and good for the Labor Party and the Greens to say that we need to be well ahead of everyone else. But there is a reason why governments need to consider this very carefully. There is a reason why even Kevin Rudd, who declared climate change to be the greatest moral challenge of our time, did not go to a 40 per cent target.

There was a range of targets under Kevin Rudd, and he settled on a five per cent unconditional target. That may increase depending on what happens internationally, and we hope that it does. But there is a reason why even a true believer like Kevin Rudd did not do it. I have no reason to believe that Kevin Rudd did not mean it when he said that he believed it to be the greatest moral challenge of our time. Obviously, there was an understanding that there are significant costs, and that is why the government did not go ahead with a 40 per cent target federally.

We at an ACT level also need to be cognisant of this. We have different challenges. We have different challenges and different opportunities. That is why I believe that it is reasonable that we go further than the rest of the nation. That is why I believe that it is reasonable that we show leadership. But when all is said and done, and presuming that the government is serious about this target and genuinely wants to achieve this 40 per cent target by 2020, that will involve significant pain for Canberrans over the next couple of years, over the next few years.

Canberra families who are subjected to far higher costs for parking, Canberra families who are subjected to significant increases in electricity over and above the ordinary increases that we would expect, will be asking their leaders and their government whether, in taking these actions—in taking action for the environment—their concerns were considered. They will be asking themselves whether the government and the ACT Assembly considered whether it is reasonable or whether it is overly burdensome for a family living in Conder who have kids in childcare and school; who have one parent working full time and one parent working part time, as is often the case; who have to juggle all of those things; and who rely on their car—whether it would be reasonable for them, when they work in Woden, Civic or the parliamentary triangle, to be paying double or triple what they are paying now. Instead of paying \$10 in the city, they will be paying \$20, \$25 or \$30 a day.

These are the kinds of challenges that are going to exist. These are the kinds of impositions that this government will be placing on these families. They will be asking themselves about this. Many of them, if they were questioned, would say, “Yes, I want to see action.” But many of them would be asking themselves whether, in imposing those kinds of punitive measures, the ACT, in order to make the Labor Party and the Greens feel as though they are leaders, will get the results that people would expect—and at what cost, what price? Those families will be asking that.

The family facing a massive increase in their electricity costs as a result would be asking the same questions. We have seen a 45 per cent increase in electricity costs over the last few years in the ACT.

Mr Rattenbury: What is that being driven by? Where is your analysis of 45 per cent?

MR SESELJA: ABS statistics. The ABS statistics show that. Mr Rattenbury can go and talk to the ABS about their statistical methodology; he can go and tell them that they are wrong. I am prepared to accept the ABS over Shane Rattenbury’s analysis. As a general rule, when it comes to statistics, I would say that I am not going to accept what Shane Rattenbury says over the ABS. I will accept the 45 per cent from the ABS unless the ABS tells us otherwise.

The best thing the government could say about that was that we are not quite as bad as New South Wales. If the best you can say is that you are not doing quite as badly as New South Wales, you are in trouble.

People are already paying more. The question will be how much more they will have to pay. This week we saw Greg Hunt comment about the elasticity issues with

electricity and some of what is happening. There is some detailed analysis that Mr Hunt has done. Despite these massive increases in electricity prices, electricity use has not gone down. So the question needs to be asked: what kind of pain is going to be imposed by these policies? What kind of pain is going to be imposed and what kind of environmental gain?

Again, we have seen the government's strategy in recent times. With the solar feed-in, we are paying over \$400 per tonne. That is a very expensive way to deliver emissions cuts. That is not going to deliver anything like what is necessary to get anywhere near this 40 per cent, but at the moment they are choosing some very expensive ways to go in order to cut emissions.

Canberrans will be asking themselves about this in the next couple of years after this bill has formally passed and this 40 per cent target is in place, after the government, presumably, if it is serious about the 40 per cent target, starts putting in place those policies. Those policies can come in only a few key areas. We all know where they are going to come, because we know where the emissions come from. They are going to come in the area of transport; they are going to come in the area of electricity. And therefore they are going to come in the areas of building standards and the like in dealing with electricity. Those are the areas where they will come.

Yesterday we saw the government refuse to rule out the congestion tax. Those are the kinds of measures that governments will need to look at in order to achieve such a target. When they do go down that path of a congestion tax, who will bear the brunt of that? I would say that the most likely people to bear the brunt of that will be people in the outer suburbs. I would say that it will be those in Tuggeranong, Weston Creek, Gungahlin, and Belconnen, particularly west Belconnen, those who live furthest away from their places of work generally and have the least opportunity to use public transport, who will be the ones who bear the brunt of some of these taxes and charges.

This debate is no longer about whether or not there should be targets; it is not about whether there should be action. It is about asking what the consequences of that action are and what it actually achieves. We are saying that showing leadership is fine. We should show leadership; we are in a different position from some other parts of the country in terms of industry and other issues. At the same time, it is also about recognising the costs and the benefits. And the costs of going that extra mile, that significant extra mile that the Labor Party and the Greens are supporting in this bill, will be significant. The environment minister here has said so. He has talked about the government's analysis. For that reason, I commend this amendment to the Assembly. (*Time expired.*)

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (12.18): We have just heard the great big fraud from the Liberal Party in this debate. This argument is a great big fraud.

Mr Seselja: On a point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, Mr Corbell is becoming a serial offender. We get pulled up for using terms like "gutless" and "vendetta". Mr Corbell cannot allege that I have engaged in a fraud. It is a personal reflection on me under standing order 55, and I ask you to ask him to withdraw.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Le Couteur): Yes. Mr Corbell, I suggest that you may wish to withdraw.

MR CORBELL: I withdraw any suggestion that Mr Seselja is engaging in a fraud, but the argument is fraudulent; it is completely fraudulent. This suggestion that 30 per cent is good—no pain for the community, no cost, and no issues with that—but 40 per cent is incredibly bad and dangerous is fraudulent. It just shows how insincere this opposition is on this issue.

Let us get to the facts of what analysis has been done to date on achieving emissions reduction. And let us understand what Mr Seselja's 30 per cent will entail. The government has commissioned three studies to identify opportunities for achieving emissions reduction. These include work undertaken by Heuris Partners, commissioned in October last year; work undertaken by Heuris Partners again, in May this year, on gap analysis and opportunity identification; and work undertaken by the firm Kinesis in December last year as a primer for the development of action plan 2.

What all those studies identified was this. About half of the 40 per cent reduction is achievable in the following areas: energy efficiency, eight per cent; solar hot water, a further four per cent—and the next couple are the kickers for Mr Seselja—green power purchase, three per cent; feed-in tariff, six per cent; and modal shift, sustainable transport, vehicles and mode shift, four per cent.

We have just heard Mr Seselja rant on about how, to get from 30 to 40, we are going to have to put up parking prices, pay more for electricity et cetera. Mr Seselja, to get to your 30 per cent you are going to need to do all of those things. You are going to need to do them all, Mr Seselja.

And then you are going to need to do further actions. According to the studies identified and commissioned by the government, you are going to need a further 10 per cent reduction in emissions through the adoption of technologies including trigeneration and energy from waste technologies. You are going to need a three per cent reduction through policy interventions such as employee density and biosequestration. And you are going to need additional purchases of green power.

So let us be very clear about this. Mr Seselja's 30 per cent is not just energy efficiency, as he likes to claim. In fact, energy efficiency is only eight per cent of his 30 per cent target. He will need to spend money and make policy intervention in solar hot water, in green power purchase, in utilisation of the feed-in tariff and in modal shift. He will need to do all of those things. So his argument is fraudulent.

We have heard Mr Seselja go out day after day and say, "We are adopting a responsible target of 30 per cent and we will achieve it through energy efficiency." He only gets eight per cent of his 30 per cent through energy efficiency. He only gets eight per cent. Where is the other 22 per cent coming from, Mr Seselja? Where is it coming from? His argument is fraudulent. It is fraudulent and it is a big lie. It is a big lie.

Mr Seselja: On a point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, we understand his sensitivity on this, and we understand why he would resort to this kind of language, but it is unparliamentary and he should withdraw.

MR CORBELL: I withdraw.

Mr Seselja: If he persists, I would ask you to ask him to sit down—if he is going to keep doing this. We understand the sensitivity, Simon.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Mr Seselja, Mr Corbell has already withdrawn.

MR CORBELL: I withdraw, Madam Assistant Speaker. But clearly Mr Seselja is sensitive on this point, because he has been caught out.

Members interjecting—

MR CORBELL: He has been caught out badly.

Members interjecting—

MR CORBELL: He has said that he can achieve 30 per cent of the emissions reduction—

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: One minute, Mr Corbell. Mr Seselja and Mr Smyth, please let Mr Corbell be heard in silence.

Mr Seselja: He is being inflammatory.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: That is no reason for you to add to it. Mr Corbell, you have the floor.

MR CORBELL: Thank you, Madam Assistant Speaker. He has been caught out badly. For the last month he has been saying, “Our 30 per cent target can be achieved through energy efficiency and it is responsible.”

Mr Seselja: That is not true.

MR CORBELL: Energy efficiency delivers eight per cent of the reduction, so where is the other 22 per cent, Mr Seselja? Where is it? What are you going to do? We know what it will involve, because we have commissioned the studies. It will involve solar hot water use, green power purchases and the use of the feed-in tariff. It will involve modal shift from private motor vehicles to walking, cycling and public transport. That is what it will involve, Mr Seselja. That is what it will involve. Don't you dare to continue to suggest that there is no significant change and there are no implications associated with your target but there are from other targets. All of these targets involve changes. They involve potential costs, they involve potential benefits, and they will need to be carefully and appropriately managed.

The Liberals' argument on the issue of a 30 per cent target is fraudulent, misleading and untrue. You do not get 30 per cent from energy efficiency; you get only eight per cent from energy efficiency.

The target that this Assembly should be adopting is the target of 40 per cent. Forty per cent is what the science tells us needs to be done. For developed countries—for established, developed, advanced Western economies—a 40 per cent reduction on 1990 levels is the target figure that we should be adopting to prevent dangerous climate change.

We cannot achieve it on our own; we are not suggesting for a moment that Canberra can. But if we, in one of the most privileged and most fortunate cities in the country, and in one of the most fortunate nations on the face of the planet, cannot adopt a target informed by the science, who can? And who will? That is the issue that we have to address here. That is why the government will not support Mr Seselja's amendment.

Debate interrupted in accordance with standing order 74 and the resumption of the debate made an order of the day for a later hour.

Sitting suspended from 12.27 to 2 pm.

Questions without notice

Taxation—housing

MR SESELJA: Mr Speaker, my question is to the Treasurer. Yesterday, in question time, you stated that the increase in change of use charge payments was a “very modest increase in the revenue that we expect to receive”. You are in fact expecting revenue to increase by 185 per cent. Why did you describe a massive increase of 185 per cent as a very modest increase?

MS GALLAGHER: The ACT government's own-source revenue is over \$1 billion a year. This year we are expecting an increase of around \$8 million in change of use charge. I would say that is a very modest increase.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Seselja, a supplementary question?

MR SESELJA: Yes. Treasurer, what modelling have you done that supports your claim that an increase of 185 per cent in the change of use charge should not impact on the price of rents in the ACT—

Mr Corbell: There's no increase in change of use.

MR SESELJA: and will you table it in the Assembly?

MS GALLAGHER: As my colleague just said, there is no increase in the change of use charge system that has been in place and supported by this Assembly for a number of years. We have rectified a problem that was identified, as those opposite, I believe,

genuinely believed we had to respond to. We have fixed that. As part of that we are expecting extra revenue.

In terms of moving to codification, which I think is where Mr Seselja's question actually lies, there is currently a number of pieces of work being done around the economic impact, around a cost-benefit analysis, by Professor Nicholls and Professor John Piggott. I have already given commitments that it will be released in a report to the Assembly around the move to codification of the change of use charge system. The figures outlined in the budget simply indicate that applying the law as it was intended to apply—

Opposition members interjecting—

MS GALLAGHER: If those opposite want me to break the law, which is what you are asking me to do, because the 185 per cent increase across the board estimates—

Mr Seselja: Is that what you've been doing for the last eight years?

Mr Hargreaves: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the imputation from Mr Seselja in interjections across the chamber was that the Deputy Chief Minister—he asked the question: did the Deputy Chief Minister break the law in the last few years? I would ask him to withdraw it.

Mr Seselja: I simply responded to what the Treasurer was saying. She asked whether we were asking her to break the law. If that is the case then that would mean that the government has been breaking the law all this time. There is no other conclusion to be drawn.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Hargreaves, on the point of order?

Mr Hargreaves: On the point of order, it matters not the reasons, Mr Speaker. It is an imputation on the member.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Hargreaves, I do not believe there is a specific point of order. Mr Seselja, please do not interject when the Treasurer is answering. You will have a chance to ask supplementary questions at another time.

MS GALLAGHER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Just in conclusion, we did not believe the law was being applied as was originally intended. We have fixed that. The figures in the budget paper merely reflect that decision and how we expect that decision to flow out across the forward estimates.

MR SMYTH: A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Treasurer, how much would revenue have to increase from the change of use charge before you would describe it as a significant increase?

Mr Corbell: On a point of order, the question is somewhat hypothetical, Mr Speaker. It is asking for the Treasurer to answer a question on the basis of something that has not occurred. It is entirely hypothetical.

MR SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Mr Smyth's question is in order.

MS GALLAGHER: The change of use charge is a small component of the overall revenue generated each year through ACT taxes and charges. I would imagine we would have to have a completely new system of change of use charge for me to refer to the word "significant". But I will leave how I describe certain events and issues to the day-to-day responses to those opposite. This is really getting a little bit silly, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Smyth?

MR SMYTH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Treasurer, can Canberrans look forward to further modest tax increases in the 2011-12 budget?

MS GALLAGHER: The budget will be introduced into the parliament in May next year. Mr Smyth, I know that you await that date eagerly and with anticipation, as we all do.

Emergency services—waste management

MS HUNTER: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, and it relates to the waste management area at the old Belconnen landfill site. Minister, given that this site is at the western-most point of the ACT suburban area, has there been any analysis of the bushfire risk of having the site used for waste management activities which have inherent high levels of fuel such as timber?

MR CORBELL: Yes, there has.

MR SPEAKER: Ms Hunter, a supplementary question?

MS HUNTER: Have emergency services been consulted about the use of the site for remediating contaminated soil from old petrol stations which contains high levels of hydrocarbons, and what risk does this activity have?

MR CORBELL: I thank Ms Hunter for the supplementary. I am not aware of any particular discussions or consultation that may have occurred in relation to the material Ms Hunter refers to. I will take that part of the question on notice.

What I would say, though, is that the ACT Fire Brigade have been paying close attention to this part of the ACT because it is at the north-western extremity of the urban area and is, indeed, an area which is subject to the prevailing winds in summer and obviously presents a potentially higher risk when it comes to fire because of its physical location. The ACT Fire Brigade have, in recent years, undertaken a range of measures to ensure compliance with regard to the storage of various materials at that

site to ensure that risk is mitigated to the greatest extent possible. I know the Fire Brigade continue to pay regard to that area.

In relation to the particular materials that Ms Hunter refers to, I will take some advice and provide further advice to the member.

MR SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Bresnan?

MS BRESNAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, given the multiple waste management activities on the site, what risk is there that toxic or hazardous leachates will seep into the Ginninderra Creek catchment area?

MR CORBELL: That is a separate question that relates to environment protection considerations. That would be a matter for the Environment Protection Authority to regulate and manage. Again, I would need to take advice from the EPA. So I will take that question on notice.

MS BRESNAN: Supplementary, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Ms Bresnan.

MS BRESNAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Given that this site has also been used as a depository for the disposal of asbestos-contaminated soil, what risk does this pose to the creek and the local area?

MR CORBELL: Those are relatively complex technical questions; I will seek the advice of the EPA and I will provide advice to the member.

Energy—feed-in tariff

MR SMYTH: My question is to the Minister for Energy. Minister, I refer to an article in today's *Australian* online entitled "Solar take-up to drive up power bills". In the article, Mr Brad Page, Chief Executive of the Energy Supply Association of Australia, said, in relation to schemes such as the New South Wales solar feed-in scheme:

The real tragedy is that these arrangements cost about \$450 per tonne of greenhouse gas saved, an extraordinary amount with vastly cheaper alternatives available. The community is paying far more than it should to reduce emissions.

Minister, what is the cost for each tonne of greenhouse gas saved under the ACT government's feed-in tariff scheme?

MR CORBELL: I do not have the answer immediately to hand, but I am happy to provide it to the member and I will take the question on notice.

MR SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Smyth?

MR SMYTH: Minister, why has the ACT government not adopted cheaper alternatives, as suggested by Mr Page?

MR CORBELL: Mr Page, of course, represents electricity generators and retailers, if I recall correctly, and, of course, many of his members—indeed, most of his members—supply energy from fossil fuel powered sources. Now, it is okay, apparently, from the Liberal Party’s perspective that the cost of electricity generated from coal, for example, does not reflect the full cost of the use of that resource. Apparently the Liberal Party believe that it is all right to have the externalities of that resource passed on and not properly accounted for in the price of that resource.

Mr Smyth: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, standing order 118(a) speaks of answers being directly relevant. The question asked was: why has the government not adopted cheaper alternatives? It was not about what association Mr Page works for.

MR CORBELL: I am explaining, Mr Speaker—

MR SPEAKER: Sorry, are you speaking on the point of order?

MR CORBELL: No, I am not.

MR SPEAKER: There is no point of order at this time. I think the minister is, in the context of any debate about where electricity comes from—which is, I think, the tenor of your question, Mr Smyth—setting up the case. I am sure he will come—

Mr Smyth: He’s attacking the Liberal Party and he’s attacking Mr Page.

Mr Hanson: That’s what he’s doing. He’s attacking Mr Page.

MR SMYTH: Directly relevant—

MR SPEAKER: Don’t! Mrs Dunne.

Mrs Dunne: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, in accordance with standing order 118(b), the minister is not supposed to debate the issue. Mr Corbell was directly going in to debate the issue, to attack the person reported and to attack the Liberal Party rather than answer the question directly, as is required by standing order 118(a).

MR SPEAKER: Mrs Dunne, I have given my ruling on my views on where Mr Corbell is up to in the question. I think that pertains to your suggested point of order as well. Mr Corbell, I remind you of Mr Smyth’s question.

MR CORBELL: Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker. The reason that we do not agree with the view of the Energy Supply Association of Australia is that it would appear to be the case, from what the Liberal Party is asserting, that it is all right to not have regard to the facts—

Opposition members interjecting—

MR CORBELL: They do not like it, but the fact is that the cost of electricity generated—

Mrs Dunne: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention again to standing order 118(b), which says that, in answering the question, the minister shall not debate the subject to which the question refers. Mr Smyth asked a direct question in relation to the alternatives the government had suggested, and Mr Corbell continues to debate the subject to say what he thinks the Liberal Party's view might be et cetera. This is not an appropriate answer in accordance with the standing order.

MR SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld. Mr Corbell, stop debating the Liberal Party's views and answer the specific question, thank you.

MR CORBELL: Mr Speaker, I have not seen the article, so I am not really in a position to comment on it. But what I would say is that the government believes that the deployment of alternative energy sources is absolutely vital for the future energy supply for our city and if we are to make the transition to a low carbon economy.

The types of analyses that the Liberal Party refer to, of course, fail to have regard to the fact that electricity generated from coal does not reflect the full cost of that resource, because it does not have regard to the environmental impact of the use of that. Therefore, it is a false comparison.

MRS DUNNE: A supplementary question, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mrs Dunne.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, do you agree that \$400 a tonne or a similar figure is an appropriate price to pay for carbon reduction?

MR CORBELL: The government's view is that there will be a range of measures that will have to be adopted as we make the transition to a low carbon economy. Some will be relatively low cost and some will be higher cost.

As members of the Liberal Party would know, the government has already announced changes to its feed-in tariff scheme to shift the emphasis to large-scale generation because large-scale generation is inherently more efficient than micro generation. So the government has capped the micro and medium-scale generation categories because of this very reason, reflecting that the relative efficiency of large-scale generation is better than the relative efficiency of micro and medium-scale generation.

The government recognises this issue and we have responded, through the policy settings we have put in place. We are largely—

Mrs Dunne: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, my question was: does the minister believe that \$450 a tonne for abatement is an appropriate figure? He has not even approached that.

MR CORBELL: I have.

MR SPEAKER: On the point of order, Mrs Dunne, I do note that, under standing order 117(c)(i), your question sought an expression of opinion from the minister. I did

let that through as a question not being out of order. In that context, I think the minister has some latitude to answer the question.

MR CORBELL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Of course the real problem the Liberal Party have here is that they voted for the feed-in tariff and now they are opposed to it. It is the same Liberal Party that says it believes in climate change and then voted against the climate change bill in principle this morning. They try to walk both sides of the road. They say, “Yes, we need to cut greenhouse gas emissions,” but then they vote in principle against the legislation that does just that.

MR SPEAKER: Mrs Dunne, a supplementary question?

MRS DUNNE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. ActewAGL is a member of the consortium referred to. Does he think that it is evil? Does the minister think that ActewAGL is—

Mr Hargreaves: Point of order, Mr Speaker. Is this a supplementary?

MR SPEAKER: Order! One moment, Mrs Dunne.

Mr Hargreaves: Is this a supplementary or is this the actual substantive question?

MR SPEAKER: This is a supplementary.

Mr Hargreaves: Then it does not require a preamble.

MR SPEAKER: Let us hear the question from Mrs Dunne before I rule on the point of order.

Mr Hargreaves: There is a preamble, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: You have the floor, Mrs Dunne. Perhaps you can say it again.

MRS DUNNE: Thank you. Minister, does ActewAGL fit your description of an evil energy company, as they are also a member of this consortium?

MR CORBELL: Mrs Dunne completely misrepresents me. At no time have I suggested that any of those companies are of the form that she described. That is her description, not mine.

Energy—costs

MR COE: My question is to the Minister for Energy. It relates to an article in today’s *Australian* online. The article says that the nation’s biggest energy retailer, AGL Energy, this week applied to South Australia’s pricing regulator to increase power bills by \$7.58 per megawatt hour next year, translating to an average of three per cent per bill, just to pass on the costs associated with the government’s scheme to encourage household-level renewables. Minister, by how much will ACT power bills rise as a direct result of you getting six per cent of your 40 per cent cut in emissions as a result of the feed-in tariff scheme?

MR CORBELL: The government has outlined what the potential cost to households will be as a result of this expansion of its feed-in tariff scheme. We have already made that information publicly available. The existing scheme for micro-generation, which provides for a maximum of 15 megawatts of installed capacity and the expansion of that scheme to medium-scale generation which provides a further 15 megawatts of generation capacity, is already accounted for in the existing price path built into electricity bills and determined by the Australian energy regulator.

The cost of that existing scheme last year amounted to \$10 per household for the full year. Under the expanded scheme, we anticipate that this will rise to no more than \$50 per household per year. So to counter any impact that this will have on low income earners, the government has focused very strongly on protecting low income earners.

We have already significantly expanded the existing energy concession payments. We have also for the first time indexed that to the relevant price index to ensure that those households continue to receive payments that keep the value of that concession in price in line with the relevant price movements.

The government is moving to protect low income households. It is what we need to do now for energy generated from coal-fire generation. It is very important to make the point that low income earners always suffer the burden of any increase in utility prices, whether that increase occurs—

Mr Hanson: Everybody suffers it.

MR CORBELL: Disproportionally, Mr Speaker—whether or not that occurs as a result of investment in existing fossil fuel powered electricity generation or whether that occurs as a result of renewable energy generation.

It is not the case that one is no cost and the other is an unfair cost. The fact is that both have costs. The costs of fossil fuel powered generation, of upgrading existing fossil fuel powered generation, of upgrading existing electrical distribution infrastructure to channel that fossil fuel powered electricity generation also have a disproportionate impact on low income earners. That is why we have a concession regime.

This government believes that we must make the transition towards renewable energy generation but in doing so we should protect low income earners, and that is exactly what this Labor government is doing.

MR COE: A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Minister, what policies have you implemented as Minister for Energy that have put downward pressure on energy prices for low and middle income earners?

MR CORBELL: I thank Mr Coe for the question. There are a range of measures that the government has put in place to assist low income earners with their energy costs.

In particular, we have put in place measures to assist low income earners to reduce their energy costs. For example, my department has partnered with the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services—

Mr Seselja: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting—

MR SPEAKER: I can't hear Mr Seselja.

Mr Seselja: The point of order is as to relevance. It was a very specific question. It asked what the minister has done to put downward pressure on energy prices, on electricity prices. It was not about what assistance was given to some; it was about what is being done to put downward pressure rather than upward pressure on the cost of electricity in the ACT.

MR SPEAKER: Minister, I think the question is about electricity prices. Perhaps you can try and focus there.

MR CORBELL: Electricity prices for households or electricity prices as a whole, Mr Speaker? If it is about electricity prices for households then energy efficiency has a key role to play. And that is exactly what this government is doing. For example, we have undertaken a detailed program. We have provided, in the last financial year, over a million dollars, in partnership with the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services, to see the retrofit of a large number of public housing properties and properties in the social housing sector, with the installation of insulation, better window coverings and the replacement and upgrading of hot-water systems. We have also entered into partnership with community service organisations, those who work in the non-profit and charity sector, to provide the replacement of energy-intensive appliances with energy-efficient appliances such as new fridges and other appliances, so that people in rental accommodation and people in low-cost social housing are able to drive down their electricity bills through that investment.

We have also, of course, made changes to the consumer regime when it comes to energy concessions, and I mentioned that earlier. (*Time expired.*)

Exhibition Park—recycling

MS LE COUTEUR: My question is to the minister for tourism and concerns the new recycling bins at EPIC. Minister, can you tell the Assembly what the new recycling system at EPIC involves and what contribution the ACT government made to the system?

MR BARR: I thank Ms Le Couteur for the question. I did indeed have the pleasure of launching this new recycling initiative at Exhibition Park a few weeks ago.

Mr Hanson: Did you get the media there, Andrew?

MR BARR: I understand that some members of the media may have attended, Mr Hanson. This initiative was a partnership with the Fruit and Grocery Council

packaging division. They provided a grant to assist Exhibition Park with the installation of some new equipment. This included a—

Mr Hanson: Opening of a wheelie bin but no time to talk to disabled children and their parents.

MR SPEAKER: One moment, Mr Barr. Mr Hanson, thank you. That is enough interjecting. Mr Barr.

MR BARR: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This included a machine that assisted those working at Exhibition Park with the unloading of the recycling. In effect you are able to put the wheelie bin into this machine and it lifts it up and tips it into a centralised recycling facility. It is a useful labour-saving initiative that was indeed supported—

Mr Hanson: Will it run in the *Canberra Times* and the *CityNews* or do you get on WIN with that one?

MR SPEAKER: Mr Hanson, I have just asked you to stop interjecting. You are warned for continual interjection. Mr Barr, you have the floor.

MR BARR: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think it shows the complete disregard that those opposite have for important recycling initiatives in the city. Whilst the Exhibition Park initiative is but a small step, it is another small and important contribution that a major event venue is making towards recycling more and more product. It was interesting that the anticipated amount of soft drink bottles, for example, that will be recycled, I am advised, over the course of the year could be laid out in a line from Exhibition Park all the way to Floriade—something like seven tonnes of additional material recycled.

The Exhibition Park Corporation is working in partnership with an industry association to deliver a practical outcome on the ground at one of our major event venues. Those opposite can cat call and be as cynical as they like. They are demonstrating this afternoon their complete cynicism on this. Meanwhile, the government will continue to work in partnership with industry to achieve these sorts of outcomes. Whilst I acknowledge that the Exhibition Park initiative is only a small component of a larger program that is occurring across ACT government, nonetheless it is important, as I say, that a major event venue like Exhibition Park shows leadership in this area.

MR SPEAKER: Ms Le Couteur, a supplementary question?

MS LE COUTEUR: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, what other sporting and event venues in the ACT now have this type of permanent recycling infrastructure, how has the government supported them and are there any further event venues where the government is working to implement this system?

MR BARR: Obviously, I do not have that detail in front of me. There are hundreds of sporting venues around the city. I am happy to take the detail of that question on notice in relation to other facilities. I know that, through the territory venues and

events area, they take this matter seriously, and across those major event venues—Canberra Stadium, Manuka Oval, Stromlo Forest Park—we can work to ensure that, if those facilities are not currently in place, they will be in the near future.

MR HANSON: A supplementary, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Hanson.

MR HANSON: Minister, why is it that you have the time to attend the opening of a wheelie bin but you are unable to find the time to meet groups representing vision and hearing impaired children?

Ms Le Couteur: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I do not believe that question has any relevance to my original question.

MR SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld. The question is out of order, Mr Hanson.

MS BRESNAN: A supplementary?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Ms Bresnan.

MS BRESNAN: What assessment has the government done of the various public events recycling programs, and are they working successfully?

MR BARR: That question bears no resemblance at all to my portfolio responsibilities. I have responsibility for those venues run by territory venues and events. The question is much broader than that. I would need to refer it on to the relevant ministers who have responsibility in that area.

Planning—young people

MS PORTER: My question is to the Minister for Planning. Minister, can you explain how the government is engaging young people in the Canberra 2030 “time to talk” initiative?

MR SPEAKER: Ms Porter, I think you might need to repeat the question for Mr Barr. Oh, he has already got it.

Mr Smyth: He wrote the question. He has already got the answer.

MR BARR: Amazingly, Mr Speaker, you might be surprised to learn that I did have some knowledge of this question. I do thank the member for Ginninderra for the question and for her interest in involving young people in planning.

Can I say that just yesterday I was very privileged to be able to award prizes to a fantastic bunch of Canberra students from across primary schools, secondary schools and colleges who participated in the “your city, your vision” 2030 program. The competition was run by the ACT Planning and Land Authority as part of the

sustainable futures program, importantly, to involve the community in discussions about Canberra's future sustainability. The views arising out of the competition will feed into the evaluation of the Canberra spatial plan and feed into the consideration around the Canberra 2030 time to talk initiative.

The Canberra 2030 competition "your city, your vision" is part of an ACT government program to seek the community's views on how to plan for a more sustainable city in response to climate change. We are planning a future Canberra that has a smaller carbon footprint, uses less energy and less water and makes best use of land and resources. We are planning for a future Canberra that is vibrant and prosperous, that caters for a growing population but also one that is ageing. We are planning for a future Canberra that provides housing and lifestyles that will continue to attract and retain young people, who will be critical to keeping our economy strong over the next 50 years.

I think that your city, your vision as a competition was, for students, a fun and constructive way to engage in a debate about Canberra's future. I am pleased to say that students expressed an amazing range of ideas and demonstrated how much they care about the future of their city. The range of ideas that were demonstrated through this program show that our education system is working well to engage students in the challenges and strategies that we need as a community to develop to cope with climate change, something that they will certainly face in their lifetime. It is great to see young Canberrans involving themselves and continuing to be involved in this debate.

The issues that were raised in this particular consultation and through this competition included some thinking about balancing increasing population with the limited space that we have in this city, looking at providing more energy efficient public transport, looking at ways to reduce our water and our waste, looking at ways to make our building more sustainable, and ensuring that there are still plenty of green spaces in our city.

I am very pleased to advise the Assembly that the winners included the year 6 group at Holy Spirit primary school, Tom Smethurst from Red Hill, Hamish Williams from Fadden primary school, Rachel Wilson from Radford college, and Callum McBride from Narrabundah college. There was also a range of other students and student representative councils who participated in this competition. I would like to congratulate them all on their passion for the future of a sustainable Canberra.

MS PORTER: A supplementary?

MR SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, what other initiatives will you be undertaking to ensure the voice of young people is heard in planning for the city's future?

MR BARR: This is a critical issue. So much of the public debate about the future of our city is being dominated by people who will not be alive in the middle of this century, so it is critical that we engage with young people now about the next 20 years

of this city and beyond. That means taking proactive steps to engage with them, because the more traditional methods of consultation are being dominated by the same old voices who put forward their same old generational issues. Their selfishness at times astounds me, and I think it is important that we take a leadership role as an Assembly to engage with younger Canberrans. The overwhelming majority of people in this city are young. The single largest demographic in this city is aged between 20 and 30, and yet their issues do not get the air time they deserve.

There are two clear themes that are emerging from the consultation with younger Canberrans, and that is about a future that is sustainable and a future that is affordable. It means representatives in this place taking the time to engage with those people through programs such as the suburban challenge that the ACT Planning and Land Authority are running with schools but also going out and meeting with young people and doing more than just going to community councils.

It means taking that extra step to engage with younger Canberrans, moving online and engaging in social networking and engaging in a variety of other consultative mechanisms, because the old Liberal Party with their stick-in-the-mud traditions of only engaging with people in the last 25 years of their lives is not the way to go for the future of this city. If they are the only voices the Liberal Party is going to hear in this debate, it is to their detriment.

MR HARGREAVES: A supplementary.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Hargreaves.

MR HARGREAVES: Thanks very much, Mr Speaker. Minister, in your consultation process dealing with children, have you consulted with the opposition yet?

MR SPEAKER: The question is out of order.

MS HUNTER: A supplementary?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Ms Hunter.

MS HUNTER: Minister, you spoke about the particular program and competition. Will you actually be taking the ideas and using them in planning processes or was it just for the purposes of the competition?

MR BARR: As I indicated in my first answer, in relation to both the thinking on the review of the Canberra spatial plan and also the Canberra 2030 process, those views will of course be taken into account. I intend to undertake a range of activities, forums, events, politics in the pub, online events that will enable younger Canberrans to engage in these issues. This is for young people from primary school age right through to—

Mr Hanson: Young people and politics in the pub?

MR BARR: We will extend the definition of “young” to “into their early forties”. There will be a range of different forums, age appropriate of course so that those

across the aisle do not get too excited. But it is important to recognise that there are more people in this city aged under 40 than I think we give credit for in our consultation mechanisms and certainly in the types of debates that we have in this place. Those opposite choose to ignore their views to their detriment.

Environment—greenhouse gas

MR HANSON: My question is to the Minister for the Environment and Climate Change. Minister, what greenhouse gas emissions offsets has the government purchased to offset its emissions? Where are these offsets and what are the costs?

MR CORBELL: To the best of my knowledge, the government does not currently purchase offsets to offset its emissions. Instead, the government works to reduce its carbon footprint by the purchase of renewable energy. The government currently purchases 32.5 per cent of its total energy needs with green power product. That is the single largest purchase of any state or territory in the country when it comes to the purchase of renewable energy for its own operations.

A number of government agencies and government-related entities have used offsets to manage the impact of particular projects. The most obvious of these is the development of the new Cotter Dam—the extended Cotter Dam project. The carbon impact of that project is being entirely offset with the use of offsets purchased through accredited schemes.

MR SPEAKER: A supplementary, Mr Hanson?

MR HANSON: A supplementary, Mr Speaker. Minister, why has the government not purchased any carbon offsets given its stated policy objective of becoming carbon neutral?

MR CORBELL: The government will consider the use of offsets into the future as it works towards its carbon neutrality objective. But, as I indicated in my previous answer, the government is already purchasing over 30 per cent of all of its energy needs from renewable sources, and we are a leader in the country in doing so.

MR SPEAKER: A supplementary, Mr Seselja?

MR SESELJA: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, what were the carbon offsets purchased for Cotter Dam and how much did they cost?

MR CORBELL: The offsets were the purchase of tree planting activities under the relevant accredited schemes. I can provide the details of that and the cost to the member, but I will need to take the question on notice.

Mental health—homeless people

MS BRESNAN: My question is to the Minister for Health and relates to people who are homeless and suffering a severe episode of mental illness. Minister, you recently announced that two more step-up, step-down mental health services are to be made available, one of which will be a facility and the other being an in-home service.

Minister, what is being done to ensure that these and existing step-up, step-down facilities and services are made available to people who are homeless?

MS GALLAGHER: I thank Ms Bresnan for the question. We have been working with the non-government sector. In fact, there was a meeting held about a week ago, maybe two weeks ago, around the allocation of these resources, a pre-tender meeting, before the tender was advertised on the weekend. I have raised the issue around supporting people with a mental illness who are homeless within our service system. In fact, Minister Burch and I have a meeting, I think on Monday, around better responding to and meeting the needs of people who are homeless across the public housing system and through Mental Health ACT.

I think there are some genuine difficulties in how we provide support to people who are homeless with complex mental health issues. I know from reading a number of the histories of clients of Mental Health ACT just how hard it is to always be in a position to provide services to people who might be homeless.

I did go out and visit last week a service run at Oaks Estate by St Vinnies, who are providing support to 26 men who have been at risk of homelessness leaving the Alexander Maconochie Centre or the PSU and providing support in that housing setting with great success. This has been funded through Mental Health ACT with a relatively modest grant of around \$250,000 to support those tenancies. It is working very well. I had a discussion with Health about that on Monday post my visit about whether there are additional opportunities to provide similar types of support to people who are at risk of homelessness because of their mental illness.

We are working pretty hard to meet the needs of this particular population group, but I would also say that it is very hard to say that we would always be able to meet the needs of this population group, and sometimes that comes down to individual client choice.

Ms Bresnan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I do appreciate the minister giving me the background information here, but my specific question was about access for people who have a mental illness and are homeless to the step-up, step-down facilities.

MS GALLAGHER: Well, they are not going to be ruled out of the services. There are two services; one is outreach into the home, so, in a sense, that does preclude people who do not have a home, because it is about maintaining a tenancy. The other service is around targeting young adults in the 18 to 25-year age group. But what I am trying to explain to you is maybe a step-up, step-down facility is not actually going to meet the needs of people who are homeless, because it is predicated on that consumer having somewhere to either stay—a house—and support being provided so they do not end up in the psychiatric unit or a place to go after they are coming out of a psychiatric unit.

What I am trying to say is that the model like the St Vinnies model, which is actually finding accommodation and providing support into that accommodation and trying to sustain a longer term tenancy is perhaps a more appropriate model for people who do

not have an existing tenancy or have no place to go. They are the discussions that we have been having and that, indeed, I will be having again with the ministerial council on mental health when we meet again in, I think, December.

MS BRESNAN: A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Ms Bresnan.

MS BRESNAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, have people who are under the age of 18 and who are homeless ever exited from an acute mental health facility to unsupported accommodation, and on what basis is this an acceptable practice?

MS GALLAGHER: Under the age of 18?

Ms Bresnan: Yes.

MS GALLAGHER: I am not aware of any case of someone under the age of 18 leaving a Mental Health ACT facility and being released into an unsupported environment. There is no case that I am aware of, but I will have to take some further advice on that.

This came up with a previous question on notice around someone going to the Dickson backpackers. Post that issue becoming public, I received correspondence from a number of business owners who said that they would no longer make their place available to people who had a mental illness based on the publicity that had got. I would have to say that I found that a little bit disappointing because Mental Health ACT do try to find—if there are restricted, limited, options and there is no family or permanent tenancy or there is a consumer who does not want to go to particular places, it is hard if options are ruled out. Not long ago I visited the Civic mental health team and I know how hard the staff work to support individuals in the community. But some of this comes down to individual choice. I am not aware of anyone under the age of 18 that I can recall, but I will take further advice on it.

MR SESELJA: A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Seselja.

MR SESELJA: Minister, in relation to the Oaks Estate example—and I think it is Samaritan House that you are talking about—what coordination occurs with service providers in Queanbeyan in particular, given the proximity and given we know that there is a lot of cross-over of the border with this population?

MS GALLAGHER: I thank Mr Seselja for the question. It is an additional service to Samaritan House but run by the same organisation. The workers who are funded through this program work very closely with particularly Queanbeyan GPs in supporting individuals who are living at Oaks Estate. They are also supported through Mental Health ACT, through the Civic mental health team. But following my visit out there last week and a request from the service provider that we look at ways to provide services at Oaks Estate, rather than people having to come in to the city to get

their treatment, we are doing some further work around that. I think several years ago services at Oaks Estate were contracted to Queanbeyan to provide that service, and that is not done now. It is done through Civic. So we are doing some further work around that.

MS LE COUTEUR: A supplementary, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Ms Le Couteur.

MS LE COUTEUR: Minister, how do Mental Health ACT staff provide follow-up care for people who are homeless once they exit one of the acute mental health wards, and how often is follow-up achieved?

MS GALLAGHER: That answer would depend on the nature of the individual needs of the particular client. If I can again use the Civic mental health team as an example, there is a lot of outreach provided. It is a fairly small team but they know their clients very well, particularly those ones that need constant follow-up. They do raise issues from time to time about being able to find people and provide them with their medication but I do not think that is unusual.

I do not think Mental Health ACT can solve people's housing issues. I think we are part of the answer. If there are ways to improve how we do that in terms of our relationship with the non-government sector, with Housing ACT and with other emergency housing providers, then we will continue to work on that. Mental Health ACT cannot solve someone's homelessness problem.

Industrial relations—work safety

MRS DUNNE: My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. In July 2009 the then ACT Minister for Industrial Relations went on the record to say that he opposed some of the proposed nationally harmonised OH&S laws, including maintenance of the Australian Building and Construction Commission and restrictions on union rights of entry. Mr Hargreaves said in the *Canberra Times* that he was not happy because it sent the wrong messages.

Last week Premier Keneally announced that she wanted to opt out of parts of the agreement that NSW signed with all the states and the commonwealth to implement nationally harmonised work safety laws specifically, among other things, in the area of union right of entry. Minister, is the ACT government going to keep its commitment to nationally harmonised OH&S laws? If not, why not?

MS GALLAGHER: Yes, we are. We have argued our case around the table in ministerial forums, particularly in relation to the disagreement that Premier Keneally is having around the right for third-party prosecution. We lost that argument around the table and we believe that there are benefits from moving to a harmonised OH&S scheme. When we lost that argument, we accepted that. We put up the good fight but we are part of the national harmonised OH&S scheme and we are not intending to follow the path of NSW.

MRS DUNNE: Supplementary question, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mrs Dunne.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, was the government's decision to go down the path of harmonisation before or after Mr Hargreaves expressed his reservations about the issue in July last year?

MS GALLAGHER: My understanding is that that was part of it, and that before agreement had been reached Minister Hargreaves did put those arguments to the ministerial council. In the end a majority of people around the table did not support that, and we accepted that. That is part of moving towards a national system. I know that there is some pressure locally from some of the unions around the right to third-party prosecutions. We have never had reverse onus of proof; we have never supported that here. I understand that there is a desire by some of our unions for us to follow New South Wales along the line of third-party prosecutions; however, we believe that there are rights under common law to access that if individuals choose. Therefore we are very keen to move on with the harmonised OH&S scheme.

MR SMYTH: A supplementary, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Minister will the Keneally withdrawal from harmonisation affect the implementation of a nationally harmonised OH&S system?

MS GALLAGHER: Not that I have been advised. I had a meeting today. As far as I understand, there is this issue in New South Wales but all other jurisdictions are very keen to press ahead. In health, where we have had WA move outside of some national agreements, that has not stopped the national agreement moving forward.

MR SMYTH: A supplementary, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, are you confident that all states and territories will meet the current 2012 deadline for harmonised laws and when will you introduce legislation into the ACT to do so?

MS GALLAGHER: Yes, that is the timetable. As to a date for any legislative reform that we need to bring in, I will have to get back to you on that. I am having my first meeting with the new Work Safety Council tomorrow, where this will be the number one issue for discussion, I imagine. So I will get back to you on that.

Children and young people—education disability services

MR DOSZPOT: My question is to the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services. Minister, now that some education disability services will be shifted to your department, how will DHCS service these students and their parents?

MS BURCH: DHCS provides a range of services to support students through Therapy ACT and other disability programs. We will support them in the environment of how the case plans work. I must admit that I missed the first part of your question because there was a conversation here.

Mr Doszpot: I am happy to repeat it.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, thank you, Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: My question, minister, is: now that some education disability services will be shifted to your department, how will DHCS service these students and their parents?

MS BURCH: We will service them as the requirements of that service shift. DHCS and DET already have an active partnership in service provision. We share a common client across many of those things, particularly those children with disabilities that are in education or schools, but they are part of our client base as well. There are ongoing formal arrangements as to how any transition and change will take effect. Without the specific service I cannot really respond, other than to give you in good faith an answer saying that DHCS and DET are working in a very strong partnership to make sure that service deliveries to those shared families are indeed in place.

MR SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Doszpot?

MR DOSZPOT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The chief executive of DET has advised that his department has been in consultation with DHCS. Can you please advise the Assembly of what has been discussed?

MS BURCH: There is a joint reference group and it is talking about programs and services delivered to children that share both DET and DHCS. One of those programs is a pilot of therapy assistance down in Woden school. That is an active partnership between DHCS and DET. I am actually quite excited about that.

That is being reviewed. That is being looked at and evaluated as the year comes to an end. I would be very interested to see how that pans out and to see what benefit that is. My health background tells me that therapy assistance on site can be a very valued addition. Other things that are discussed are transition from school. Black Mountain is also on the table and I think we have had that discussion about transition and post-school options.

MRS DUNNE: A supplementary question, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mrs Dunne.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, what discussions have you had with the minister for education or other officials in the department of education about this transfer of responsibilities and where will the money be coming from? Will the money also be transferred from the department of education?

MS BURCH: I do not have the detail of the money trail, so I can bring that back. There is an active working group, as I have said. Am I part of that active working group? It is between the chief executive of DET and DHCS. Minister Barr and I talk around this, but the two departments talk about this as well, and that is the active group. There are terms of reference for a disability education working group, and the membership of that is: manager, disability education and manager, learning support, the Catholic education office—so it is even broader than the two agencies—the Association of Independent Schools, a principal representative, a representative of Therapy and a representative of Disability ACT. So this is a broad conversation. It is not just public schools and Minister Barr's schools. It is not just Disability ACT. It is about ensuring that the non-government providers as well are lined up in this conversation.

Mrs Dunne: A supplementary question, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Mrs Dunne.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, what is the aim of the transfer of responsibility and services from the Department of Education to DHCS?

MS BURCH: I would say the premise behind any change to service is ensuring effective and efficient delivery.

Children and young people—consultation

MR HARGREAVES: My question is to the Minister for Children and Young People.

Mrs Dunne: You'll be waiting a long time.

MR HARGREAVES: For you guys I would wait a long time.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Mr Hargreaves, your question, thank you.

MR HARGREAVES: My question is: how does the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services engage and consult with younger people?

MS BURCH: Thank you, Mr Hargreaves. The ACT Labor government is committed to meeting the needs of all young people in the community, particularly vulnerable young people, and recognises the ACT community and its young people as a diverse group whose needs vary according to their social, economic and cultural backgrounds. This is reflected through the government's ongoing commitment to engagement with young people, the community, the government sector and the non-government sector.

The department, through the Office for Children, Youth and Family Support, continually engages and consults with young people in order to meet the government's commitment. We have got a young people's plan for 2009-14 that demonstrates significant ongoing consultation with young people. Throughout 2009 the department engaged with up to 600 young people face to face and through surveys.

The department also engages and consults with young people through the annual Youth InterACT Conference, and feedback from this forum has been vital in further policy development.

Consultation for the children and young people's plan was from young people from a diverse group of backgrounds, life experiences, cultures and abilities. In response to the engagement and consultation with young people, the department's Office for Children, Youth and Family Support facilitated a whole-of-government response to report on the progress of the 2010 implementation plan. This progress report will be tabled later this year. The department also engages and consults with young people through the Youth InterACT strategy which was launched by this government in 2002.

Broadly speaking, we engage with young people on issues that matter to them. This is something that we take quite seriously. This is why we committed in 2008 to provide an annual budget of \$20,000 to the Youth Advisory Council to hold forums, conduct online consultation and engage with young people who might otherwise not be heard. The Youth Advisory Council meets on a monthly basis and its co-chairs meet regularly with me to discuss current issues and to work with the council and its wider consultation. The YAC is an important group and does provide valuable information to me. The YAC comprises 15 young people, ranging in age and experience. It also undertakes public forums and is a good strong portal for youth.

National Youth Week in Canberra is another significant example of the department's engagement with young people in Canberra. Each year the department engages with other jurisdictions in the planning of National Youth Week and supports the ACT young persons representation in that planning process.

Through the Youth InterACT website, the department further extensively talks to young people in Canberra. A total of over 990 young people and other community members have registered on that site. We have also provided additional funding and a new space for the multicultural youth service. This was a deliberate exercise to enhance our connections with our multicultural youth.

As I have described briefly, the department extensively consults and talks with young people in the ACT in order to address the issues of young people. This is an extensive piece of work of the department and is clear evidence of this government's commitment to meeting the needs of the young people in our community.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Hargreaves, a supplementary question?

MR HARGREAVES: Minister, could you please tell us what the composition is of the Youth Advisory Council?

MS BURCH: There has been a number of changes to the Youth Advisory Council this year with the terms of a number of members expiring. An extensive recruitment process was undertaken to seek new members, and the department received 23 applications. Nine new members began their term at the October meeting just recently, and these members have been appointed for a term of two years with an option of a third year.

I am pleased with the new appointees and the energy and enthusiasm that they have brought to the council. These people come from a diverse range of backgrounds and range in ages from 12 to 24 with six females and three males. The council members include one member who is from an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander background, five from culturally diverse backgrounds, and one member has a disability.

I would like to name the nine new appointees: Ms Emily Bulger, Hannah Coleman, Daniel Gaffney, Ruth Simpson, Michael Smith, Elyssa Corner, Rebecca Courtney, Zane Bulot and Melissa Dimmick.

The council will be holding a planning day in November to develop the next work plan for the next 12 months, and I look forward to receiving a copy of this. I am particularly delighted with the new work the council is looking to undertake. For example, it is looking to convene a community forum on young people in transition. I am sure that would be of interest, given the conversations we have had in this place over youth transitions this week. The forum will focus on ways to support young people transitioning from education and training to employment or further education. A subcommittee is working through the details of that, and I am very pleased that that is, indeed, happening.

MS PORTER: A supplementary?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, what qualities do the new members bring to the Youth Advisory Council?

MS BURCH: I thank Ms Porter for her interest in YAC. The ACT government thinks it is important to engage broadly with young people in the ACT on issues that matter to them. In order to do that, it is necessary to have a diverse range of skills and experience. I am delighted to say that new appointees bring a range of qualities to the council.

The council has a new member who is currently home-schooling, is a young carer of her mother and a young person with a disability. The new council members are attending schools and universities as well as pursuing vocational opportunities. Some are graduates working full time on youth roles in government departments, and others are in the community sector in the ACT.

One council member is a peer facilitator to the create your future program where she represents Create and young people in care. Another member has worked with vulnerable young people on a range of issues affecting young people. Another council member runs a mentoring group for young males aged between 12 and 16 years and also volunteers at various community organisations, including Youth Alive. In 2005, a council member received the Prime Minister's award for skills of excellence and, in 2007, was the Tasmanian young Australian of the year award recipient. Both awards were for recognition of work for older Australians in the broader community.

Various council members have been representatives on youth councils and representative councils previously. Council members have a range of interests in the community, including an emphasis on arts, with its members being active in both the Canberra Youth Orchestra and the Canberra Youth Theatre.

I am very pleased with the quality. I think that is quite an impressive list of young people that have shown an interest in being a member of YAC. The skills, experience, interests and views that they will bring will, indeed, be quite fantastic. It is a diverse group and I believe that gives the government a good source of engagement with young people throughout the ACT on issues that matter to them. (*Time expired.*)

Ms Gallagher: I ask that all further questions be placed on the notice paper.

Standing order 73

Mr Smyth: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, under standing order 73, I seek your ruling in relation to standing order 62 or perhaps standing orders 202(a) or (e). On a number of occasions in the last five months you have had to bring Mr Hargreaves to heel—particularly on 23 June, 24 June and 29 June—for asking supplementaries that were clearly out of order. On 29 June you actually said:

If you continue to ask questions that are evidently out of order, you are going to push me to have to make a stronger ruling than simply ruling it out of order.

Mr Hargreaves did it in the last sitting period; he has done it again today. When will you make a stronger ruling than simply ruling it out of order, as he continues to ignore you?

MR SPEAKER: Clearly, Mr Smyth, it is the judgement of the Speaker as to when to make that call. It was not my judgement today that that was an issue I needed to cover. I also had cause to address Mr Hanson in the same way today, and I think that is an ongoing question of judgement. I note your concern.

Mr Smyth: So is that your ruling?

MR SPEAKER: I am not required to make a ruling, Mr Smyth. You asked me for my feedback.

Mr Smyth: No, I asked you on a point of order under standing order 73, and the Speaker has to make a ruling. It says “shall make a ruling”.

MR SPEAKER: I made a ruling on Mr Hargreaves earlier. I ruled his question out of order. Sit down, Mr Smyth.

Mr Smyth: And the point of order is, though, Mr Speaker—

MR SPEAKER: Mr Smyth, I have been clear. Sit down, thank you.

Mr Smyth: Well, no, you have not been clear, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Sit down, Mr Smyth. I will name you if you do not sit down.

Mr Smyth: The point of order clearly says—

MR SPEAKER: Sit down, Mr Smyth.

Supplementary answers to questions without notice
Mortgage relief fund
Industrial relations—work safety

MS GALLAGHER: On Tuesday, Mr Coe asked me a question about the mortgage relief fund—I think it was Mr Coe—around the cost of the work done by the Centre for Commercial Law at the ANU. The cost of that work was \$5,000 plus GST. All other costs of developing and administering the scheme have been absorbed by Treasury with revenue office staff administering the scheme.

The groups and organisations consulted for the mortgage relief scheme were: the ANU Centre for Commercial Law; CARE financial counselling services; Queensland, New South Wales and Victorian state government housing departments; the Legal Aid Commission; the ACT Council of Social Services; and financial institutions including Westpac Corporation, National Australia Bank, the Commonwealth Bank, Aussie, Bendigo Bank, Australia and New Zealand Banking Group, St George Bank, Community CPS Australia and Members Equity.

Also consulted were the Australian Bankers Association, the Mortgage and Finance Association of Australia, Abacus—Australian Mutuals, Australian Securities and Investments Commission, the Credit Ombudsman Service, ACT Office of Regulatory Services, the Financial Ombudsman Service, the Public Advocate of the ACT, the ACT Law Society; and peak accounting bodies, including the National Institute of Accountants, the Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Association of Certified Practising Accountants ACT.

In relation to a question around the work health and safety legislation and when it would be introduced, it is flagged for introduction in the autumn 2011 sittings.

Insurance—common law damages claims

MR CORBELL: Yesterday in question time Mr Seselja asked me about a keynote address that I gave to the Australian Lawyers Alliance ACT branch conference. He asked me:

In that speech, did you indicate that the ACT government would not be introducing thresholds or caps or similar changes to access to common law? If yes, did those statements reflect government policy on the matter? If no, what did you say in relation to that matter?

In the speech I gave on 23 June 2006, I indicated that, while at the time general caps and thresholds were resisted in the ACT, that did not mean that the government would

shut its eyes and not contemplate any changes at all. Indeed, at the time I said that nothing could be further from the truth and that my department continued to meet and monitor changes that might be desirable or necessary in the ACT.

At the time I also indicated that the ACT would continue to amend legislation to ensure that plaintiffs have appropriate access to the courts. I will just quote from a couple of my statements to reinforce that point:

General caps and thresholds were resisted in this jurisdiction—and do not form part of the ACT’s balanced economic model. That doesn’t mean that we have shut our eyes and will not contemplate any changes at all—nothing could be further from the truth—my department continues to meet with and monitor changes that might be desirable or necessary in the ACT.

I also said:

... the approach the ACT Government took was to take effective, equitable steps to put more money in the hands of plaintiffs and less in the hands of lawyers and their “bought and paid for” professional advocates acting as expert witnesses.

I finally said:

We need about 4 years of insurance data to start drawing conclusions. The first two years of data doesn’t mean that insurance is overpriced in the ACT—it just means we need to wait a couple more years to see what the final position is.

Yesterday in question time Mrs Dunne also asked me:

... why is it the case that you would not allow any recording of the speech that you made on 23 June 2006, and will you, by close of business today, table a copy of that address ... how often in your busy career do you ask that there be no record kept of speeches that you make?

In answer to Mrs Dunne’s question, now that I have had the opportunity to check the record, I can inform the member that I have no recollection whatsoever of making such a request when delivering my speech on 23 June. I can also inform the member that I have no recollection of ever making such a request at any public event I have attended during my time as a member of this place.

Mr Smyth: On a point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, will the minister table the speech that he was quoting from?

Mr Corbell: That is not a point of order.

Mr Smyth: No, well, I am asking would you table the speech. All right. Madam Assistant Speaker, under standing order 213, will the minister please table the document that he was just quoting from?

Mr Corbell: Yes, Madam Assistant Speaker, I would be happy to. I table the following paper:

Common law damages—Tort reform—Copy of speech by Mr Corbell.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Le Couteur): Thank you, Mr Corbell.

Bimberi Youth Justice Centre—re-offenders

MS BURCH: Yesterday in question time Ms Hunter asked a number of questions in relation to the percentage of young people exiting Bimberi who re-offended and were subsequently sentenced to AMC. In response to this question, when a young person exits Bimberi following a sentence the young person may or may not be subject to a good behaviour order with a supervision condition. If a young person is not subject to a good behaviour order with a supervision condition, any ongoing involvement with youth justice services is voluntary. Data is not maintained by the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services, which tracks young people into the adult criminal justice system.

Ms Hunter then asked a supplementary question around services and how long these services were provided. I think I made mention of a number, but for young people who are sentenced to Bimberi, case managers commence planning for the young person's transition as far as possible in advance of the young person's exit. This involves developing a transition plan with the young person and their family members and support people which addresses their needs, such as accommodation, income support, counselling, education, employment or re-establishing relationships with family, friends and community services.

As outlined above, if a young person exiting Bimberi is subject to a good behaviour order with a supervision condition, Community Youth Justice will provide ongoing case management to that young person in the community. Community Youth Justice case managers work closely with Bimberi case managers prior to and following the young person's exit in order to ensure continuance in case management. Community Youth Justice will provide a case management service for the duration of the young person's good behaviour order.

If a young person exiting Bimberi is not subject to a good behaviour order with a supervision condition, case management and services will generally be provided by a non-government community organisation. These services will be involved in planning with Bimberi case managers prior to the young person's exit. The length of time that that community service works with the young person is dependent on the young person's needs and their case plan. The turnaround program may also support a young person in transitioning from Bimberi to the community. Through the youth services and family support services, a number of community services are funded to provide services to young people who are exiting the system.

Ms Bresnan then asked about the connections with the corrections department and those exiting Bimberi. For any transfer of a young person from Bimberi to the AMC the primary objective is continuance of care in custody, which is achieved through consultation and information sharing between Bimberi and AMC staff. If a young person over 18 is transferred from Bimberi to AMC under section 111 of the Children

and Young People Act, information is provided from Bimberi staff to AMC staff on the young people's needs, risks and case management plans. This is outlined in the young people's policies and procedures and notified in the legislation register. If an adult is admitted to AMC who has previously been in custody at Bimberi or Quamby, AMC may contact Bimberi management to seek relevant information on the person's prior custodial history and case management.

Election commitments—mid-term report Paper

MS GALLAGHER (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Health and Minister for Industrial Relations): For the information of members, I present the following paper:

Achievement of Election Commitments—Mid-Term Report—7th Legislative
Assembly for the ACT, dated October 2010.

I seek leave to make a statement in relation to the paper.

Leave granted.

MS GALLAGHER: It gives me pleasure today at the halfway point of this term of government to table a document that lets the people of Canberra know how well the government is performing in relation to the commitments the Labor team took to the October 2008 election. It should be borne in mind that a great deal has been achieved in the past two years that has not been directly related to specific commitments we took to the 2008 election.

At the time of the poll the world was just waking up to the scale and potential impact of the global financial crisis. A significant amount of Labor's time, ingenuity and experience over the past two years has been directed at shielding the Canberra economy and Canberra jobs from the worst impacts of the GFC. It was time and experience well invested.

Our local economy has come through the crisis in magnificent shape. ACT Labor has worked shoulder to shoulder with industry right through the past two years, preserving jobs, keeping food on Canberra tables and keeping the economy humming. We have also worked side by side with the federal Labor government, acquitting the commonwealth's massive stimulus spending in the territory and doing so in a fashion that has made the ACT and the ACT government models for the rest of the nation.

At the same time, however, Labor has been delivering on the vision it took to the people in 2008, a vision for a better city and a stronger community. The document I table today outlines the extraordinary distance we have come at this midpoint of the term in delivering on our ambitions for this city and its people.

As always, there are instances where we have decided to deliver on commitments in a more effective manner and other instances where actions taken by the commonwealth have essentially delivered for us, meaning that we have been able to direct our best

efforts and greater energies elsewhere. And, as always, we have delivered on our commitments in a manner that is fiscally prudent, carefully targeted and evidence based.

We have managed to deliver capital works programs on a scale that no previous ACT government has been able to dream of, let alone achieve, and we have done it year after year, including in the first years of this term in the midst of a global downturn. We have not just protected jobs; we have created them. We have kept faith with the people of Canberra on the issues they tell us matter most to them day to day—health, education and economic and physical security. We have kept faith with Canberrans of the future by delivering on our commitments in relation to climate change, water and affordable housing.

Because we are a party and a government that believe in the core Labor values of equality and opportunity, we have also delivered on our commitments to those Canberrans most vulnerable to being left behind or marginalised—the elderly, the very young, those living with disabilities and those who devote long decades of their lives to caring for them.

The details are contained in the document I table today, but I would just like to highlight a few items to illustrate the manner in which the government has been working energetically right across the service delivery spectrum to improve the quality of life for Canberrans and the liveability of our city: 40 new hospital beds, new operating theatres, Australia's first public nurse-led walk-in centre, the ACT's first dedicated neurosurgery suite, more money for community-based mental health and a new mental health assessment unit.

There are more teachers in our primary schools, more teachers in our high schools and colleges, smaller average class sizes and dedicated literacy and numeracy coordinators in every school, new schools where they are needed and upgrades everywhere else. There are fibre broadband connections to every school and two-thirds of the preschools and around \$30 million in extra funding for the CIT and a pledge to see every young Canberran in full-time education, training or employment at least until the age of 17.

There is a new ACT skills network, reform to government procurement processes that will benefit local businesses, leadership in the area of climate change, with a commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40 per cent by 2020, the extension of the feed-in tariff to large-scale generators capable of powering many thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of homes, and great progress on a new Cotter Dam which will massively increase our water storage capacity overall and help secure our water supply for generations to come.

There is an aggressive push to get Canberrans out of their cars and into more sustainable forms of transport with dollars to match. There are dedicated bus lanes and bus priority measures on major roads. There is the Redex high frequency bus service running every 15 minutes from 7 am to 7 pm and more than \$7 million extra in the past two years alone on cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.

There is a commitment to break the back of housing affordability, despite the failure of the market, and a determination to manipulate what levers we can as a government to drive improvement. Hundreds of brand-new affordable dwellings have been delivered just in the past two years, courtesy of policies such as OwnPlace, land rent and the partnership between the government and Community Housing Canberra Affordable Housing, and 20 per cent of all greenfield estates are now to be devoted to affordable housing product.

And for those who have slipped through the cracks and become homeless, there is more transitional housing than before. There are new outreach services that seek out and connect with those on the street and allow them to start the journey towards secure tenancies and better lives. For those in our government houses, there are energy efficient makeovers. For all new public housing, there are six-star energy ratings.

There are more police to enforce the government's major reform of the Liquor Act. There is newer and better equipment and vehicles for our firefighters and paramedics, a dedicated seniors club for the Tuggeranong Valley, and a new Youth Advisory Council to ensure that the government is kept abreast of the issues confronting our city's youngest residents.

There is more money more quickly and with fewer hassles for carers. There is a companion card to allow Canberrans with disabilities to enjoy more of what this city has to offer. There are eight new speech pathologists to give our children the best possible start in the area of verbal communication and there is a microcredit scheme to help budding businesswomen achieve their dreams.

These initiatives naturally represent just a small fraction of the investments and achievements of this Labor government over the past two years in pursuit of a better city and a stronger community. I have selected them for special mention because collectively they give a flavour of what we have been working for and delivering over the 24 months since the last ACT election.

They are the legacy of a Labor team that is energised and enthusiastic and always on duty. We have never taken Canberrans for granted and we never will because we know that government is a gift, an opportunity to make a difference to a community's quality of life and also an opportunity to show leadership in relation to the really significant challenges that confront us all wherever we live.

As Treasurer, it gives me satisfaction to know that we have achieved so much in a manner that has left us with the strongest economy in the country, the lowest jobless rate and our AAA credit rating intact. We have maintained our unimpeachable fiscal reputation while remaining sensitive to the plight of those in our community who have been most vulnerable to the impact of the global financial crisis, those in housing stress, those without job security and those along the supply chain whose own livelihoods depend on the good health of the broader economy.

We have worked extremely productively with industry and community groups to step through some of these big challenges—planning, reform, procurement, housing

affordability and infrastructure—to come up with shared solutions. This work continues and we thank them for their partnership. I am pleased to be able to face the people of Canberra today on behalf of the Chief Minister at the midpoint of this term and report back to them on the promises that this government made two years ago.

Papers

Mr Corbell presented the following papers:

Subordinate legislation (including explanatory statements unless otherwise stated)

Legislation Act, pursuant to section 64—

Liquor Act—

Liquor (Fees) Determination 2010 (No. 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2010-273 (LR, 20 October 2010).

Liquor Regulation 2010—Subordinate Law SL2010-40 (LR, 20 October 2010).

Sport—ACT 4 GWS

Discussion of matter of public importance

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Le Couteur): Mr Speaker has received letters from Ms Bresnan, Mr Doszpot, Mrs Dunne, Mr Hanson, Mr Hargreaves, Ms Hunter, Ms Le Couteur, Ms Porter, Mr Seselja and Mr Smyth proposing that matters of public importance be submitted to the Assembly. In accordance with standing order 79, Mr Speaker has determined that the matter proposed by Mr Doszpot be submitted to the Assembly, namely:

The importance of ACT 4 GWS.

MR DOSZPOT (Brindabella) (3.24): Before I start my speech on this matter of public interest, I have to declare that as shadow minister for sport I was proud to be one of the early members of ACT 4 GWS. My colleague Alistair Coe signed me up, and he has motivated most of our Liberal colleagues to join in—all of our Liberal colleagues in the Assembly. As I understand it, there are other members of the Assembly who have also joined this campaign to try and attract the new AFL Sydney-based franchise Greater Western Sydney to play some of their games in the ACT.

Apart from our Assembly members, there are close to 5,000 other Canberrans who have signed up as members to date. I believe that the actual numbers, as of this morning, are around the 4,900 mark, agonisingly close to the 5,000 target required. I would like to recognise members of the ACT 4 GWS team who are here with us this afternoon.

The campaign was the brainchild of former Magpies Belconnen legend Peter Taylor, also a prominent Canberra businessman. Peter attended the launch of GWS in August 2009 and became aware of the opportunity for Canberra, as GWS was interested in establishing a presence in Canberra and the region to align with the recruiting zones

that had been allocated to it by the AFL. Peter Taylor talked Gary Buchanan into joining him to formulate a strategy and campaign. Their plan involved corporate sponsorship and community involvement as well as the support of the major local Aussie Rules clubs in Canberra. The target of 5,000 members was set to show the AFL that Canberra was serious about supporting this venture, and the number to date is already a significant show of support and commitment, especially when compared to the Gold Coast, whose membership stands at 7,000.

From the information I received from the ACT 4 GWS team, the Canberra community has taken up the challenge well and truly. In fact, the Belconnen Cats' last president, Rob Kelly, was leading the charge in signing up supporters for the ACT 4 GWS campaign around a month ago. Peter had secured, at that stage, almost 60 pledges in his efforts to help secure AFL in the region. The lifelong Carlton supporter said that motivation was not a problem when he heard about the campaign to have team GWS build a home in Canberra. He thought it would be fantastic to see a team commit to our region. That seems to underline the sentiments of most AFL supporters in Canberra—Mr Barr too, I would hope. While they have a historical allegiance to their favourite team, they want to see Canberra get the opportunity to be involved at the national AFL level.

The importance of ACT 4 GWS is obvious. If the campaign succeeds—Peter tells me that it is not if but when the campaign succeeds—GWS will play up to 20 games in Canberra over the next five years, four games per year. AFL in Canberra and the region will have a seat on the GWS board and GWS will continue to invest in local talent academies. GWS will establish a training base in Canberra and GWS will conduct community camps. GWS will field a team in the AFL Canberra competition or in a second-tier AFL competition that will feature Canberra clubs.

One of the tangible benefits to Canberra tourism would be having approximately 4,000 Sydney-based supporters coming to Canberra four times each year. The greater western Sydney-based supporters would, according to predictions, increase over the years, especially if the areas around Campbelltown and greater western Sydney catch the enthusiasm that has already been engendered amongst the fans by some of the AFL legends like Kevin Sheedy.

I attended a function at Manuka Oval a couple of months ago. Along with around 100 or so other supporters, including my colleague Mr Brendan Smyth, we were given an example of the persuasive power and enthusiasm of Kevin Sheedy and his interaction with the junior players. He talked at length about the virtues of a Canberra link with western Sydney as a means of ensuring the involvement of the once predominantly Australian football city that Canberra was—one that has produced champions such as Carlton icon Alex Jesaulenko and Essendon great James Hird. He pointed out to all of us that ACT 4 GWS is a great opportunity for Canberra and also for the AFL to once again regain a foothold in our national capital—that the capital city should be a part of truly national competition.

This is a message that other codes have delivered to their respective code administrators and have capitalised on for mutual benefit. The Canberra Raiders have

been great ambassadors for Canberra and enhanced the profile in junior development in Canberra and the region. Likewise, the Brumbies have contributed through their emergence as one of the significant teams in the Super 14 Rugby Union competition, profiling Canberra not only nationally but throughout the growing Rugby Union competitions in South Africa and New Zealand.

Thus there is an opportunity for Canberra, and also for the AFL, to once again regain a foothold in our national capital that should bring more benefits to the Canberra community through increased tourism and business opportunities, through junior and senior football development and through community involvement. Indeed, the strategy devised by Peter Taylor states that ACT 4 GWS is not just about securing a few AFL games at Manuka Oval each year: it also brings other opportunities for the local Aussie Rules participants. It gives a real opportunity to provide Canberra local talent with a clearer pathway to the AFL.

I understand that already GWS has signed five of our local boys on the club's inaugural list. A partnership with GWS and the new directions that have been outlined will mean an end to the fly-in, fly-out arrangements of the past; give us a Canberra team, a team that will play four matches in Canberra with a special ACT-designed jersey for the local matches; and give the opportunity for Canberrans to follow a team with local connections that will compete in the AFL. It is an opportunity that is there for the taking.

Peter Taylor and his hardworking team have done well to get so close to that magic 5,000 membership figure. But he is already talking about getting beyond that figure. He quotes the Hawthorn-Launceston connection that has been in place for a few years, where 8,000 members have been signed up. Obviously, that took a number of years. But the work that has already been put in is very significant. I would like to urge AFL fans here with club allegiances that this is not about love for the club; it is about love for the game and support for the AFL in Canberra.

If this campaign is successful, Canberra will have an opportunity to play a meaningful part in the overall development of the AFL. This is a rare opportunity where a professional AFL club becomes part of our city. We are not merely buying games, as Peter has said; AFL Canberra will have a seat on the board of GWS. This will further ensure that Canberra is heard in any future development in AFL. It will also mean that local clubs will have direct links in the national AFL league. It would also contribute to a stronger link between grassroots and elite sports, giving juniors a clear path to AFL development programs and access to broader competition opportunities.

There are proposals for a junior GWS squad for prospective Canberra talent to develop their talent, and the reserve team will play in the local competition. In fact, with regard to the second-tier competition, we would be the hub for the Riverina.

In addition to that, GWS already has an active community and schools program which would be a welcome addition to our sports outreach offerings here in the ACT. There are also prospects for a tie-in with the sports program at the University of Canberra which I think will serve to further enhance our profile as an internationally competitive sports industry cluster. I was proud to have been amongst the people who

attended the signing of the MOU between the University of Canberra and the ACT 4 GWS team.

Yet with all these benefits, I must add that I am excited by the prospect of having 20 professional AFL games in Canberra over five years. As we said, it is not a fly-in, fly-out arrangement; it is one that can continue to develop broader community and sporting links.

I do not want to get into the negotiation issues between the government and GWS; it is not our place. However, a partnership with our city and GWS is, hopefully, possible—as in the case of the Hawthorn-Tasmania experience. What is more, as AFL is more and more becoming an export commodity, our GWS ties would allow Canberra to not miss out on this opportunity, which further builds on our already-mentioned role as a burgeoning sports industry hub.

In closing, I would like to again commend the work that has been put in by a lot of people connected with the club. They include Peter Taylor; Gary Buchanan; the GWS chairman, Tony Shepherd; and the CEO, Dale Holmes. And of course there is the contribution from the supporting clubs—Ainslie Football Club, the Queanbeyan Tigers, the Belconnen Magpies and the Eastlake Football Club. There is the support of Peter Taylor's company, Pedders Suspension, and Autoco. And there is also the work that has been carried out by Coordinate.

All in all, it has been a very interesting and exciting community project that has now involved close to 5,000 Canberrans joining this membership. I hope that that membership grows well beyond that 5,000 and beats the ability of Mr Barr's team, Hawthorn, to draw 8,000 members, I think, in Launceston. I am sure that we have the capacity to beat or at least match that target.

I thank the Assembly for the opportunity to speak about this matter of public importance and I trust that there will be a fairly united approach from all of our colleagues here in the Assembly.

MR BARR (Molonglo—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Planning, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Gaming and Racing) (3.35): I thank Mr Doszpot for raising this matter this afternoon. I think he will find that this is a nice way to end a sitting week, with a little bit of agreement around the chamber about the importance of this community campaign, the importance of ACT businesses partnering with this community campaign in order to achieve something really positive for our city. I think it goes without saying that an opportunity is presenting itself for Canberra that is perhaps once in a lifetime and that as a community it is terrific to see that at a grassroots level, at an organised level within AFL in Canberra, our business community and government have been able to work together in order to get right to the brink of securing something really fantastic for Canberra.

I have just jumped on the website and can advise members that their membership counter is now up to 4,988. That would appear to be just 12 short of that 5,000 target. So if there is anyone in the building listening now who has not yet signed up, please

do so. If by the end of this speech I can see the membership counter tick over—I will hit “refresh” in a moment—I think this will be a fantastic thing.

I do accept that there is a challenge that Mr Doszpot has laid down that we, in Canberra, could, in fact, be more supportive of this new team than the Tasmanian community is of the mighty Hawthorn football club, but we do have a little catching up to do, noting that that arrangement has been in place for a little longer and that, in fact, what has occurred in Tasmania is that they have been able to sell membership to a club that exists and is playing games.

I think it is a credit to the Canberra community that nearly 5,000 have signed up to it and they have not got a product yet. We know it is coming and we know it is going to be fantastic. People have taken a leap of faith here and it is fantastic to see.

I think it is important to note from the outset that, as minister for tourism and minister for sport, I have been actively involved in working with the local organisations and with the AFL in order to see this come to fruition. I look forward to the day in the next month or so when we can stop referring to the team as GWS. It will have its own name and its own branding that will encompass something broader than just western Sydney. I think this is a part of what we are trying to achieve here.

The AFL have set out for this region and have been very clear from the start that, although the major economic base and the major population base for this team clearly is in western Sydney, it is a team for the region. Canberra is the second largest population base within the team’s region and we have a really important role to play. And I think that acknowledgement from the AFL from the start has been really important in ensuring that we get the outcome that I am now increasingly confident we will.

I think it is also worth acknowledging the role and the lead teams play in Canberra. They have a very strong mentoring effect on younger Canberrans. There is ample evidence to show that primary school and high school age kids are motivated into physical activity and are likely to stay active for longer and lead longer, healthier and more productive lives when they have these role models close by.

That is one of the reasons why we have established the Children’s Physical Activity Foundation and why we have the minister’s physical activity challenge. That is why the government supports sport at a community and elite level so strongly. That is why we work hard to ensure that teams like the Brumbies, the Raiders, the Darters, the Capitals, the Meteors, the Comets, just to name a few, continue to call our city home and continue to have such a strong community-based relationship. That is why we invest in sporting facilities. That is why we continue, as a government and a community, to support the most active sporting community in Australia.

Sport and physical activity have a massive economic impact as well. According to Access Economics, sport is contributing around \$245 million a year to the ACT economy and providing full-time work for nearly 3,000 Canberrans. This study that Access Economics undertook shows that participation in sport and recreation is saving the community over \$84 million a year in associated health costs. And if we were able

to halve the current rate of physical inactivity, we could save a further \$47 million a year. That is why initiatives and new partnerships like this one are so important.

But beyond this economic, social and health impact, this initiative, I think, is a great builder of social cohesion and the AFL—and I would like to pay credit to them today—have been at the forefront in this social leadership. They have taken important steps to stamp out vilification, whether that is based on race, on sex, on sexual orientation. They have set a great example and it is important that this parliament commends them for that.

AFL is the national sport. And I think it is critical that the national sport is played in the national capital at the highest level. That is why it is so important that we continue to work with the AFL and with GWS to finalise these arrangements.

There is no doubt there was a bad taste left in people's mouths over the way that the North Melbourne Kangaroos treated us in that period where they were playing matches, as Mr Doszpot indicated, effectively flying in and flying out. I do not think that relationship ended particularly well and there was, unfortunately but perhaps justifiably, a degree of cynicism about the nature of that relationship. I think the AFL have been genuine in wanting to ensure that their sport is played in every major city in the country and so have worked with us in the intervening period between North Melbourne leaving and GWS arriving to ensure that we still have quality AFL matches in the city.

We have worked to secure pre-season and premiership matches. A number of people and sponsors have been integral in ensuring that we have been able to keep up that presence. But it is important now to look at what this opportunity presents for us. It is moving beyond just purchasing matches. It is about having a real stake in our team.

There are hundreds of thousands of men, women and children who play AFL across this country. There are thousands in the city of Canberra. It is a game that appeals to all ages. We have just witnessed a fantastic masters carnival. Perhaps the highlight for those of us in this place was the politicians' victory over the media on Saturday night. In spite of the coverage that it was a 14-all draw, I confidently recall kicking two goals and seeing Paul Walsh kick one of the goals of the year. And I only recall one goal from the press gallery. How it ended up at 14-all, I am not sure.

Can I acknowledge the contribution of my colleague across the chamber Mr Coe, who played very well in the evening, and a number of other members of parliament. We could not quite make up a full team of 18 politicians. This was disappointing but there were quite a few Liberals involved, which was good to see. But it was just as well that we had such wonderful contributors as Paul Walsh who was able to step in and become a politician for the night and make such a strong contribution. But I digress.

The popularity of AFL nationally is clear to see, with 6.5 million tickets sold to AFL games during the last season and millions and millions of viewers watching matches. The average national audience reach for an individual round of AFL during 2010 was more than a million people. More than 3.6 million people watched this year's grand final. That is why having AFL in Canberra and having that exposure for our city is

really important and will help provide another compelling reason for people to visit this city.

Just as importantly, AFL is a sport that is loved by the Canberra community. Many thousands take part in local competitions, school-based carnivals and, increasingly, a large number of women and girls are participating. And that is fantastic to see. This year we saw 14,000 spectators jammed in to watch a fantastic match between the Bulldogs and the Swans. It was watched by a national TV audience of over half a million people. In short, the AFL's future in the ACT, I think, is looking very bright and it is important that we take advantage of this opportunity for the tourism and economic benefits that it will bring to our city.

We have noted that the environment for clubs selling matches has changed. The renegotiation of stadium agreements in Melbourne has meant Victorian-based clubs are less likely to want to sell matches interstate. The costs of running AFL teams are considerable. I am advised it is around \$30 million a year. This city, in and of itself, does not have an economic base, I think, large enough to sustain a team in our own right; so this partnership with GWS is the perfect solution for a city of our size.

We have continued our discussions with the AFL in the last few weeks to finalise this. We have explored extensively over a two-year period how the ACT can be part of the new team and what that team can offer the ACT community. I think there is agreement across the board now that we can have a genuine stake in this new club.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend GWS for the great faith they have shown in the Canberra community. One of their earliest recruits is young Josh Bruce, and GWS is providing a potential for Josh and no doubt many other Canberra-based AFL players to fulfil their AFL dreams. There is now a very clear pathway for juniors to come through the ranks in the ACT, the ability for a second-tier competition and for GWS to be involved. For that to include Canberra clubs, I think, is very exciting. Obviously a lot of the focus will be on the elite level but we need to recognise the pathway and the opportunities that are there for young footballers who might be in under 10s this year to see that there is the possibility, if they practise hard, keep fit and learn the skills of the game, that their career could take them all the way to the elite level.

Under the leadership of Peter Taylor and countless other prominent players and activists in local football circles, there is no doubt that this campaign has been a great success. I understand that the strong support that has been enlisted from the licensed club sector and many local companies has been critical in convincing those who are doing the sums in Sydney that this is going to work. We have seen a really important campaign run through the local media, with local players and AFL fans demonstrating their support. We all have a shared desire to see the national game played in the national capital.

As people have alluded to, I am indeed a passionate Hawthorn supporter. It is not that often that I will take out membership of another football club but I was very proud to be one of the very first to sign up to GWS, to act for GWS.

Mr Hargreaves: Some Hawthorn supporter you turned out to be.

MR BARR: I still maintain my membership of the Hawthorn Football Club and will continue to do so.

Mr Hargreaves: Where are the forms?

MR BARR: If you jump online, you can get in just in time. It is because of that shared desire of so many Canberrans to see this team be successful and to see this process—led at the community level and involving ACT businesses and finally now nearing completion in terms of a deal between the ACT government and the AFL around infrastructure, sponsorship and match-day guarantees—that we are very close, within, I imagine, about four weeks, to being able to make a significant announcement.

There is of course an important financial dimension to all of this. We will need to support this team with similar financial support that we provide for our other national league teams. We continue to have very positive discussions. They have been going on this week. We are discussing a 10-year agreement. We are looking at infrastructure at Manuka oval and what we might need to do to ensure that the financial returns to the team are there and that there is sustainability for the code in the ACT. So we are looking very hard at the financial realities.

We are also looking, though, at the benefits to the ACT community. We want to make ACT 4 GWS a reality because we hear this message that the Canberra community wants this team. It is an enormous opportunity, one that has the potential to deliver enormous benefits to our city.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (3.50): I would like to thank Mr Doszpot for bringing on this matter of public importance this afternoon. It is clear that around the chamber there is a level of support for it, and I think it is good that we take the opportunity to express that.

Like other members, I should probably declare what might be considered a conflict of interest upfront, as I am also one of the foundation members on the list. I put my money on the table as well to try and bring some AFL to Canberra. It would be fair to say that, when we talked about this in the party room this morning, I discovered there were a number of closet AFL fans in my party room whom I might never have picked. We have quite a few. It would also be fair to say that it was not universal. My colleague Ms Bresnan of course, as I think all members know, is a die-hard Broncos fan, and she is a little miffed at the departure of Israel Folau to team GWS. So I think there was a little bit of mixed feeling on that front.

I also feel some pressure now that Mr Barr was able to inspire with his fine words one extra sign-up on the web page during the time of his speech. I am closely watching to see if I can do a little better, but we will see how we go.

A lot has been said already about the potential benefits of having this partnership between the Greater Western Sydney team and the ACT, and I share many of those views. The obvious potential for having a team here and the pathways and the inspiration that can provide to young people is perhaps, to me, one of the most

attractive parts of the proposition. There is no doubt that having a clear pathway through will encourage young people to stay involved, to have a team that they associate with rather than necessarily having to leave town to follow their chosen sport. That would be of great benefit to the ACT, and we are not just talking about young men. AFL has a traditionally strong female support base, as well as very competitive women's competitions right through to the open age. A traditional view of it might be that this is talking about young men, but it actually crosses over the genders and cuts right through the community.

Having another top level sporting team in the ACT with proper role models will encourage greater participation by young people in the ACT, and it will also promote better health. I think the aspect of promoting better health is quite an important one as well as the level of participation. If you have a look at the figures from the Greater Western Sydney website already, the simple participation numbers and, therefore, the health benefits amongst young people, are extraordinary. They had more than 8,000 participants in the AFL Auskick program in Greater Western Sydney alone.

Through community club football, they have access to 26 junior and senior clubs across Greater Western Sydney. Nearly half of the schools in the area are involved in AFL programs, and the Paul Kelly Cup has nearly 2,500 participants from Greater Western Sydney schools. So I think you can see the impact that AFL has in an area where they have not yet had a team. I know the ACT, of course, has a very rich history of AFL. I grew up in Batemans Bay where my Batemans Bay Seahawks played in a south coast competition. We did not make it into the ACT competition, but I know that across the ACT clubs, such as Ainslie and many others have a really proud and deep history. You just have to go to somewhere like the Eastlake Football Club and see the memorabilia on the wall and the list of past champions to know how deep and rich that history of AFL in Canberra is. Taking the opportunity for us to partner with the new GWS team I think will only enhance that rich history.

But, of course, there are benefits for the city as a whole beyond those for AFL tragics in the city. For Canberra there will be television and internet exposure, as these matches will be beamed all over the world and not just in Australia. I know that they are beamed all over the world, because I have a friend who has just been posted to the UK for work purposes and she signed up to some satellite TV company just so she could get AFL matches through the course of the season. We, of course, just saw the match played in China a week or so ago as the AFL attempts to expand coverage and participation around the world.

Obviously there is employment and income for local businesses on match days and, clearly, if we are able to structure the games in a way that increases the number of overnight visitors, all the better for the tourism sector in the ACT. We were just debating that sector yesterday and talking about the many forms in which tourism and events can contribute to the local economy.

I think another interesting factor which has not been touched on so much in the debate already is that GWS has already built strong corporate support in western Sydney. With matches regularly taking place in Canberra, those corporate supporters will inevitably come to this city to follow the matches. I think the possibilities arising from that simple exposure of the ACT and Canberra to those corporate players in western

Sydney and the potential economic and employment opportunities flowing from that are perhaps difficult to measure, but they are some of the interesting possibilities that may emerge from that strong corporate support that the team has already generated.

We are discussing all of this, of course, before the team has even launched, let alone got itself a name. The level of excitement attached to it is palpable and I think quite positive for a team that has not even got off the ground yet. Having the team come here regularly will enable Canberrans to regularly see high quality AFL matches in the city. Of course, away teams will come as well, and fans of those teams will no doubt flock to the games, too. It will see Canberra become a regional hub, because, despite New South Wales being historically a rugby league state, there is right through the region a strong affiliation and strong attachment to the AFL competition. I think we would see people coming from around the region—the Riverina, Goulburn, Orange and the south coast—for these matches. Placing Canberra as a regional hub for this sporting team I think would work very well.

Having top level AFL matches in Canberra will improve the usage of our major sports facilities. The more they are used, the more the overall costs are offset. Obviously, if a facility is used only once or twice a year, the costs are not dissipated as much. And I do want to touch on the costs, as I think it is something we need to be mindful of.

It has been interesting to watch the negotiations the minister has had with the AFL in the last couple of years around what price games will be and how willing the ACT has been to pay for those games. I want to give the minister some credit here, because he has not taken an approach of getting AFL to Canberra at any price. This really only comes from reading the newspapers—and we all know how much one should be careful in judging one's information from the newspapers—but my sense is that the minister has been prudent in simply not signing up to AFL at any price. That is something we need to continue to be mindful of as we go through the negotiations with the AFL.

The AFL are clearly a commercial operation at some level as well. We see that in some of the activities they undertake and the way they conduct themselves. I think we have to negotiate hard to make sure that we enter this partnership in a way that is viable for the ACT on an ongoing basis, because we are talking about a 10-year partnership, and that is something that we will need to take into account.

We must also consider the costs that will go with providing the necessary stadium facilities, whether that is some sort of upgrade at Manuka Oval or a longer term move to Canberra Stadium if we see a reconfiguration of that stadium. We regularly debate in this place the economic pressures upon the ACT and the pressures upon the ACT budget. The potential investments and the numbers we have seen put around for stadia upgrades are very substantial. I recall when the minister released various options last year that one of the options of the four that was set out for the possible redevelopment and construction of stadia had a price tag on it of \$300 million. Obviously there was federal money presumed in that sort of package, but it gives us a sense of the potential scale of expenditure that is required. If we were to see those sorts of numbers being put around to improve our stadia facilities in the ACT, I imagine we would have a very animated debate in this chamber.

Having perhaps added those few words of caution, I will close by simply offering my support on behalf of the Greens for the bid. I think the team have done an excellent job so far. I met Peter Taylor at an event recently. I had never met Peter before and he rocked up and said hello to me, and he knew that I had signed up. I had never particularly said anything publicly about it, so he is clearly right on top of his bid and who is signing up to join it. I suspect that also means any of his friends who have not joined up are on a hit list.

I think the team have done an excellent job putting in a very professional bid and being very enthusiastic about it. I have been receiving emails from some of the clubs around town I am a member of imploring me to sign up—which I already had done—and to sign up my family. There is a great energy to the bid, and I hope that it will be successful and that we will be enjoying high level AFL in the ACT.

MR COE (Ginninderra) (4.00): I am very thrilled that today's matter of public importance is about the strong possibility that the ACT and region may soon have ownership of an AFL team. Firstly, I would like to say that I fully endorse what my colleague Steve Doszpot said in his support of this campaign for a permanent home for AFL in the region. It is certainly a campaign I am very passionate about. Canberrans certainly have an affinity with Australian rules football. Whether it be because so many Canberrans came up from Melbourne with the public service agencies in the 1950s and 1960s, through the national expansion of the game in the 1980s and 1990s, the success of the Auskick program or by many other means, there is room for a home for AFL in the capital territory.

In spite of never having had a team in the AFL or the VFL before, the region has punched well above its weight when it comes to producing players. Whether it be James Hird, Alex Jesaulenko, Shaun Smith, Mick Conlan, Ian Low or Aaron Hammill, Canberrans have done very well in the top league of football. It is also worth mentioning Bob Furler, who was a premiership winning captain coach at the Ainslie Football Club and also a joint winner of the Tassie medal in 1947 for the outstanding player at the Australian rules football interstate carnival. The players I have just mentioned were from the ACT. If I was to discuss the region and to include the Riverina, in particular, the list of players would be as long as your arm, including the likes of Carey, Kelly, the Danihers and many, many more.

Unlike some other sports with national leagues, the AFL, like the NRL and Super 14, have supporter followings that extend beyond those actually playing the sport. By this I mean that, for some sports, it seems that the crowds are likely to almost exclusively come from those that play the sport or used to play. For supporters of AFL, I think a much larger proportion would follow the competition in spite of not having had any formal connection with playing the game themselves. This means the potential supporters of an ACT team would extend beyond the current Australian rules football clubs. However, the clubs certainly do have a strong role to play.

The AFL has always been cautious when expanding the league into new markets, and I think most will say its expansions have generally been very successful. For some other sporting codes, we have seen expansions that have not worked out for one

reason or another. I think the AFL has been very keen to ensure that any new team does survive and is in fact a premiership contender soon after entering the competition. To that end, we can be confident that the GWS team will be a threat for the premiership, and it is possible that the cup could one day come to Canberra.

What would a successful ACT 4 GWS campaign actually mean? GWS will play up to 40 games in Canberra over the next 10 years. AFL in Canberra and the region will have a seat on the GWS board. The GWS will continue to invest in local talent academies. GWS will establish a training base in Canberra and the region. GWS will conduct community camps in the region, and GWS will field a team in the AFL Canberra competition or in a second tier AFL competition that will feature Canberra clubs.

The campaign to get 5,000 on board with GWS has been very well executed through media campaigns, on-the-ground promotion at clubs, signage at grounds around the territory and word of mouth. The target is very close to being reached. This is a tremendous effort. I think Canberrans have a bit of a history of being a little reserved when it comes to backing our sporting teams, especially when they are not winning. So to get near to 5,000 people to pledge \$50 for a team that has not yet played a game in the big league is very impressive and a tribute to the ACT 4 GWS team.

I am very pleased to say that all members of the ACT opposition are on board with GWS and have pledged our support to make the ACT 4 GWS campaign a reality. Each Liberal member of the Assembly acknowledges the benefit of the team and just how good it would be for the ACT community. I encourage all Canberrans to get behind this bid.

Again, this is not about getting the odd game in Canberra and living match to match; this campaign is about getting a team that invests in Canberra and, in turn, Canberra can invest in them. It is about us all having pride in a team and giving football in Canberra an identity in the national league. An example of the promotions are as follows: the Canberra branch of the Geelong Football Club, the Canberra Cats, which I am a member of, has promoted the cause extensively. One sentence in a recent email stood out: "It's not about barracking for GWS; it's about getting top sides playing here." Here you have paid-up members of the Geelong Football Club supporting the GWS campaign. That is what I am. So even if you barrack for another team, you can and should get on board with GWS. It means so much to the promotion of AFL in the national capital.

I would like to pay tribute to some of the key organisations that are supporters of the campaign here in Canberra. My colleague Steve Doszpot has already mentioned them: Ainslie Football Club, Queanbeyan Tigers, Belconnen Magpies, Eastlake Football Club, Pedders Suspension, Autoco and Coordinate. Whilst mentioning the Belconnen Magpies, which is, of course, in my electorate of Ginninderra, I would like to congratulate our president, Bob Garrett, on his commitment and his club's active involvement in the campaign. But by far and away the key person to commend and thank is Peter Taylor for his commitment to the cause. If this campaign is successful, all Canberrans will owe a great deal to Peter.

A successful campaign will mean millions of dollars for our economy, an invaluable addition to the cultural and sporting lives of our city, a professional team for younger players to strive towards being a part of and to look up to and additional promotion of our great city around Australia. The business development manager of the ACT Southern News South Wales region for the AFL, Garry Buchanan, also deserves to be commended. He and David Pembroke from the contentgroup and the rest of the team in Canberra have fought tirelessly to make this a reality, and I welcome him here today.

Furthermore, I would like to put on the record my thanks to the GWS chairman, Tony Shepherd, and the CEO, Dale Holmes. Dale has spent a lot of time in Canberra over the recent months promoting the team and the ACT presence. Of course, the team GWS head coach, Kevin Sheedy, has played an integral role in promoting the game around Australia for decades. We in the territory have been privileged to have his presence and his promotion of the GWS team in Canberra and the region over recent months.

Most of the people I mentioned were at the announcement of a memorandum of understanding between GWS and the University of Canberra on 9 September. This is a great partnership and is signed by Dale Holmes and the vice-chancellor, Professor Stephen Parker, based around sharing resources and facilities and putting the experience and expertise of both parties to common use. Such collaborations between professional sporting teams and universities are growing in number across the world and represent a great opportunity to benefit all concerned.

The University of Canberra sports studies professor, Keith Lyons said:

The partnership between the University and GWS is a great opportunity to support an exciting venture for sport in the capital region. Both partners have made big commitment to community development.

Finally, I ask the ACT government to assess what they can do to remove barriers and to support what promises to be a great boom for the territory. What the club needs is certainty. The ACT government must be clear about what they can and will do to help make the GWS presence in Canberra a reality. We cannot have year-by-year negotiation when we are looking for a long-term commitment from GWS. We need a government and a minister who is decisive and committed to do all that is reasonable for this campaign.

I know that the minister is, of course, a supporter of AFL, and he probably needs very little convincing of this importance. I support ACT 4 GWS. What I have briefly described today is a well coordinated campaign of football lovers, community-minded people, business, education institutions and governments who are keen to bring about a team in the AFL that Canberrans can take ownership off. In their words, it's our team.

MR HARGREAVES (Brindabella) (4.09): It is no secret to anybody in the Assembly that I am a massive AFL fan—except for the blind, deaf and stupid, and you can put

up your hands for any one of those three. I thank Mr Coe for recognising all of the big players in this and also my colleague Mr Barr. With respect, Mr Coe, you were a bit remiss: you forgot Brian Quade, the president of ACTAFL in Canberra, sitting up in the gallery. This bloke is as misguided a person as you have seen in his allegiances. Nevertheless, he is a very effective operator in AFL in the ACT.

It has been hard to wipe the smile off my face since that torturous long weekend in October that ended with Collingwood as premiers—108 to 52, Madam Assistant Speaker. I will say it again: 108 to 52, and we beat St Kilda. My condolences to the departing Mr Smyth, to Mr Kiermaier and, dare I say it, Mr Dick Stalker, who lost a heap of money on it, as we thought he might.

There is only one thing better than beating St Kilda in the grand final and that is beating them by one point in the grand final. For those who do not know what that is, you need to go and do your history because your education is sadly lacking. But I am under no illusion that Collingwood—

Mr Smyth: But you do hold the record for having lost the most grand finals.

MR HARGREAVES: I might remind Mr Smyth that since 1958 Collingwood has won three grand finals to their one, which they stole after the siren because that renegade Barry Breen kicked it after the siren and it should have been disallowed. If they want to celebrate their bushrangery they can go ahead and do it. But winners are gingers and the rest of you can please yourselves.

I have no illusions, of course, that Collingwood will play here should the ACT 4 GWS bid be successful. We host AFL games at Manuka Oval. It is an exciting prospect that the ACT could have a formal permanent and meaningful link with an AFL club. AFL has a rich history in Canberra, having played here for over 80 years. When settlers moved to Canberra they brought with them their passions, including AFL, soccer and cricket. As a matter of fact, when I first came to Canberra in 1968 it was the local AFL that was broadcast on Channel 7 TV. The local competition is deep with history. We have witnessed the glory days of local football—the great local rivalries of Eastlake, Manuka and Ainslie watched on by crowded hills. Manuka Oval has been central to the history of AFL in Canberra, having hosted the first grand final in 1930. Mr Smyth was about three then. Since 1998, Manuka Oval has hosted a number of elite AFL matches, including 14,000 people packing in to watch the Sydney Swans take on the Western Bulldogs earlier this year.

Mr Smyth: Did you ever play on Manuka Oval?

MR HARGREAVES: I have actually, but we will talk about that some other time when we talk about what it was I played. It looks significantly different nowadays, though, but it still has a familiar glow of former glory. Over the years our local competition has produced a number of AFL superstars, including former Carlton legend Alex Jesaulenko, who would not be famous except for using a Collingwood player to get up into the air in the first place. If it had not been for Collingwood he would have been a nobody. He would have been a nobody if it had not been for Collingwood. Current Essendon coach and former captain James Hird comes from a

very famous Canberra AFL family. I say g'day to his dad, Allan. There is current Sydney Swans co-captain Craig Bolton and, most recently a young Eastlake player, Josh Bruce. He became the first local player to be signed by Greater Western Sydney following his selection in the 2010 all Australian under 18 team.

How good is this? His selection highlights the pathway that many young Canberran footballers aspire to when they participate each week. As part of the nurturing of local talent, GWS have stated their intention to create a junior GWS elite talent squad for Canberra's best talent enabling them to prepare their skills as they move through the age brackets. This will help the local players. It is the best opportunity yet to develop their talent and train with a high quality squad. There are now over 24,000 participants in AFL in the ACT and surrounding region and participation numbers in Canberra are continually improving.

I could not make a speech about AFL without talking about the women's league. I recognise Gary Buchanan in the gallery today. He was around when I was pestering everybody to try and get the women's league recognised.

Mr Doszpot: Ten short, John.

MR HARGREAVES: Ten short what?

Mr Doszpot: Numbers. We need 10 more members—

MR HARGREAVES: No, you do not; you need nine. I just signed up. I would be very interested to know—I ask the minister to check it out—whether GWS is going to have a women's team. That would be fantastic. You might also like to know that it was Tuggeranong that won the women's AFL grand final this year, Mr Smyth. I can see he is absolutely schizophrenic. He is beside himself here. He loves his footy does our Mr Smyth.

Mr Barr: They were wearing Hawthorn colours, weren't they?

MR HARGREAVES: No. Nobody would dare go out in daylight hours wearing Hawthorn colours, Mr Barr—not without armed guards anyway. Since 2001—this is really interesting—the ACT government has supported AFL Canberra with nearly \$400,000 in operational support, as well as, of course, supporting numerous other capital works projects through local clubs. High demand for the AFL in Canberra has required upgraded facilities throughout the territory. The government has not only improved the top-end facilities of Manuka Oval and Greenway but also supported local facilities. I am still going to badger the government about knocking off that oval at Isabella Plains for a proper training facility for my beloved Tuggeranong Hawks, but we will talk about that some other time.

We talked about climate change earlier on. I am sorry; it is not Greenway. It is the Gordon district playing fields—home of the Tuggeranong Hawks. We have introduced the Point Hut pump station to irrigate those playing fields rather than use potable water. It will provide a minimum of 95 per cent of the requirements of the 6.9-hectare playing fields, which explains the excellence of the players who come out of that particular Tuggeranong football club.

By the way, this \$200,000 investment ensures that local kids have the best opportunity to emulate all the AFL stars from Tuggeranong, like Essendon premiership player Justin Blumfield and, as mentioned earlier, former St Kilda captain—losers!—Aaron Hamill, who had the good sense to leave. But where did he go? Carlton. There is no accounting for taste, is there? That is another good thing that Collingwood would like to do after beating St Kilda again—beat Carlton.

I was told by Mr Doszpot that we are 10 members short. As of this morning there were 4,932 membership pledges, but do you see this? You were knocking me about this. In that man bag, for the purposes of the *Hansard*—

Mr Seselja: Is that a purse or a man bag?

MR HARGREAVES: No, that is a man bag. It is a utility satchel, you ignoramus. The difference is that it has not got a shoulder strap.

Mr Seselja: Does it have your moisturiser in it?

MR HARGREAVES: Where is your feminine side, Mr Seselja? That is why you could not get a game in AFL, mate—because you are not in touch with your feminine side.

Can I now turn to the really serious bit about this? We need to remember that in football, and in fact in any sport, the best part of it is having a lot of fun—having a lot of fun and giggles on the field and having sportsmanship. We have a tourism aspect to this. It would be a drawcard for this city. But, more importantly, the Greater Western Sydney team is a professional outfit. Kevin Sheedy would not touch it if it was not a professional outfit. Having a professional outfit essentially co-base itself using Canberra as that base is probably the most fantastic news for AFL supporters for decades. If we are to have an incremental step towards having our own team in the AFL, which will happen well after I am gone, this is the only way to go about it.

Mr Smyth: Well, go now and assist the process.

MR HARGREAVES: I will be gone next Thursday. We have seen teams go down the gurgler. Cosmos is one. You know about that, Mr Doszpot. But there are other teams that have tried it and not quite made it. I think there is a good chance that GWS is going to be a real force. It will take a little while. What better place to nurture that talent and all of that corporate commitment to AFL than here in Canberra? I think this is the best thing since sliced bread.

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (4.19): On behalf of the Liberal Party in this place, where all members are members of the GWS bid, I would just like to add a few words and thank a few people as well. It is really important that young players have something to aspire to. They need to have heroes who will inspire them to be the best that they can be, whatever their sport. You can see in a way the decline, almost, of Australian rules football in the ACT. Firstly, the Cannons, followed by the Raiders and then the Brumbies in particular brought to this town first-rate football—the best football of the

code. You can see the success. Canberrans in particular like successful teams. We need to have in place, for those kids that follow Aussie rules, a number of games played here in Canberra colours to give them something to aspire to. I can attest to this. I played Aussie rules in the mid-1960s in Sydney. I can recall a game—

Ms Le Couteur: In the mid-sixties?

MR SMYTH: Yes, the under 7s, 1966.

Mr Barr: I didn't realise you were that old, Brendan.

MR SMYTH: There is laughter. It was under 7s and under 8s, St Patrick's primary school, Kogarah Aussie rules club. We won. I was in two grand finals. I saw St Kilda do a demo match in Sydney—the whole team. We all barracked for St Kilda for the rest of our lives. Now, 44 years later, I may be the only one that kept that vow and I lived to see the St Kilda grand final. Seeing those guys playing and the standard that they played at just inspired young kids. Our team was coached by one of the fathers at my primary school. Our greatest victory was 144 to nil win against Greenacre who were coached by the local nun. There was a little inter-religious rivalry there. But we had something—we had an example; we had something special. That is what we need in this city.

When I came to Canberra in 1969 I played a couple of seasons for Woden-Manuka. It does not exist anymore. At that stage there were probably 20 or 24 teams, or 20 or 24 clubs, in the local area. We had the ACTAFL and the Monaro league. A lot of Aussie rules was played. Really, south of Goulburn at that stage was Aussie rules territory. I think that decisions made by the AFL let Aussie rules in the territory and southern New South Wales down.

You can see it because the followings have travelled to the best teams in the territory. They go to the Raiders, they go to the Brumbies and they follow that success. People like success and they like seeing the highest level of the sport. That is what GWS are offering us. They are offering us a chance to see 40 games in the next 10 years and to see that level of sport. They are giving our kids something to aspire to, to be thrilled by, and an incentive to train harder.

Apart from all the other benefits about pride in the city, getting the kids to join, issues of inclusion and addressing issues of mental health, which organised sports does, it really is a time of great pride and everybody should be behind it. I hear Mr Hargreaves has just joined so that will make two from the Labor Party. I know that Mr Rattenbury has joined. Are there another three, Mr Rattenbury, so that we can get these last 10?

Mr Barr: The Treasurer's a member.

MR SMYTH: The Treasurer. So we have got three out of the seven members of the Labor Party. Madam Assistant Speaker, you can speak for yourself when we have finished. It is about leadership and it is about helping those guys who are doing a good job for us to do this. Dave Pembroke and Gary Buchanan are here, as well as Mr Quade, the president. Welcome, Mr President, in that capacity.

We have got great people doing a good job here and we need to back them up. Having Sheedy as the coach is great. He has already spoken in Canberra a number of times. He understands about country sport. He understands about regional sport. He can rattle off the names from Canberra and the surrounds who have come through the grades and gone on to great things, initially in Melbourne when it was all played in Melbourne, and now around the country in the various teams. It is an opportunity that we should grab. It is an opportunity that we should do everything in our capacity as individual members here to support. We should encourage the minister to support it and we should encourage the city to support the GWS bid for the ACT.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Le Couteur): The time for this discussion has expired.

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill 2010

[Cognate bill:

Climate Change (Greenhouse Gas Emission Targets) Bill 2008 (No 2)]

Clause 7.

Debate resumed.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (4.24): I rise to speak to the amendment that Mr Seselja moved before lunch, which seeks to cut the proposed reduction target from 40 per cent to 30 per cent. The Greens will not be supporting this amendment. We chose to support the 40 per cent target because it is based on science. It is based on the best possible evidence of what this planet needs us as the inhabitants to do.

I heard Mr Seselja calling across the chamber at Mr Corbell earlier about it being some magic number. In fact, it is a number that is actually in science. It is in the Bali climate negotiations. It is in a series of scientific papers. It is the best possible science that we have. What the science is telling us is that it is the appropriate target to be aiming for in order to prevent dangerous climate change. It is scientifically based.

It contrasts with Mr Seselja's number. He has plucked out of the air 30 per cent and is running this extraordinary line that 40 per cent is going to ruin us all but 30 per cent will be okay. It was a shame I had to speak after Mr Corbell because he spent some time pointing out the fraudulent nature of Mr Seselja's argument and I think he summed that up quite well. I think it is worse than that. I think Mr Seselja is putting forward a deceitful argument where he is trying to convince the community of Canberra—

Mr Seselja: On a point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, I know that Mr Rattenbury is feeling fired up but it is not appropriate for Mr Rattenbury to be calling me deceitful. I think that, particularly as the Speaker, he would know this. We get called to order for much less in this place. I would ask you to ask him to withdraw it.

Mr Hargreaves: On the point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, my reading of what Mr Rattenbury was saying was that it was the argument that was deceitful and not Mr Seselja.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Le Couteur): I would have to say that I also believe that Mr—

Mrs Dunne: On the point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, that is a nice argument. But when you say that someone uses a deceitful argument, the clear implication is that you are making an assertion about their character and the sorts of arguments they would give and therefore they are deceitful. The member should be asked to withdraw.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Thank you, members, for your contributions. I do not believe there is a point of order. Mr Rattenbury was describing the argument, not Mr Seselja. Mr Rattenbury, you have the floor.

MR RATTENBURY: I think it is an appropriate description because the argument simply does not stack up. “Thirty per cent is painless but 40 per cent is going to ruin us all.” It is the worst kind of Liberal Party dog-whistling that John Howard so epitomised. Mr Seselja has put forward no modelling whatsoever to demonstrate this. He has got nothing to base the difference between the 40 per cent and 30 per cent on. There is not a skerrick of modelling behind it and it is simply embarrassing that that is the kind of argument that is being propagated to make a case in this place.

We do need to be mindful of the financial impacts of these policies. And I think every member of this place has made that observation through the course of the debate already. He cannot stand here today and predict all of the costs. It is impossible to do. Over the next 10 years, as we strive towards this target, technology will change. The federal government will probably finally introduce some substantive policies. A number of things will happen. I think anybody who stood here today and said this is exactly what it is going to cost over the next 10 years would be being untruthful because nobody has that capacity to predict. But we must be vigilant over the next 10 years, as we strive towards this target, to do it in the most economically efficient way we can find. I think that is how we have to also look at the whole equation.

The Liberal Party come into this place and talk about costs all the time. It is always about the costs. I do not think I have ever heard them talk about the benefits that some of these policies deliver. I think that is unfortunate, because we have to be realistic. There are costs involved here. But there are also benefits to this community. There will be positives. There will be new jobs. New jobs will be created in new industries. There will be reduced energy bills from making homes more energy efficient. These are positives that will be delivered to Canberra families.

Canberra families will benefit from improvements to public transport. It always amazes me the way that Mr Seselja talks about the imposition of public transport on people. He talks about the people in Conder. If we get better public transport in this town, people who live in places like Conder, Macgregor, Weston Creek, right across Canberra, including parts of Gungahlin, potentially will have better access to public transport and will be able to choose to not necessarily have to drive. They will have the choice of catching a decent bus service if we improve the public transport in this town. But it does not suit the narrative to actually identify some of those positives, some of those benefits.

I think it is simply dog-whistling of the worst kind that we see from the Liberal Party to imply that costs will never increase, which is the implicit argument that Mr Seselja tries to put. "Do it our way and there will never be a cost increase." It is simply not true.

I wanted to pick up on the point that Mr Seselja was making about electricity price increases. He said that the ABS indicates that prices have increased by 45 per cent. He then verbally me when he said that I was disputing that figure. I do not dispute the ABS figure, although I do note that the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission in the ACT has indicated a figure of 40.7 per cent. Either way, it is still a substantial number. I do not dispute that, despite Mr Seselja's verbally my earlier comments.

But it is interesting to reflect on what has driven those electricity price increases in that period. It is not some great climate conspiracy. It is not some great lefty conspiracy. No, let us actually look at some of the press releases by the ICRC on electricity price increases over the last four years because I think they are instructive. We will start with 2007 when regulated retail prices in the ACT were deemed to increase by 16.7 per cent by the ICRC. The commissioner said:

The price increase is driven by increases in the wholesale price of electricity which rose dramatically in April and remained high through the beginning of June.

He went on to say:

The current drought is impacting the availability of hydroelectric power from the Snowy system and water for cooling thermal base load generators in Queensland.

That would be coal-fired electricity. In 2008, electricity prices rose by 7.1 per cent on average from 1 July. The stated reason for that price increase, he said, was that in the eastern states electricity prices were still under the influence of the March shift in electricity generation costs, which peaked prices at up to 220 per cent higher than the historical average in July of 2007.

In 2009, the average price increase in the ACT was 6.42 per cent from 1 July 2009. The commissioner on this occasion said:

The increase in price is due mainly to an increase in distribution costs, although this has been partly offset by a reduction in the wholesale price of electricity.

In 2010, the commissioner announced an increase of 2.35 per cent in retail electricity prices for small customers to take effect from 1 July 2010. He said that this reflected a reduction in the wholesale price of electricity, combined with an increase in the transmission and distribution charges applicable to ACT customers.

And that is where we start to get to the nub of it. Anybody that has at least researched it knows that the substantial price increases in electricity in recent years have been driven by the need to invest in infrastructure. This reflects the neglect by governments

over the last 20 or 30 years. None of those have been Green governments. They have been Liberal or Labor governments in all those states. The increase reflects the failure to invest in the necessary electricity infrastructure that this country needs. And now this generation is having to pay for it. That is what has driven a lot of the electricity price increase. As I have just indicated from the commissioner's press releases, there have been a number of other factors—the drought, distribution costs and others.

When Mr Seselja stands here and says that there has been a 45 per cent increase in the price of electricity, he is somehow trying to insinuate that the great greenhouse conspiracy has driven up the price and it is going to be like this again in the future. It is simply not true. I believe it is a deceitful argument and I think it is unhelpful to debate it in this place as we try to deal with very serious issues.

It is going to be difficult and challenging to deliver a 40 per cent target. I do not think anybody has denied that. But we have an obligation, a moral obligation, to try to set this city up for the future so that our children are living in a city which is moving towards being a low carbon city because that is the pathway that this planet is heading down and we, in the ACT, have to take our steps as well. (*Time expired.*)

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (4.34): The only person in this place who makes deceitful arguments is Mr Corbell. The argument that he makes today does not hold water. The problem for Mr Corbell is that—and let us face it—in the past he has been found to have persistently and wilfully misled the Assembly on a number of issues. And we see it continuing today. He cannot make the case.

MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Mr Hargreaves): Mr Smyth, can I ask you to be really careful about that, please? I know you will be. I am just asking you to be really careful.

MR SMYTH: Which bit, Mr Speaker?

MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER: You say “repeatedly making wilful and misleading comments”.

MR SMYTH: That is a quote from the *Hansard*.

MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER: I am just asking you to be a bit careful so that we do not end up interrupting the debate to have another—

MR SMYTH: Can I not quote from *Hansard*?

MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Attribution would be good. It is easy for me.

MR SMYTH: It is from *Hansard*, 24 June 2004.

MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR SMYTH: It is in the *Hansard*. And this is the problem. Mr Corbell cannot make the argument. He just asserts. As he finished the in-principle debate, he jumped up and slammed me and said, “You are wrong. This is incredibly wrong.” But I want to

refer to a line that Mr Corbell made and that has been reported on the ABC. It quotes Mr Corbell as saying:

This bill is an important opportunity for the ACT to once again establish itself as a leader.

Clearly at some point in time, we led the greenhouse gas and climate change debate. And it is true, right up until 2001 when this crowd took over. From 2001 to 2010, it has been ignored by the Labor Party, aided and abetted by Greens members of this place. The Labor Party had majority government for a term but did nothing, unchallenged, aided and abetted by the Green member in this place.

The real leadership on these issues in this place and a record of achievement belong to one party, and that is the Liberal Party. Based on our record and our experience, we have a view moving forward and we believe that the target should be 30 per cent.

It is interesting that, when you look at the documents that Mr Corbell quoted from, they are somehow saying, "We have done the work. We have got a pile of documents." I have got your documents, Mr Corbell. I have got all the things you wrote about—the Kinesis report, the greenhouse gas emissions, the existing baseline project, the carbon sequestration audit. None of them will tell the ordinary taxpayer of the ACT how much this will cost.

What we are doing is writing the government a blank cheque, a cheque that will be written and endorsed by the hard work of the people and the businesses of the ACT, because they will have to pay. Why? Because Mr Corbell and the government, in their failure of leadership, in their failure to act over the last nine years, in their hairy-chested, pat me on the back approach to this argument, have said, "I want to be seen to be doing something because I have not done the work. I have picked some of the most expensive options. And the ACT taxpayer can pay." And that is not good policy.

In comparison, I would point members to the report *Australian sustainable energy: zero carbon Australia stationary energy plan* recently produced by the Energy Research Institute, University of Melbourne. These guys have an idea too. Their plan is to make use of 100 per cent renewable energy in 10 years. They have actually done the work. This is not a government department. This is not an entire government with almost 20,000 public servants. It is a research institute. But what have they done? They went out and did the work. It is quite interesting that they then got some plaudits from business:

Zero Carbon Australia 2020 is exactly the type of positive, rigorous technical analysis that is urgently needed to chart our path to a sustainable future—and convince Australia that there are far better alternatives to the complacent assumption that our high-carbon lifestyle can continue ad infinitum.

Let me say those words again—"positive, rigorous technical analysis that is urgently needed to chart our path to a sustainable future".

Mr Corbell's approach is akin to being in the Sydney to Hobart yacht race and wearing a blindfold. We know we are meant to go there but we have got absolutely no

idea of how to get there and how much it will cost. And that is appalling policy development and leads to appalling policy execution, like we have seen in the building education evolution federally where immense amounts of taxpayers' money have bought halls at three times the price they are normally worth and, in particular, the just go and insulate those homes policy that led to deaths, four deaths, hundreds of homes being burnt down and incalculable cost to the taxpayer. The cost just keeps mounting.

That is what is happening here today and it must be resisted. If you want support, do the positive, rigorous technical analysis and make your case. Just do not say, "We have picked the number 40 per cent."

The report then goes on to give a summary in just three lines. What is this plan about? It is about a 10-year road map for 100 per cent renewable energy. Okay, that is what they want to do. They have stated it quite clearly. They want base-load energy supplied by renewable sources. That is fine. That is where we want to be. That is what we are going to do. And how much does it cost? They claim it is affordable at \$8 per week. They have done the work.

It then goes on to say, "Here is how we have designed the stationary energy plan supply system. Here is how you get 100 per cent renewable energy supply. Here is the work we need to do to manage grid and load-manage and create a national grid. Here is how you resource the transition. By the way, we have actually done the numbers and to get this in 10 years time will cost a total investment to the Australian people of \$370 billion over the period 2011-2020." This is something that stands up to scrutiny. We have an objective. "This is how we are going to get there. This is what it costs. Here is the analysis." Here are the flimsies that Mr Corbell threw at me as somehow refuting my claims, and if you look anywhere in any of these documents and do a word search for the word "cost" or "dollar", you cannot find a price. It is just not there.

We do not know how much this is going to cost. We do not even know whether it is long term or sustainable. Yet these people from the Energy Research Institute in their *Zero carbon Australia stationary energy plan* then go on to say, "And this will serve the nation for the next 40 to 60 years." That is long-term planning. That is doing the work, minister. That is providing the argument to back up your case.

We know it does not matter. We know that this will go ahead because it is in the Greens-Labor coalition agreement. This is what you get when you get a coalition of strange bedfellows. We know the Greens have no idea of how to cost their policies because after the election, in the negotiation with the Greens, we costed their policies for them. We started working out what it would cost because they do not do the work either. And that is the problem. It is great to have lofty ideals. It is great to aspire to something. But we are the politicians that pass the budgets, make the laws and deliver the policies for the people. There it is again in the coat of arms: "the people".

But no-one in this place can tell me how much this will cost, how we will get there, and whether or not we can actually make it. And if you compare the two approaches, then you must have doubt about the people who are backing it.

Mr Rattenbury said, “It will be challenging.” Yes, it will. Yes, it will be challenging if you cannot detail it. If you do not know how you are going to get there, what vehicle you are driving, how much you are going to load it up with, what the effect is, what the long-term effect is and is it sustainable, then, yes, it will be challenging, because you have not done the work. Ideology is not a substitute for analysis and for costings. Ideology, as presented today by the Greens-Labor coalition, will be paid for by the ordinary people of the ACT.

Let us look at some of the judgements that Mr Corbell has made. Go to one of your documents, Mr Corbell. You did not know the answer in question time. I will give it to you now. “What is the cost of a tonne of CO₂ courtesy of the feed-in tariff?” The abatement cost, on page 21 out of 40 of this report, if you put in solar hot water systems, is \$27 per tonne of CO₂ abated. If you put in wind, it is \$55 per tonne of CO₂ abated. If you put in green power, it is \$60 per tonne of CO₂ abated. And if you put in solar power, solar PVs, which I am a big supporter of but you need to know the facts, which is the feed-in tariff, in this case it is \$350 per tonne—

Mrs Dunne: That is probably generous.

MR SMYTH: That is probably generous. We saw today the report that it is probably \$400. But given the timing on the report, it was probably accurate at the time. This is the problem. Somebody pays for this. It is not those opposite. (*Time expired*).

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (4.44): Mr Smyth and the Liberal Party should reflect on the arguments they mount about the apparent weakness of the government approach when it comes to these targets. Mr Smyth asserts that there needs to be positive, rigorous, technical analysis to underpin those targets. I simply put this question: where is their analysis for their 30 per cent target? Where is the technical analysis? Where is the rigorous assessment that underpins the legislation that is before us today for debate, a piece of legislation that establishes a 30 per cent emissions reduction target by the year 2020? Mr Smyth insists that it must be rigorous—that there must be technical analysis and detailed, robust economic analysis that underpins those targets. Where is it for his 30 per cent target? There is not any—none; zilch; nothing.

Mr Smyth: Go and look at our policies.

MR CORBELL: That is their position. That is the hypocrisy of their argument.

Mr Smyth: Persistent wilfully misleading.

MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Mr Hargreaves): Order! Stop the clock. Mr Smyth, Mr Corbell heard you in silence; I would appreciate it if you would extend to him the same courtesy.

MR CORBELL: They do not like it when the truth is pointed out to them, but that is the truth. Mr Smyth stands up and says, “We demand technical, rigorous, detailed analysis to back up your targets.” Then, putting on their other face, they walk into this

place and say, “We want 30 per cent.” But they do not apply the same standard to themselves. They are a joke. They have no credibility and they have no policy substance behind them whatsoever. On each and every day between now and the next election, Canberrans will see that more and more: they have no policy substance.

I draw to the Assembly’s attention again the fraudulent argument that the Liberal Party make when it comes to their emissions reduction target. They claim that 30 per cent can be achieved without paying, without cost, but that 40 per cent is somehow the end of the world. The fact is that any emissions reduction target comes with costs. Those costs must be managed and the impact of those costs, where they are unfair and unreasonable, must be ameliorated. That is the challenge that we face. That is the challenge that our society faces.

For Mr Seselja to go out to the Canberra community and say that his emissions reduction target does not mean cost to them, does not mean impact on them, is a fraudulent argument. The reason for that is that we have heard Mr Seselja say, “We are going to achieve this through energy efficiency and similar measures. That is how we are going to achieve it.” Energy efficiency gets you eight per cent of your 30 per cent, Mr Seselja—eight per cent. You need to find another 22 per cent. Solar hot water is going to get you only four per cent.

What is going to get you the remainder? It is going to be measures like green power purchase, Mr Seselja? That is the argument that he uses to hit the government around the head with about the fears of electricity price increases. It is going to come from the feed-in tariff—six per cent there. And it is going to come from sustainable transport changes, modal shift—around four per cent.

The three areas where Mr Seselja criticises the government and runs his fear campaign in the Canberra community are the three areas that he himself will have to use to get towards his 30 per cent. To get his 30 per cent, he will need to use measures around green power, the purchase of renewable energy such as through the feed-in tariff, and modal split. He is conducting himself in a way where he presents a fraudulent argument if he suggests otherwise.

To get to his 30 per cent he will need to do more than all of those things combined. He will also need to explore the 10 per cent reduction possible through the adoption of trigeneration and energy from waste technologies as identified in the government studies. He will need to find interventions through new policy measures such as changing employee density and biosequestration mechanisms. He will need to engage. We as a community need to engage on these issues and in these policy areas. Whether it is 30 or whether it is 40, it will require considerable effort.

The difference between the Liberal opposition and those on this side of the chamber is that we accept that the only rational position to adopt is one informed by the science, that a 40 per cent reduction is what is required. If that is what we would expect of others to achieve a safe climate, it is what we should expect of ourselves.

That is the approach that we adopt. We do so without apology and with a commitment to work through the delivery of those outcomes.

As I have previously indicated to members in this place, this will be determined through the development of action plan 2 to “Weathering the change”. We will use the studies and the analysis that the government has made publicly available to date to inform the final suite of measures we will use to move towards the first of those targets, which is the peaking target in 2013, and then the 40 per cent reduction by 2020. That will be the approach that the government will adopt.

I do not believe that anyone listening to this debate can seriously believe the claims of those opposite that their target comes without cost or impact on the community. It does. Any shift to a low carbon economy will. We will be judged by how we will manage that cost, how we will protect those who are vulnerable and how we will make that adjustment. That is the approach that this Labor government is determined to take.

MR SESELJA (Molonglo—Leader of the Opposition) (4.52): When you follow blind ideology, as the Labor Party and the Greens do on this issue, the problem is that you do not consider the costs. There is only one fraudulent argument that has been put in this place today, and that is from Simon Corbell and Mr Rattenbury—that 40 per cent is a magic number. What we are being told today by the Labor Party and the Greens is that 40 per cent is a magic number, that it has special, mysterious qualities where, if you can just get to 40 per cent reductions, all of our climate change issues will be solved. They say that if you do 39 per cent you will not get there. If you do 38 or 37, you will not get there. If you do 41 or 42, you have done too much. According to the Labor Party and the Greens, 40 per cent is the magic number; it is the one that will get us there.

Does anyone really believe this kind of claptrap—the idea that, with all of the uncertainties that exist, if only we can get to this magic number of 40 per cent then we will fix it. It is rubbish. What we need to do as policy makers is consider all the facts.

There are a lot of good things that we aim towards in politics. In education, we looked at it—we came up with an idea to cut class sizes to 21 in primary school—right through primary school. There were some people, a lot of experts, who would say, “If you could get to about 18 or 15, you could get some seriously good educational outcomes.” I agree with them. In an ideal world, if we could have 15 in a class that would be fantastic.

But we did the numbers. What happens when you do the numbers? You say, “We would like to get to 15 or 18 if we had the money. But we can get to 21. We can fund that, and 21 is not a bad start; 21 is a good place to be.” That is the equation that we all have to solve as policy makers. We have to take what are laudable goals—or important goals, important policies or ideals—and say, “What is reasonable?”

We consider a number of factors. We consider a range of expert advice. We consider the cost to the community, to the government. In the case of action on climate change, we consider what is happening around the country and around the world—because we cannot exist in complete, splendid isolation. We can change leadership, but we cannot completely ignore what goes on around the rest of the country because it will impact on us.

For instance, if an ETS were to come in—this is an interesting one—we know that, according to the Australia Institute and others, local action taken to reduce emissions here in the ACT would allow people in Queensland to pollute more cheaply. That is what it will allow. It would allow people in WA perhaps to pollute more cheaply. We cannot simply ignore these factors.

The position of the Labor Party and the Greens is to look at it blindly, ideologically, and say, “We’ve got a magic number; we have to do that regardless of the cost.” That is the position of the Labor Party and the Greens. You can hear it when they speak about it. They do not actually give fair dinkum consideration to the cost impact on Canberra families. We are the only party standing up and saying that we will consider that.

Do we want to see action? Yes. That is why we have led the way. That is why the former Liberal government led the way. But they never did it blindly—blind to the consequences, blind to the costs. We have had these debates at the national level. Imagine if we had this kind of argument from a government: “Forty per cent—have to get there. It does not matter. We don’t particularly care about the cost. We will pursue 40 per cent.”

We need to consider all the factors. We on this side of the chamber make no apology for saying to the community, “Yes, we will support action. Yes, we will lead the way. But we will do our best to minimise those costs. We will do our best to set targets that are reasonable so that Canberrans are not asked to do far too much, far more than their fair share, for no environmental benefit.”

That is what we are facing. That is why this is an important debate. That is why it is important that we amend this clause. We can have all sorts of ideas. We can have all sorts of grand plans. But we have to consider how it works. We have to consider how it impacts on the community. It is clear from this debate.

Right at the end of Mr Rattenbury’s original speech in the in-principle debate there was a sort of cursory discussion of cost, in an almost dismissive manner as if this does not matter. If you believe it so fervently, then it does not matter that any cost is worth bearing if you approach it in such a blindly ideological way. We do not approach things in that way. We approach things in a calm and considered manner, looking at how we serve the interests of the environment and the community, how we do things that are achievable and how we do things that are cost effective.

If you want an example of how this government in particular does not have regard to cost, you only have to look at the solar feed-in scheme. Mr Corbell says that this is going to make up six per cent of their 40 per cent reduction—six per cent. That is a significant amount. It is a pretty significant amount at \$450 a tonne—or will it be \$350 a tonne? It is certainly not going to be getting down to the \$20, \$30 and \$40 a tonne that we see for all sorts of other measures. Mr Smyth set it out well.

If we were in any doubt about the attitude of this government and how they are likely to go about seeking to reach this target, have a look at their record. They choose one

of the most expensive ways of reducing emissions that you could possibly imagine. It is one of the most expensive ways you could possibly do it, and they choose that. They make that their flagship—the flagship of their policy.

When Mr Corbell was asked about it today in question time he would not address it. He could not address it. He was saying, “You have got to look at all the costs.” Yes, you do. There are lots of ways of cutting emissions, but this government choose something that is 10 or 20 times as expensive as other measures—not just a little bit more expensive but significantly more. If that is going to be the attitude, if that is going to be the way—and if they are seriously going to achieve six per cent of their 40 per cent target through a scheme which is so expensive—then indeed the costs will be greater than we would have even anticipated.

There are lots of ways to do this. You have got to set a reasonable target and then you have got to find the best ways of getting there. This government has shown, through its actions and through its rhetoric, that it does not look for the most cost-effective ways. Indeed, it often pursues some of the most expensive ways to do it. There will be a cost.

There are two factors here and there are two reasons why we differ significantly. The target has to be reasonable, not pursued through blind ideology. And the method of getting there has to be efficient and effective. The government, through their support for this and through their actions, fail on both counts—as do the Greens. They fail on both counts. These debates show just how little regard they have for what this costs the community, just how little regard they have in pursuing this target. They will pursue it at any costs. The costs will not be to them; the costs will be borne by all Canberrans.

I commend the amendment to the Assembly and I look forward to further debate on this issue.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (5.03): I am conscious that we need to progress the debate on the amendments and I will be brief, but there are a couple of comments that Mr Seselja has made that must be answered for the purposes of this debate.

Once again, we do not hear from Mr Seselja how he believes he will achieve 30 per cent. He keeps running away from that debate. How is he going to achieve 30 per cent? He talks about all the terrible measures, in his mind, that will need to be applied to reach 40, but how is he going to reach 30? He has been out there fraudulently presenting to the people of Canberra that he can get it through energy efficiency, and he is wrong, because he can only get eight per cent of his 30 per cent through energy efficiency. How is he going to get the remainder? How is he going to achieve it?

The fact is that a significant element of achieving 30 or 40 will need to be achieved through the sourcing of alternative energy supply—energy which is not generated from fossil fuels. That is the truth. That is the fact that he has to face up to. There is no way—

Mr Seselja interjecting—

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr Seselja, order please!

MR CORBELL: that Mr Seselja can avoid the inevitability that, whether it is 30 or 40 per cent, it must have a significant contribution from renewable energy sources. And that is the issue that the Liberal Party clearly have failed to come to grips with.

A Labor government is clearly and deeply conscious of the impact of any policy measure on low income earners. For that reason, the government will continue to adopt measures that assist those low income earners and other disadvantaged persons in the community who can be disproportionately impacted by a policy measure that overall is in the public interest. That has been the approach of Labor governments for many decades. Hard reforms have to be made for the good of the nation, for the good of the community. Whether it was tariff reform, whether it was other economic reform, those reforms had impacts. But even if they had impacts, and they did, measures were put in place to assist those who were disproportionately affected by those impacts to make the transition and to be protected from the detrimental impacts that would otherwise accrue to them.

That is the way you manage these issues. That is the way you address them. You do not run away from difficult reform. You do not pretend, like the Liberal Party does, that “all is sweet and rosy if you take our path”. The Labor Party understands the challenges of these reforms and the Labor Party will always act to protect the interests of low income earners and to assist them through this process. That is why we have already changed the concession regime for low income earners when it comes to utility costs, why we have indexed it to CPI and why it is the most generous scheme in the country. It is because we understand and we will always work to protect those individuals in our society. But at the same time we will not shy away from the importance of these reforms and we will not shy away from making the transition to a low-carbon future.

Mr Seselja likes to walk both sides of the street. He likes to claim that he believes in energy efficiency, he believes in climate change, but he also believes that there should not be any costs associated with making the transition. That, clearly, is fantasy land when it comes to Mr Seselja.

This amendment is all about the Liberal Party’s big policy fraud on the Canberra community. But I think the Canberra community are better than that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr Smyth: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, under standing order 62, I seek your ruling on tedious repetition from the minister. We have now had two doses of this. He circles around constantly trying to make a point which he is not doing very effectively, but it is tedious and it is repetitious, and I seek your ruling.

MR CORBELL: Well, you don’t like it; that is your problem.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr Corbell, can you get to your point, please?

MR CORBELL: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The point does bear repeating because the Canberra community—

Mr Smyth: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, you have just warned him not to be tedious and repetitious and he stands up and says the point bears repetition. It is a violation of standing order 62 and it is actually an insult to you in your role as Deputy Speaker.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, sit down, thank you very much, Mr Smyth. I think you have made your point, Mr Corbell.

MR CORBELL: It sounds like it is a very sore point, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I accept your ruling. Thirty per cent is not the target for our community; 40 per cent is. Forty per cent is the figure because, if we are to have any credibility in engaging with other cities, with other communities, we have to demonstrate that we ourselves understand what the science tells us.

Mr Seselja: Magic!

MR CORBELL: It is not magic; it is science, Mr Seselja. It is based on the science. It is based on the views of thousands of scientists from across the world. If you disagree with that, go and have the argument with them. But we accept it, we understand it and we will act on it.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (5.10): I love it when I stand up and Mr Rattenbury groans. You know that you are getting under their skin.

This is an important matter of principle. It is a matter of principle that needs to be reinforced. The Canberra Liberals have had a consistent approach in this matter. The measure of the target that we think we should be aiming for is one which is a balanced approach. As Mr Seselja has said, this is about balancing the benefit to the environment and the cost to ACT taxpayers.

On top of that, you have to take into account the impact that going down a particular path will have on businesses in the ACT when we are nothing more than a very small hole in the great big donut of New South Wales; the impact that, over time, this will have on the flight of industry from the ACT, the impact that will have on the underlying tax capacity of the ACT and the underlying capacity for us to maintain industry in this town.

Mr Corbell has spent a lot of time attempting to justify his figure of 40 per cent. He says, “Well, everybody agrees with me.” It is a pretty special sort of figure and the arguments put forward by Mr Corbell in support of it were pretty special, especially in their circularity. But we have to look at what this government does. Mr Corbell wants to be able to say that he is the leader. He is on the record today in the media saying, “By this, we shall re-establish our leadership.”

First of all, we have to remember that we in the ACT lost leadership under the tutelage, under the leadership, of the man who is now cycling through Spain,

Jon Stanhope. When Jon Stanhope came to power, one of the things that he inherited was a review process for the greenhouse gas scheme that we had in place at the time. The review that came out late in 2002 gave the minister some particular direction, and that direction was: "Don't have a whole lot of tiddlywinks little policies." It was a criticism of the previous government's greenhouse gas plan, and there were too many small programs. "Find the appropriate programs that are large and can give you reasonable bang for your buck and invest in those."

But what did Mr Stanhope do? Mr Stanhope spent about 18 months criticising the previous government's greenhouse gas plan and then he spent about six or eight months in the run-up to the 2004 election not talking about the plan. Early in 2005, he formally abandoned the greenhouse gas plan. We did not have to see another one until 2007 when, suddenly, he became interested in the subject again. So for the first six years of the Stanhope government there was no action on climate change except to criticise those who had come before him.

This is the context whereby we have today in this place the culmination of the Stanhope government's newfound interest in climate change. Simon Corbell laments the fact that he is not considered a leader in this field and he wants to become a leader in this field. If that is the case, it is the fault of Simon Corbell not standing up to his leader when his leader abandoned the greenhouse gas plans that were in place and refused to take the advice of eminent people who reviewed the greenhouse gas plan and made suggestions.

When Joe Baker, the then Commissioner for the Environment, drew the Chief Minister's attention to this in the *State of the environment report* in 2004 he was ignored quite badly by the Chief Minister. The Chief Minister showed complete disregard. Constantly after that there have been Auditor-General's reports and the like.

Now the government want to find a little place in the sunshine here. They are saying, "If we have this target, we will look good and we can add to that our feed-in tariff scheme and people will see just how hairy-chested we are on this issue." But let us look at all the things that they have cast aside in the process. They have cast aside a no-waste plan, which has significant implications in relation to greenhouse gas reductions. They have cast aside a green bin program, which has significant implications in relation to greenhouse gas reductions.

They have looked selectively at particular policy issues, and when they talk about cost, they talk about cost in a very narrow way. They say, "We will bring you energy efficiency and that will compensate for the rising cost of electricity." If we have people creating increases in the cost of electricity of the sort that we have seen and that appear to be caused by the feed-in tariff in South Australia—and it will probably have the same implications here in the ACT—you are going to need a whole lot of energy efficiency just to counteract the cost of the rising price of electricity.

You have to look again at the critique that was run by the Canberra Liberals of the feed-in tariff, at the time the feed-in tariff was debated. We spoke against the feed-in tariff because by our calculations at the time the abatement cost per tonne of CO₂ was \$516. I have gone back and looked at my calculations. It was \$516. I took this to a

range of people and I said: “Have I got this wrong?” It does not matter which way you add it up and how you calculate it, if you start from point A, you get to \$516. That figure has fallen back a little because the scheme has now been revised back, the multiplier has been revised back, but we are now in the vicinity of about \$450; \$350 to \$450.

It is extraordinarily expensive abatement. It was the point that I made at the time of the debate on the feed-in tariff. When you look at all of the information available to us, I said at the time that if we are going to be spending ACT taxpayers’ money in this way, we should be getting much more bang for our buck. I pointed to the McKinsey curve, which members here will be familiar with, and all the things on the McKinsey curve that point to the abatement that you can do, some of which is at no cost, some of which gives you a net return, particularly insulation. Around the \$150 mark per tonne of CO₂ saved will give you a return of \$150—all the way through the McKinsey curve. And the McKinsey curve only goes up to about \$100 a tonne, per tonne of CO₂ returned. The feed-in tariff, the cost of photovoltaics, is not even on the McKinsey curve; it is on the dotted line that goes off into the “too expensive to contemplate at this stage” range.

This is the problem with the government’s approach to this whole debate. Firstly, they abandoned the field for years. They had no interest in it; it was not an issue for them. I suspect that somewhere in the period after the 2004 election, in the run-up to the 2008 election, they thought that perhaps they needed to get on board with this and they suddenly found some interest in the subject. But they did get a bit of a flogging in the run-up to the 2008 election because of the failures and the weakness of the weathering the change document. I do not know that there was anyone outside the Labor government who had a good thing to say about the weathering the change document in terms of its failure to set interim targets, its failure to set achievable targets along the way. I hope Mr Rattenbury remembers his criticisms of the document before the 2008 election.

After they abandoned the field for such a long time, they came late to the argument. They have spent a lot of time doing exactly what the consultants and the people who reviewed previous things said—cobbling together a whole lot of little programs that will give you a little bit here and a little bit there, which are uncoordinated and therefore costly. At the same time they criticise the Canberra Liberals for not at this stage putting forward a costed analysis. There is no costed analysis from the government about how they are going to proceed towards this 40 per cent target. There is no road map and there is no costing for the cost of that journey. The people of the ACT deserve a costing for that journey before they sign up to it.

MS LE COUTEUR (Molonglo) (5.20): I rise to speak briefly on some costs which seem to have been totally ignored in this debate—that is, the costs of climate change itself, the costs of inaction, the costs of not doing enough to actually address the issue. I think we are all aware of a lot of these but we just have not focused on them in this debate. We know there are going to be big costs on energy supply, water security, agriculture, health, coastal communities and infrastructure.

Coastal communities are an obvious one. We already have the situation in New South Wales where people are not able to build on land that they own because the local

councils know that within the lifespan of the building the land is likely to be under water. We have all seen the very scary maps of Australia and other parts of the world showing possible inundation of our major cities, the vast majority of which are located on the coast. What will happen as we have the sea level rise? Most of the cities in the world, the major cities in the world, and a lot of our agricultural regions are within a few metres of sea level. This will have a huge impact and a huge cost on the world if we do not do anything about this.

The longer we delay doing something, the more expensive it will be. I note in this regard that the CEO of BHP Billiton, Marius Kloppers, recently called for a clear price on carbon to be established in Australia. I agree that he did not talk about the amount of mitigation, but I think it is very clear from all parties that we know there will be a cost if we go down the track of not mitigating, and we need to look at those costs as seriously as we look at the costs of doing something.

Mrs Dunne mentioned weathering the change. I would be the first to agree that it is not the be-all and end-all of climate analysis. But even this has quite a lot of very interesting and potentially scary things about what might happen in Canberra. It says that the temperature in the ACT and surrounding regions is likely to become warmer. The number of days above 35 could average six to 14, and it is now five. That will mean we will have, particularly among older people, more vulnerable people, more deaths from heat issues. That is what has happened in the rest of the world, and that is the sort of thing that would happen here.

We all know about droughts, and I think we have all seen the CSIRO projections for droughts as a result of climate change. Very fortunately, the drought that we were just part of seems to have stopped, but it is a real issue with real costs.

There is a section about climate change health impacts. It says that these are going to include, as I said, temperature-related illness and death due to increased temperatures and heatwaves, food and water-borne diseases due to changes in water quality and a range of bacteria and pests, respiratory disease due to increased pollution and mental health disorders due to social disruptions.

On that note, we are so lucky that it has started raining again because had the drought not broken we would in a few years have seen the street trees in Canberra start dying en masse. I think Canberra would have been an incredibly psychologically distressing place to live in with all the trees dead. That is the sort of thing that could happen if we do not address climate change.

With respect to vector-borne disease, we are likely to have mosquitoes and things like that in Canberra in real numbers. Another impact would be injury, trauma and related effects from an increase in extreme weather events. These are just the things that weathering the change talks about for Canberra. We are already seeing climate-related impacts on human beings in the rest of the world. We are fortunate that we are an affluent community and it has not hit us much yet, but I think that in this debate we need to look at all the costs. We need to look at the costs of inaction with as much energy and nit-picking as we look at the costs of action. I would urge the Assembly and the Canberra community to look at all of the costs as part of this debate.

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (5.25): I agree with Ms Le Couteur. It is interesting when you go to the website that has the climate change strategy, weathering the change. The third principle that the Chief Minister outlines is that to delay activity is to cost more. But we have actually had nine years of delay. We have actually had nine years without leadership. We have had nine years without a strategy. We have had nine years of a government bereft of ideas. It seems that today it all comes down to one number. As Mr Corbell described it earlier today, it is a magic number.

When I hear the words “the magic number” from a minister, it starts to scare me. I do not know whether he has conjured it up. I do not know whether the druids told him. I do not know whether he found it at Stonehenge on his tour of solar sites in the Northern Hemisphere. But if the wizards are talking to you and you are hearing magic numbers, then I get very scared.

When you look at the climate change document that the Chief Minister provided, you do wonder about this government’s commitment to the whole issue of climate change. When you go through the principles that are driving this, people should be very worried. We are told that delaying or ignoring a response would be dangerous and much more costly in the long term. Apply that statement to the last nine years of Labor government. I will say it again: from the Chief Minister’s own strategy, we are told that delaying or ignoring a response would be dangerous and much more costly in the long term.

Couple that with Mr Corbell’s statement earlier this day where he said that this bill is an important opportunity for the ACT to once again establish itself as a leader. Implicit in that statement is the criticism that every environment minister before him of his government has failed. We have not led. We have not done anything. Now he wants us to believe, because he has a magic number, that he has got the magic solution to this problem. I accept what Ms Le Couteur says. There are other costs here. But as I said earlier today, you cannot just say, “Let us address this issue.”

Everybody talks about triple bottom line until it does not suit their argument. Then somebody says, “Let’s talk about the social only,” or, “Let’s talk about the environment only.” You have to take them all together. If you do not take them all together, it is like the old surgeon’s code or the doctor’s code: first, do no harm. You do not know how you are getting there and what it will cost. We have a government that has not done the work and that has ignored the problem for nine years. They had initiatives. As Mrs Dunne pointed out, they got a roasting from Joe Baker, the former commissioner for the environment and from the Auditor-General over abandoning no waste by 2010. But today, magically, they want us to believe that 40 is the number.

They have made no case. There is no plan. There are no costings. As I said earlier, the only person making fraudulent arguments in this place is Mr Corbell. The amendment should be supported.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (5.29): I was not planning to speak again but I do want to pick up very briefly on this point around the 40 per cent and the increasing suggestions from the opposition about where this might come from. We have heard it

described as a magic number. I just heard Mr Smyth use the word “druid”. For the education of the chamber, there is a 25 to 40 per cent bracket. It was derived based on evidence from the intergovernmental panel on climate change which is comprised of more than 2,000 of the world’s leading scientists.

They come from countries around the world and their reports are developed by consensus. You have got peer-reviewed science that has set this set of parameters. That science was taken to the Bali climate negotiations in 2007. How the years fly by. At Bali 198 governments came together under the banner of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. There were 198 governments and around 10,000 or 11,000 delegates, which also included NGOs, scientists and business.

The outcome text from there indicated that developed countries should adopt targets in the region of 25 to 40 per cent in order to match the scientific evidence. That is the reality. That is the science. That is not the Liberal Party making stuff up. That is the real world that Mr Smyth and Mr Seselja should pay more attention to.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (5.30): I cannot believe that Mr Rattenbury actually took time to stand and make our argument for us. He actually said that the consensus was that we needed a number somewhere between 25 and 40 per cent.

Mr Seselja: But 40 per cent is the magic number, apparently.

MRS DUNNE: Somehow, if the Liberal Party adopts a number which is within that consensus range—30—and the last time I looked 30 was somewhere between 25 and 40 per cent, unless there is the new Green math, that is not legitimate. That is in no way legitimate. The only—

Mr Seselja: The only way you can do it is 40; that is all we have been told.

MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Mr Seselja! Can you please let your own member speak.

MRS DUNNE: number that you can possibly select is the one that the Greens have selected. Madam Deputy Speaker, the Greens and the Labor Party in the form of Mr Rattenbury and Mr Corbell today have been desperate. They have spent all day arguing the point over and over again about why their number is better than ours.

Mr Seselja: It’s a magic number.

MRS DUNNE: No, actually it is not a perfect number, Mr Seselja. I think a perfect number has to be some sort of prime number and 40 is not a prime number. It is a beautiful round number and it can be divided by a whole lot of things. But every time Mr Corbell and Mr Rattenbury get up and argue the case as to why their number is superior to the figure put forward by the Canberra Liberals, they reinforce the case made by the Canberra Liberals.

Mr Rattenbury did it just then. He said there is a range; there is an international consensus. The IPCC has an international consensus somewhere between 25 and 40.

The Canberra Liberals, after a lot of thought, consideration and discussion have chosen the figure 30.

That is not good enough for Mr Rattenbury. He wants to go to the far end, to the expensive end. I point again to the little regard that Mr Rattenbury had in his remarks for the cost that this will have on the people of Canberra. It is all right for him; he is earning a substantial income. Mr Corbell talks about the effort that they are going to put in for low income people. They are actually going to increase the concessions. The increase in concessions for electricity were roundly criticised by the community sector for not being generous enough.

Mr Smyth: What are they doing for middle income earners?

MRS DUNNE: But then, what about the middle income earners? What relief will there be for the single income family where they have two or three kids at school? They will, on the surface of it, have a substantial-looking income. But by the time you take out all the outgoings that it takes to run a family, they will be doing it tough. Increases in electricity bills cause them to do it tough.

Mr Corbell said here today that by their estimation the expansion of the feed-in tariff scheme will cost every ACT family another \$50 a year. If you are poor, if you are a low income earner—and there is a very narrow definition of what a low income earner is—you will get some relieve through the concession scheme. But here we are saying that at the current rate it is going to cost every Canberra taxpayer six per cent—\$50 a year.

The people of the ACT can do the multiplication. That is six per cent. It is going to cost them \$50 a year. So how much per year is the whole scheme going to cost? How much is it going to cost my neighbours in Evatt with one income who are sending their kids to the local school? It is going to cost them much more than that. That is only what six per cent will do. Just do the math. The people of the ACT are facing bills of thousands of dollars under this scheme.

Mr Rattenbury: Where's your modelling?

MRS DUNNE: There is no modelling. There is no indication for this government or from the people who are supporting them how much this will cost. But the minister admits—

Mr Corbell: You're making it up.

MRS DUNNE: The minister here admits that was six per cent—

Mr Seselja: Point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, could you call Mr Rattenbury and Mr Corbell to order? Call them to order. We have been called to order when we have interjected. They are not only accusing Mrs Dunne of making it up; they are being unruly. I would ask you to call them to order.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Le Couteur): Mr Seselja, I did not hear them calling the names you were suggesting, so I think we should just proceed with the debate.

Mr Seselja: They both did it; they both called her—

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: That may be true, but I did not hear it, Mr Seselja. Mrs Dunne, you have the floor and I suggest that you continue.

Mr Rattenbury: Point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, Mr Seselja just reflected on your ruling.

Mr Seselja: Sorry, how?

Mr Rattenbury: Mr Seselja quietly made the observation that you were hearing nothing and seeing nothing. He was implying a bias in your ruling, Madam Assistant Speaker.

Mr Seselja: Are you in the Speaker's chair now, Shane? It is not really clear to me. It seems like you are sitting in the Speaker's chair.

Mr Rattenbury: Zed, you are so thin-skinned. You are pathetic.

Mr Seselja: No, we only have to look at you wrong and we get a ruling.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Mr Seselja, please stop. Mr Seselja, Mr Rattenbury, please stop the cross-talk. Mrs Dunne, you do have the floor. I invite you to continue speaking.

MRS DUNNE: Thank you, Madam Assistant Speaker. In question time today Mr Corbell came the closest we have seen to an analysis of this policy. He admitted that the feed-in tariff and its expansion, which will deliver us six per cent—not six percentage points; six per cent of the cut that we need—will cost us, every Canberra household, about \$50 a year.

So you can do the math. If six per cent is going to deliver us about \$50 a year, it is close to \$1,000 per household every year to deliver these things. \$1,000 is not the sort of change that the average—

Mr Seselja: It is going to be much more than that.

MRS DUNNE: And it is probably going to be much more than that; that is a back-of-the-envelope analysis based on the only analysis that Mr Corbell has put forward in his debate.

Mr Seselja: That is not credible at all. At \$400 a tonne? So there you go; it is not the six per cent.

MRS DUNNE: I see.

Mr Seselja: It is much more.

MRS DUNNE: He was actually saying it is six per cent and it would cost us about \$50 a tonne. Now he has resiled from that. But the back-of-the-envelope calculation based on what Mr Corbell said in question time today tells the people of the ACT that they are facing every year, year on year, an increase in costs—electricity and other things—of about \$1,000. Mr Corbell has not justified that to the people of the ACT. The Greens have not justified that to the people of the ACT. What that does is take money out of the economy that ACT taxpayers could spend on other things that would stimulate the economy.

It will be a drain on our economy. There is no antidote to that from Mr Corbell or Mr Rattenbury. This is why the Canberra Liberals have chosen a more moderate path, one that will be not as expensive for the people of the ACT because we understand what it is like to be a middle income public servant with a couple of kids at school. We know what that is like. They may have forgotten, but we know what it is like for those families. We know how hard it is and we are not about making it even more difficult than it already is.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (5.39): There are some issues that have been raised during the debate about the appropriateness of the figure which bear some analysis. The Liberals seek to mount their argument on the basis that because 30 per cent is somewhere between 25 and 40, it is a legitimate figure. What they fail to understand is that that range was designed to take into account both developing and developed economies. Developing economies are expected to adopt less of a greenhouse gas emissions reduction than developed economies are, because obviously developed economies are wealthier, have more capability and share a greater level of the burden in terms of their contribution to the overall level of carbon emissions in the atmosphere.

It is completely misleading, again, for the Liberals to argue that because 30 per cent is between 25 and 40 per cent, it is acceptable. They are effectively saying that we should adopt a target for a developing nation. That is essentially their position. Their position is this: “We believe that with all our relative wealth globally, with all our relative affluence, with all our relative knowledge and expertise, we should adopt a target which is the type of target expected of a developing or an emerging nation rather than the target for a fully developed Westernised economy which has had the opportunity and the benefit of unrestrained carbon emissions for centuries.” That is their position. That position is morally bankrupt. They need to understand that that is the position that they advance.

The government does not accept their position, because it is morally bankrupt. We do not accept that you should adopt a greenhouse gas reduction target equivalent to that of a developing or emerging economy. We accept that we should adopt a greenhouse gas reduction target of an emerged, established, Westernised, fully developed nation, such as we are. We are relatively one of the most affluent cities within this nation, and we should adopt a greenhouse gas emissions reduction target commensurate with that.

MR HANSON (Molonglo) (5.42): I will be supporting the amendment; it makes sense. I was doing some other work in my office before and I heard the raucous

interjections coming from Mr Corbell and indeed Mr Rattenbury. Before I speak to the amendment, let me say that it did cause me to think about the contradiction of having someone who is in this place a Speaker who chastises and criticises the Liberal opposition for its interjections—

Mr Rattenbury: Relevance.

MR HANSON: and constantly warns us.

Mr Rattenbury: Are you mounting a dissent? Have the guts to do it.

MR HANSON: And now we have the ironic position that he is here trying to get me to move dissent in himself—

Mr Rattenbury: Dissent in the interjection.

Mr Corbell: Point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Le Couteur): Yes, Mr Corbell.

Mr Corbell: If Mr Hanson has a contribution to the policy issue that is being debated, by all means he should make it, but if he is just down here to have a dig at another member it is out of order. It is not relevant to the debate; he should be called to order.

Mr Rattenbury: Yes. You cannot just walk in here and start trash talking the Speaker, Jeremy. Have some decency. Have some guts of your convictions.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Corbell. Mr Hanson, I invite you to contribute on this debate.

MR HANSON: Mr Rattenbury is interjecting again, saying, “Have some guts; have some guts.” I am not sure what he wants me to do. I am certainly not moving dissent in you, Madam Assistant Speaker, and I cannot move dissent in Mr Rattenbury because, although he is making these continual interjections—at me as I am speaking, and he did at Mr Seselja and Mrs Dunne—I cannot move dissent in him. This is the entire contradiction. We have someone who is an advocate passionately for his cause.

Mr Rattenbury: Relevance. Do you know anything about the issue?

MR HANSON: I disagree with Mr Rattenbury’s position on this, but I also acknowledge that he is passionate. He is a true believer; there is no doubt about it. This is where the error comes. If you have somebody that does believe passionately, who is made the spokesman for the party—

Mr Corbell: Relevance.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Mr Hanson, as Mr Corbell was about to say, this is not strictly relevant to the debate. I invited you to talk about climate change issues.

Mr Seselja: On the point of order, Madam Assistant Speaker, Mr Hanson was finishing a sentence. There has been a lot of discussion about whether people are blindly following ideology as part of this debate or whether it is based on reason. He was halfway through his sentence. It is very difficult for you to know what his conclusion was going to be as a result of that. I think he might be allowed to finish what he was saying.

Mr Corbell: He has not yet addressed the amendment. In no way has he addressed the amendment; he probably does not even know what it is.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Mr Hanson, please direct your remarks—

MR HANSON: The point is that I have been facing a number of interjections and I have been responding to those interjections. I will try to continue, ignoring Mr Rattenbury's interjections. The point is that there is a decision to be made about what is the right balance. This is an issue that we have agreed that we need to deal with here in the ACT. The Liberal Party has taken a strong stance, and it has done for a number of years.

It is an issue of balance and it is an issue of making sure, as we look towards the future on this issue, that we are achieving balance between what is achievable, affordable and realistic. The figure of 30 per cent is a far more sensible figure. It is far more achievable. It is actually affordable, and I think it is a more judicious figure—one that has probably got a far better chance of being achieved in the end, despite the rhetoric from the government and the Greens. The figure that we are proposing is eminently sensible.

Some of the barbs that have been thrown in the interjections from Mr Corbell and Mr Rattenbury, and in the speeches they have made, have been most unreasonable. There has been leadership by the Canberra Liberals for a number of years on this issue. The fact that we have set a very ambitious but affordable target should be commended rather than—

Mr Corbell: How much will it cost?

MR HANSON: Always less than 40 per cent, Mr Corbell. I think that is the point—always less than 40 per cent. The point is that these costs are likely to be exponential, because there are certain things that you can do that are affordable measures that—

Mrs Dunne: We'll tell you the day you tell the people of the ACT what your scheme will cost.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Mrs Dunne and Mr Corbell, please stop interjecting. Mr Hanson, you have the floor.

MR HANSON: Thank you. There are obviously going to be significant costs associated with doing this that can be borne, and will need to be borne, by members of the ACT community. It is a matter of what level of costs we are prepared to accept.

As you move forward from 30 per cent up to 40 per cent, the evidence suggests that that is when you move out of the range of measures that can be done as we are moving now with the variety of measures we have adopted into more extreme measures. It is those more extreme measures that are going to be exponential when it comes to the increase in costs for Canberra families.

You asked me what it will cost. I cannot give you a definitive figure. I cannot; nor can you. But what I can say is that the figure of 40 per cent will be—and this is what we can guarantee—significantly more. It will be significantly more, and that is a cost that is going to be borne by Canberra families. It is not only going to be damaging for Canberra families but it will be damaging for our economy as we continually have to adjust subsidies to—

Mr Corbell: How do you know that, Jeremy? What analysis have you done, Jeremy?

MR HANSON: Mr Corbell is interjecting again. If he cannot accept the fact that there is going to be a significant increase in costs between applying 30 per cent and applying 40 per cent, I think he is naive. Can I tell him what that is in dollar terms? No, I cannot. But what he is asking us to do is accept blindly that 40 per cent is the figure to adopt, knowing that that is a figure that he cannot put a price on but knowing that it is going to be an absolutely massive cost to the people of the ACT, for working families.

Simon Corbell and his fellow ideologues have been sitting pretty on their ministerial salaries for some years now and have generally forgotten the cost pressures that people in Tuggeranong, Belconnen and elsewhere in Canberra—up in Gungahlin—face as they struggle to meet their power bills, their water bills and so on.

I commend this amendment that Mr Seselja has brought forward. I really want to put this on the record. Let us make sure that, as we progress with this debate, it is a sensible debate, it is measured and we get away from some of the ideological interjections that we are getting from both Mr Rattenbury and Mr Corbell. They have been absolutely unhelpful. Let us consider debate on what is going to be best for Canberra both in terms of our environment and in terms of our economy and, importantly, cost pressures and affordability for Canberrans and what they can afford with their cost of living pressures.

Question put:

That **Mr Seselja's** amendment be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 6

Noes 10

Mr Coe
Mr Doszpot
Mrs Dunne
Mr Hanson
Mr Seselja

Mr Smyth

Mr Barr
Ms Bresnan
Ms Burch
Mr Corbell
Ms Gallagher

Mr Hargreaves
Ms Hunter
Ms Le Couteur
Ms Porter
Mr Rattenbury

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

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

Adjournment

Motion by **Mr Corbell** proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Hungarian revolution—anniversary

MR DOSZPOT (Brindabella) (5.54): This Saturday, 23 October, marks the 54th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. It is a day that changed the course of the life of my family as well as around 100,000 other Hungarians who fled the communist regime that had taken power in Hungary again after the revolution. After the revolution, my family became refugees.

In 1956 in Hungary, economic collapse and low standards of living caused by the reorganisation of the economy under the Soviet model provoked working-class discontent which gradually spread to the agricultural industry, the intelligentsia and university students. There was also growing opposition to the military occupation of Hungary by the Soviet Union.

On 23 October 1956, Hungarian students protested against the Soviet occupation of Hungary, which led to a spontaneous popular armed revolt that lasted until 4 November 1956. The revolution, led by former Prime Minister Imre Nagy, deposed the incumbent Soviet-backed government, disbanded the unpopular state police and forced the withdrawal of the Soviet military presence, giving Hungarians a few precious days of freedom, a “Budapest Camelot”, before being subsequently crushed by the ruthless Soviet military machine, with a great loss of life.

Against this background, my family made plans to escape. My father had already been imprisoned for two years by the communists in 1948 for being a Catholic youth worker, and he was now targeted again. We became refugees from religious and political persecution in Hungary.

I would like to recognise this anniversary today and recognise two commemorations held in Canberra. The first one was this afternoon at a special function at the Hungarian Embassy to commemorate the anniversary of the 1956 revolution in Hungary, and was hosted by His Excellency Gabor Csaba, the Hungarian Ambassador.

The second function will be on this Saturday afternoon, 23 October, when the Canberra and District Hungarian Cultural Association will hold a commemoration at Monash of the 1956 Hungarian uprising and freedom fight. I would like to offer my congratulations and thanks to the President of the Canberra and District Hungarian Cultural Association, Mr Attila Ovari, for the work that he has done and continues to do on behalf of the Canberra Hungarian community. This function is but another

example of his commitment to ensure that the local Hungarian community has some commonality to get together on.

Koolamon Restoration

MR COE (Ginninderra) (5.56): This evening it is a pleasure to stand up to commend all those involved with a venture called Koolamon Restoration. I do not think many people in the territory would be aware of the magnificent work which happens through this organisation in the lives of people who are recovering from addictions of different sorts.

Koolamon Restoration is a joint venture with Church Army and Koolamon Fellowship, and it is a residential drug and alcohol rehabilitation program based on the Church Army's successful programs in the United States and also in the Blue Mountains. It is a model based on Christian values which also uses the Alcoholics Anonymous 12-step program. It also has a partnership with Housing ACT, and I understand they have got a property or two in the Woden area where they assist those in their programs. They have a 12-month program where phase 1 goes for two to three months with a focus on the 12-step AA program, and then phase 2 includes employment and full-time education or volunteer work.

It really was quite inspiring going to a dinner a couple of months ago to hear about the great work and to hear some testimonies of people that are either going through the program or have recently completed it. What was pretty amazing was the consistent testimony whereby people went into the program thinking, "What can I get from it?" but by the end they were saying, "What can we give?" I think that is a wonderful testament that people who have gone through this program are determined to actually help others who are going through similar experiences that they once went through.

We heard of people that had been released from the AMC and were looking to move on with their lives, and the Koolamon Restoration was there to give them that assistance. There were a number of case studies we heard, and they really were inspiring and motivational. I think everyone who was at the International Church in Belconnen who heard these testimonies really had the utmost admiration for the achievements of these people in spite of the tremendous adversity they have faced just recently.

I would like to commend Tim Scheuer from Church Army Australia and also Dr Tim O'Neil, who is a GP working out of Dickson. He is the local champion of Koolamon Restoration, and Tim is doing some superb work. He has got so much energy; he has always got umpteen projects on the go, and he really is a great asset to the organisation and, indeed, to the Canberra community.

I encourage everyone to find out a little bit more about Koolamon Restoration. You can contact them by email at koolamon@spin.net.au or come to my office and I will happily pass on some more contact details.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The Assembly adjourned at 6 pm until Tuesday, 26 October 2010, at 10 am.

Schedule of amendments

Schedule 1

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Bill 2010

Amendment moved by Mr Seselja

1

Clause 7 (1) (a)

Page 4, line 14—

omit

40%

substitute

30%

Answers to questions

National Arboretum Canberra—tree thefts (Question No 1049)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 August 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) What was the cost for each of the 12 dragon trees stolen from the Arboretum on 27 July 2010.
- (2) How many of the 12 dragon trees were recovered and how many of these trees have survived since their recovery.
- (3) Will replacement dragon trees be purchased to replace the trees that did not survive; if so, (a) at what cost and (b) when will they be purchased.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The five smaller Dragon Trees cost \$120 each and the seven larger trees cost \$369 each.
- (2) Five of the twelve Dragon trees were recovered and all have been repotted and are doing well.
- (3) The replacement cost of the larger Dragon Trees is likely to be in the order of \$335 to \$370 each and they are expected to be purchased by the end of the calendar year.

National Arboretum Canberra—tree plantings (Question No 1050)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) How many trees have been planted at the National Arboretum to date, and what is the total cost of these purchases.
- (2) How many trees are due to be planted over the next ten years and what is the projected cost of the purchase of these trees.
- (3) How many visitors have been recorded at the National Arboretum to date.
- (4) What is the projected number of visitors to the Arboretum for the next ten years.
- (5) What is the total cost of security and maintenance of the National Arboretum by year to date.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) To date approximately 25,000 have been planted at the National Arboretum Canberra (NAC). The total cost of plant purchases to date is approximately \$259,000 (exclusive of GST).

- (2) The National Arboretum Canberra has a goal to plant 100 forests by the time of its official opening in 2013, the year of Canberra's Centenary. It is anticipated that another 18,000 trees will be planted at a projected cost of \$189,000 (excluding GST) over this period.
- (3) The National Arboretum Canberra is still in its construction phase and not formally open to the public. Consequently there is no systematic method of recording visitor numbers at this time. However, as the Arboretum's development is of great interest to the public, opportunities have been provided to the Canberra community and visitors to the National Capital to access the site and learn about the project.

The Friends of the NAC have hosted two public open days. The inaugural event held in March 2009 attracted an estimated 4,500 visitors over the course of the day, and the March 2010 event had an estimated attendance of around 7,000 people.

Over the financial year 2009-10 the NAC team and the Friends of the NAC provided 37 guided tours to community groups and the general public. This provided an opportunity for approximately 1,600 visitors to access the site and learn about the project as it develops. The NAC has also hosted 10 tree planting events with International Heads of State/ Government, an Australian Minister, Ambassadors and the diplomatic community. One public artwork launch has also been hosted in recent months. These invitation only events have seen around 350 additional visitors to the Arboretum, importantly including several international visitors.

The site has been open to the public each Sunday for equestrian, cyclist and pedestrian access since November 2009, but there is no mechanism in place to count these visitors. However, this year the National Arboretum gates will be opened to permit public vehicle access each Sunday during Floriade. The first Sunday saw approximately 250 visitors to the site and it is anticipated this number will grow as the word of the opening spreads.

Considering all these visitor opportunities, it is estimated that somewhere in the vicinity of 15,000 people have visited the site to date.

- (4) The forests and facilities of the NAC are still being established and the site is not expected to be formally opened until 2013. However, it is anticipated that the public will be provided with regular access as the site develops, consistent with safety considerations appropriate to a construction site. Visitor numbers will depend on the facilities and gardens in place, but are expected to increase over time as the NAC is further developed. More formal projections of visitor numbers will be estimated in the business and marketing plans currently being developed for the NAC.
- (5) Security costs in the early years of the development of the NAC were either minimal or met by the various contractors. Security costs were approximately \$3,400 in 2008-09 and \$17,700 in 2009-10.

Maintenance costs met from the operational expenses budget were approximately \$167,900 in 2007-08; \$150,000 in 2008-09 and \$400,000 in 2009-10.

Housing ACT—properties (Question No 1054)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 25 August 2010:

- (1) How many properties owned by Housing ACT were identified for disposal in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the total cost of maintenance for each property referred to in part (1) during the 12 months prior to being identified for disposal.

Ms Burch: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 62 properties were identified for disposal in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) Maintenance costs for individual properties are included in Attachment A. Prior to identification for sale/disposal the total cost for maintenance was approximately \$150,322. It should be noted that after a property is identified for sale/disposal maintenance is carried out to ensure that the sale can proceed and revenue is maximised.

PST_PRO_PROPREF	Total
0690000113000A Total	\$57.02
1020200011000A Total	\$653.70
1030200026000A Total	\$4,243.00
1030250009000A Total	\$4,263.88
1030370013000A Total	\$1,783.35
1040410008000A Total	\$153.80
1040420003000A Total	\$1,476.58
1040710022000A Total	\$250.05
1040740020000A Total	\$4,077.56
1040880016000A Total	\$4,843.33
1040940010000A Total	\$3,124.41
1040960020000A Total	\$242.04
1050280013000A Total	\$2,727.31
1100130005000A Total	\$302.73
1240340001000A Total	\$10,423.94
2120230014000A Total	\$2,689.39
2120460023000A Total	\$1,233.90
2150180011000A Total	\$859.12
2180330019000A Total	\$66.18
2180460005000A Total	\$638.24
2180500029000A Total	\$1,617.13
2200600020000A Total	\$572.24
4410270010000A Total	\$3,200.23
4450050010000A Total	\$1,549.86
4480100003000A Total	\$6,110.50
5520660024000A Total	\$4,262.85
5580550013000A Total	\$5,782.89
5601270015000A Total	\$636.22
5601600008000A Total	\$4,927.28

5610040017000A Total	\$1,793.01
5610260018000A Total	\$1,376.26
5610300012000A Total	\$1,412.84
5660630003000A Total	\$5,275.16
5660640002000A Total	\$220.28
5660960002000A Total	\$1,309.70
5661190015000A Total	\$3,830.54
5670430011000A Total	\$818.94
5680730082000A Total	\$4,691.35
5700960227000A Total	\$75.28
5701010009000A Total	\$7,222.81
5720190008000A Total	\$250.53
5740550002000A Total	\$13,499.97
6021160029000A Total	\$3,619.26
6021560004000A Total	\$3,385.24
6021680003000A Total	\$11,308.82
6074400025000A Total	\$1,607.29
6080430023000A Total	\$3,258.60
6095560006000A Total	\$562.94
6106160037000A Total	\$8,396.19
6140960016002A Total	\$269.22
6230040018000A Total	\$2,021.93
6230250005000A Total	\$1,197.56
7061060015023A Total	\$149.48
Grand Total	\$150,321.93

Taxation—volunteer fire brigades (Question No 1055)

Mr Smyth asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 25 August 2010:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the view of the Australian Taxation Office that decisions in recent legal cases concerning volunteer fire brigades have led the Commissioner of Taxation to consider that volunteer brigades do not meet the strict criteria for public benevolent institution status.
- (2) What action is the Minister proposing to take in response to this view of the Commissioner of Taxation to secure the funding of volunteer fire brigades.
- (3) Is the Minister intending to make representations to the Commissioner of Taxation about this matter; if so, can the Minister advise the community of the nature of these representations; if not, why not.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Rural Fire Service does not have Public Benevolent Institution (PBI) status. The issue has been re-examined by the ACT Emergency Services Agency as recently as June 2010, with the conclusion that due to the ACTRFS being under the control of the ACT Government, an application for PBI status would be rejected by the Australian Taxation Office. Apart from legal cases and the views of the

Commissioner of Taxation that volunteer brigades do not meet the strict PBI criteria, Taxation Ruling (TR 2003/5) specifically mentions bush fire brigades and states “*Search and rescue teams which consist of volunteers, and voluntary organisations such as bush fire brigades which have as their central purpose the provision of direct relief to persons in distress, may qualify as public benevolent institutions even where they are government sponsored. This will be so where they are not arms of government and subject to government control.*”

- (2) The ACT Rural Fire Service continues to be funded as part of the Emergency Services Agency within the Department of Justice and Community Safety.
- (3) I do not intend to make representations to the Commissioner of Taxation about this matter. The Australian Taxation Office ruling clearly notes that where voluntary organisations such as bush fire brigades are subject to Government control that the PBI provisions do not apply. In addition, the Emergency Services Commissioner has advised that our Bushfire Volunteer Brigades would not benefit from PBI status as they are volunteers and as such are not remunerated for the work they carry out. Any provisions relating to PBI status would only apply to full time public servants.

Housing—affordability (Question No 1058)

Ms Bresnan asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) What work is being done to ensure that the ACT Government Affordable Housing Action Plan remains evidence based.
- (2) What are the ACT Government’s definitions of ‘affordable housing’ and ‘housing stress’ and what data does the ACT Government gather on an ongoing basis to monitor these measurements, at the median and at different percentile levels.
- (3) Does the Government use gross income or disposable income when defining affordable housing and housing stress and, if gross is used, why is this used rather than disposable.
- (4) What are the latest updates that the ACT Government has for the data and tables that were provided in the Affordable Housing Steering Group Report of 2007, most especially tables 2.2, 3.1, 3.2.
- (5) Which housing groups, based on households income levels and income percentiles, are shown to still be suffering housing stress, and which groups are suffering increased housing stress.
- (6) How do these households referred to in part (5) compare to households that earn the median income level.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

1. The Affordable Housing Action Plan falls under the responsibility of the Department of Land and Property Services in consultation with the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services, and ACT Treasury. Regular consultation occurs between

these agencies and other external key stakeholders to ensure that the 84 objectives within the Plan are implemented in the most targeted and effective way. In addition to the monitoring and reporting against the explicit targets within the plan, there is ongoing monitoring of the key affordability indicators of house prices, first home buyer numbers, income to house price ratios, income to rent ratios and land prices.

2. The ACT Government defines affordable housing as housing that is safe, appropriate and accessible and where housing services are purchased for 30 per cent or less of a household's gross income. Housing stress occurs when a household's housing services costs exceed 30 per cent of gross income. The Government collects and reviews data on household incomes, house prices and weekly rents across the territory.
3. The ACT Government uses gross income as it is a widely recognised measure both nationally and internationally. It is also used by Housing ACT to set public housing rents.
4. The tables in the Steering Group Report are based on ACT Planning and Land Authority (ACTPLA) data and unpublished ABS income data commissioned by the ACT Government in 2007. Updates have been received from ACTPLA for the latest house price and rental distribution across the Territory while updates to the ABS income data will be commissioned as part of a full review of the Affordable Housing Action Plan to take place before the end of 2010.
5. The precise income levels and percentiles are yet to be calculated. Work has focussed specifically on the various income thresholds at which households are able to enter public housing, community housing, the private rental market or home purchase. Based on the analysis, households in the private rental market earning between \$35,000 and \$65,000 are in the most housing stress. A full analysis will take place as part of the full review of the Affordable Housing Action Plan to take place before the end of 2010.
6. Households on median income in the ACT are able to privately rent a typical 3 or 4 bedroom home or purchase a median priced home without experiencing housing stress.

Libraries—book return chutes (Question No 1071)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) What is the new system for returning library books to ACT libraries via a chute, involving scanning a library card in order to access the chute, and why was this new system introduced.
- (2) Is the new system permanent or is there a trial period.
- (3) Are there any cost savings associated with this new system.
- (4) What work was done prior to introducing the policy to assess how it would work, and what consultation was done with patrons.
- (5) Has the Government received patron feedback on the new system and how is this being taken into account.

- (6) How many complaints have been received regarding the new system.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The new system for returning library items is part of the rollout of Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology which helps manage library collections. Part of this system includes an automated chute and a book sorter at Woden Library. The new chute and book sorter use RFID to identify items as belonging to the library, automatically return items from members' records, and automatically sort items for shelving, member requests, or return to other branches. Woden Library has an automated chute and book sorter. Kingston Library also has an automated chute, but no sorter. The new Gungahlin Library will also have an automated chute and book sorter once completed.
- (2) The new system is permanent.
- (3) There have been no direct cost savings as a result of the introduction of the new chute and book sorter. The new system was introduced as part of a workplace health and safety measure due to the manual handling workload for staff in the Woden Library and vandalism that has been occurring through library book chutes. Staff that would have been sorting books have now been redeployed to other tasks within the library service.
- (4) The new system is part of the library-wide rollout of RFID technology. Library staff undertook an assessment of the new system and its operation prior to its introduction. There was no consultation with patrons about the introduction of RFID in the libraries.
- (5) The Library has received feedback about the system from both Kingston and Woden Libraries. Generally, feedback about the Kingston chute has been positive. Feedback from Woden Library patrons has resulted in ACTLIS in liaising with the Heritage Unit regarding installation of a bench for patrons to put books on at the chute, and with the chute supplier to change the system to have it unlock when it recognises a library book rather than a library card.
- (6) There have been 147 complaints received by ACTLIS management regarding the chute at Woden Library.

**Planning—McGregor Hall
(Question No 1072)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) Has the public land in the Northern Part of Section 21 City been sold by the ACT Government to the Australian National University (ANU); if so, how much has the ACT Government received for this direct land sale.
- (2) If the sale referred to in part (1) has not yet taken place, how much does the ACT Government expect to receive from the sale of this land.

- (3) What conditions are attached to the sale of the land, including requirements for the ANU to assist with relocating community groups that were using McGregor Hall.
- (4) What are the details of the recent safety inspection undertaken at McGregor Hall.
- (5) Is asbestos present at McGregor Hall and does it remain safe for use.
- (6) What action has the Government taken to assist the Canberra Musicians' Club to find a new venue once McGregor Hall has been demolished.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. & 2. Yes, the block has been sold. The site was sold for \$2,640,000 ex GST. The ANU is undertaking associated and offsite works on behalf of the Territory to the value of \$646,605 ex GST which was deducted from the final figure the ANU paid to the Territory.
3. The direct sale criteria contained in the ANU City West precinct Agreement requires the ANU to enter into a Development Deed with the Land Development Agency (LDA) for the development of the site, including associated off-site works. The ANU had no obligation to relocate the users of McGregor Hall. The Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services (DHCS) assumed responsibility for the building many years ago when the term of the Crown lease to the Pensioners Club expired on 31 December 1989.
4. The building was closed due to public safety concerns. A hazardous materials assessment of the building undertaken by Coffey Environments confirmed that in addition to asbestos other contaminants include lead based paint to cladding, window frames and some internal finishes, synthetic fibre insulation within the roof cavity and walls and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) within the light fittings. Advice was also sought from the Environment Protection Agency, the Health Protection Service and Worksafe ACT about the matter and after a meeting onsite with representative agencies and in consideration of the potential risks to health and safety of workers, or anyone accessing the building, it was decided that the building should be closed to public access immediately in order to address the Government's responsibilities in relation to safety and legislative obligations.
5. Robson Environments was engaged to address the asbestos issue, including the clean up areas inside the building, removing debris and sealing damaged asbestos sheets and conducting airborne fibre monitoring. The monitoring produced results indicated that airborne fibre concentrations were below the minimum practical detection limit. There was concern that if the building was used again there was opportunity for further damage to occur, in particular to the asbestos sheeting. The building was not considered safe to use in its current condition and was closed and a fence erected around the site for the safety of the public. Demolition of the building will require the removal of asbestos in accordance with the Hazardous Materials Survey and Management Plan, prepared by Robson Environments, and the requirements of the Contaminated Sites Unit of the Department of the Environment, Climate Change, energy and Water (DECCEW).
6. DHCS continues to meet with the users of McGregor Hall and suggest alternative spaces that could be used, including the new Griffith neighbourhood hall, which is scheduled to open in mid September 2010. It is understood that there are current

discussions with the musicians about using the Ainslie Arts Centre and possibly other DHCS facilities within the Civic precinct.

Yarralumla Brickworks (Question No 1073)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Arts and Heritage, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) When will the Site Analysis Report of the Yarralumla Brickworks, currently being prepared by the Land Development Agency, be publically released.
- (2) Have any ACT Government departments received complaints about damage being done to the Brickworks site, including but not limited to graffiti and bricks being removed; if so, what actions have been taken to secure the brickworks site from further damage.
- (3) When will the program of immediate repair and maintenance works recommended in the Brickworks Conservation Management Plan commence and has any funding been provided for these works.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Information from the Canberra Brickworks Site Analysis Report has been presented in a range of formats throughout the Community Conversation Workshops. The consultant report is available on the LDA website at:
http://www.lda.act.gov.au/?/canberra_brickworks/index
- (2) The Department of Land and Property Services, as the custodian of the Canberra Brickworks has received reports of unauthorised entry and malicious damage. The Land Development Agency has also been contacted in relation to on site security through its community consultation process.

To address the concerns of residents and improve asset protection an initial allocation of \$50,000 has been provided for additional security patrols and the inspection and maintenance of fencing has been increased. In addition, liaison with ACT Policing, specifically in relation to the Canberra Brickworks and Yarralumla residents is underway.

These measures supplement the inherent security provided by having a tenant on site and being able to report on intrusions and damage.

- (3) The ACT Property Group has allocated an initial \$50,000 this financial year to undertake some of the recommended works. Pending the ACT Property Group first quarter financial review, additional funds may be available.

Environment—disused service station sites (Question No 1074)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Planning*):

- (1) How many disused service station sites that have not been redeveloped currently exist in the ACT.
- (2) Have any of these disused service stations been developed since the Government extended the concession of development applications fees for these sites.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There are currently 15 disused service station sites (three of these are operating as mechanical repair workshops).
- (2) No. Development applications have been approved for 14 of the sites.

All approvals are subject to remediation and certification from the Environment Protection Authority that the land is suitable for redevelopment.

A number of those sites are actively being remediated at the present.

The three sites still operating as mechanical workshops are not eligible for change of use remission under the current policy.

Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1075)

Mr Seselja asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Chief Minister*):

In relation to each department in the Minister's portfolio, what was the balance of all departmental bank accounts, including Territory bank accounts, at the end of each month in 2009-10, and what were the total withdrawals and deposits each month.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

While the information sought in the questions exists, it is not collated in the format requested and the Government is not prepared to authorise the diversion of resources necessary to do so. Details of the cash holdings of ACT Government Departments and Agencies are published in accordance with the requirements of the Financial Management Act 1996, the Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Act 2004, and the Chief Minister's Annual Report Directions (which are endorsed by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts each year). Reports for 2009-10 will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures. Monthly account balances do not provide a meaningful indication of program activity or service delivery as they are affected by a number of factors including invoicing processes.

Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1077)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

In relation to each department in the Minister's portfolio, what was the balance of all departmental bank accounts, including Territory bank accounts, at the end of each month in 2009-10, and what were the total withdrawals and deposits each month.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The information sought in the questions is not collated in the format requested and the Government is not prepared to authorise the diversion of resources necessary to do so.

Details of cash balances, payments and receipts are published in agency annual financial statements in accordance with general Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*.

Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1079)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

In relation to each department in the Minister's portfolio, what was the balance of all departmental bank accounts, including Territory bank accounts, at the end of each month in 2009-10, and what were the total withdrawals and deposits each month.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

While the information sought in the questions exists, it is not collated in the format requested, and the Government is not prepared to authorize the diversion of resources necessary to do so. Details of cash balances, payments and receipts are published in agency annual financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—departmental bank accounts (Question No 1080)

Mr Seselja asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

In relation to each department in the Minister's portfolio, what was the balance of all departmental bank accounts, including Territory bank accounts, at the end of each month in 2009-10, and what were the total withdrawals and deposits each month.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

While the information sought in the question exists, it is not collated in the format requested and the Government is not prepared to authorise the diversion of resources necessary to do so. Details of cash balances, payments and receipts are published in

agency annual financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—departmental bank accounts
(Question No 1081)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

In relation to each department in the Minister's portfolio, what was the balance of all departmental bank accounts, including Territory bank accounts, at the end of each month in 2009-10, and what were the total withdrawals and deposits each month.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

While the information sought in the question exists, it is not collated in the format requested and the Government is not prepared to authorise the diversion of resources necessary to do so.

Details of cash balances, payments and receipts are published in the Department's annual financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*. The Department's Annual Report for 2009-10, which includes financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—departmental bank accounts
(Question No 1084)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

In relation to each department in the Minister's portfolio, what was the balance of all departmental bank accounts, including Territory bank accounts, at the end of each month in 2009-10, and what were the total withdrawals and deposits each month.

Ms Burch: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

While the information sought in the questions exists, it is not collated in the format requested and the Government is not prepared to authorise the diversion of resources necessary to do so.

Details of cash balances, payments and receipts are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Budget—savings
(Question Nos 1087, 1090, 1103, 1104 and 1105)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 26 August 2010
(*redirected to the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services*):

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what savings did the Minister offer from their portfolio area as part of the 2010-11 Budget process and what was the value of each.
- (2) Which of these savings were included in the Budget.
- (3) If the Minister's savings were rejected, why.

Ms Burch: The answer to the member's questions is as follows:

By longstanding and accepted convention, explained in the *Cabinet Handbook*, the deliberations of the Cabinet are strictly confidential. The decisions taken by the Cabinet in settling the 2010-11 Budget are published in the Budget Papers.

**Budget—savings
(Question No 1089)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what savings did the Minister offer from their portfolio area as part of the 2010-11 Budget process and what was the value of each.
- (2) Which of these savings were included in the Budget.
- (3) If the Minister's savings were rejected, why.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

By longstanding and accepted convention, explained in the *Cabinet Handbook*, the deliberations of the Cabinet are strictly confidential. The decisions taken by the Cabinet in settling the 2010-11 Budget are published in the Budget papers.

**Budget—savings
(Question Nos 1095 and 1096)**

Mr Seselja asked the Attorney-General and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what savings did the Minister offer from their portfolio area as part of the 2010-11 Budget process and what was the value of each.
- (2) Which of these savings were included in the Budget.
- (3) If the Minister's savings were rejected, why.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

By longstanding and accepted convention, explained in the *Cabinet Handbook*, the deliberations of the Cabinet are strictly confidential. The decisions taken by Cabinet in settling the 2010-11 Budget are published in the Budget Papers.

**Budget—savings
(Question Nos 1097 and 1098)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Minister for Energy, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what savings did the Minister offer from their portfolio area as part of the 2010-11 Budget process and what was the value of each.
- (2) Which of these savings were included in the Budget.
- (3) If the Minister's savings were rejected, why.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

By longstanding and accepted convention, explained in the *Cabinet Handbook*, the deliberations of the Cabinet are strictly confidential. The decisions taken by Cabinet in settling the 2010-11 Budget are published in the Budget Papers.

**Budget—savings
(Question No 1102)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Gaming and Racing, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what savings did the Minister offer from their portfolio area as part of the 2010-11 Budget process and what was the value of each.
- (2) Which of these savings were included in the Budget.
- (3) If the Minister's savings were rejected, why.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

By longstanding and accepted convention, explained in the *Cabinet Handbook*, the deliberations of the Cabinet are strictly confidential. The decisions taken by the Cabinet in setting the 2010-11 Budget are published in the Budget Papers.

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question No 1107)**

Mr Seselja asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Chief Minister*):

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

There were no outstanding loans as at 30 June 2010, or during the 2009-10 year, for the Chief Minister's Department.

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question No 1110)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Business and Economic Development*):

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

There were no outstanding loans as at 30 June 2010, or during the 2009-10 year, for the Chief Minister's Department.

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question No 1111)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Department of Land and Property Services had two outstanding loans at 30 June 2010 for the balance of the Magistrates Court (\$5,661,746) and the Dame Pattie Menzies building (\$4,183,352) totalling \$9,845,098.

The above loans were entered into on 24 April 1997.

The current interest rate is approximately 7.72% and the maturity date of the loans is 24 October 2010.

The Department of Land and Property Services makes quarterly loan payments to the Territory Banking Account which is responsible for the Territory's financing arrangements.

Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1113)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Arts and Heritage, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for the Arts and Heritage*):

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

There were no outstanding loans as at 30 June 2010, or during the 2009-10 year, for the Chief Minister's Department, Heritage within the Department of Territory and Municipal Services or the Cultural Facilities Corporation.

Finance—departmental loans (Question No 1114)

Mr Seselja asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

For the purposes of this response, Treasury refers to 'loans' as 'borrowings' or 'interest bearing liabilities'.

Treasury (Core)

- (1) As at 30 June 2010 Treasury (core) has one outstanding loan of \$33 million.
- (2) The loan was entered into on the 4th of February 2008.
- (3) The loan has a variable interest rate and a maturity date of 2037. For the quarter ending 30 June 2010 the interest rate was 4.42%.
- (4) The loan has been provided by the Territory Banking Account. The loan is to facilitate the finance facility provided by the Department of Treasury to Community Housing Canberra Limited.

Territory Banking Account

Details of the answers to each question are summarised in the attached spreadsheet.

Home Loan portfolio

- (1) The ACT Home Loan Portfolio has 13 loans with an amount outstanding of \$89 million as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) The first of the 13 loans was entered into on 30 June 1974 and yearly thereafter until 30 June 1985, with the final loan on 30 June 1987. Prior to Self Government, the Commonwealth established a trust account to hold housing assets (properties and loans). The loans were transferred to the Commissioner for Social Housing in 1987 from the Commonwealth after the enactment of the *Housing Assistance Act 1987*.
- (3) The interest rate applied to each loan is fixed at 4.5%. The term of each loan is 53 years. The maturity date of the first loan is on 30 June 2027 and yearly thereafter until 2038, with the final loan maturing on 30 June 2040.
- (4) The loans were provided by the Commonwealth through the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement.

ACT Insurance Authority

Nil Loans

Superannuation Provision Account

Nil Loans

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question No 1116)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

There were no outstanding loans as at 30 June 2010, or during the 2009-10 year.

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question Nos 1117 and 1118)**

Mr Seselja asked the Attorney-General and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

In response to question 1 to 4, the Department did not hold any loans as at 30 June 2010.

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question Nos 1119 and 1120)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate change and Water and the Minister for Energy, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Department had no loans outstanding as at 30 June 2010.

(2) N/A

(3) N/A

(4) N/A

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question No 1123)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

There are no outstanding loans for the Tourism, Sport and Recreation portfolio.

**Finance—departmental loans
(Question No 1124)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Gaming and Racing, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each department or agency within the Ministers portfolio area, what loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
- (2) When was each loan entered into.
- (3) What is the interest rate and maturity date of each loan.
- (4) Who has provided each loan, and how was each loan acquired.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) In relation to the ACT Gambling and Racing Commission, no loans were outstanding as at 30 June 2010.
 - (2) N/A
 - (3) N/A
 - (4) N/A
-

**Finance—government programs
(Question No 1129)**

Mr Seselja asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Chief Minister*):

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of rollovers of appropriation are published in agency annual reports and relevant instruments prepared under the Financial Management Act 1996 are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. Details of overspending programs are similarly disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget) and agency annual reports. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with relevant statutory requirements from time to time.

**Finance—government programs
(Question Nos 1131, 1134, 1147, 1148 and 1149)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services*):

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Ms Burch: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of appropriation rollover instruments prepared under the Financial Management ACT 1996 are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with the Financial Management Act 1996. Details of programs requiring additional funding are disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget). In addition, agency annual financial statements and management, discussion and analysis (M,D and A) explain significant variances between budgeted appropriation and appropriation drawn, budgeted expenditure and actual expenditure. Agency Statements of Performance include actual Government Payment for Outputs and cost by output, together with variance explanations where there is a material variance from budget. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, M,D and A and statement of performance, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—government programs (Question No 1132)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Business and Economic Development*):

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of rollovers of appropriation are published in agency annual reports and relevant instruments prepared under the Financial Management Act 1996 are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. Details of overspending programs are similarly disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget) and agency annual reports. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with relevant statutory requirements from time to time.

**Finance—government programs
(Question No 1133)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of appropriation rollover instruments prepared under the *Financial Management Act 1996* are tabled by the Treasurer periodically.

The Treasurer also tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's Advance in accordance with *Financial Management Act 1996* from time to time.

Details of programs requiring additional funding are disclosed in the Budget Paper in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget). In addition agency annual financial statements and management, discussion and analysis (MD&A) explain significant variances between budgeted appropriation and appropriation drawn, budgeted expenditure and actual expenditure.

Agency statements of Performance include actual GPO and cost by output together with variance explanations where there is a material variance from budget. Annual reports for 2009-2010, which include agency financial statements, MD&A and statement of performance, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government programs
(Question No 1135)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Arts and Heritage, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for the Arts and Heritage*):

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.

- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of rollovers of appropriation are published in agency annual reports and relevant instruments prepared under the Financial Management Act 1996 are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. Details of overspending programs are similarly disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget) and agency annual reports. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with relevant statutory requirements from time to time.

Finance—government programs (Question No 1137)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of appropriation rollover instruments prepared under the *Financial Management Act 1996* are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with the *Financial Management Act 1996* from time to time. Details of programs requiring additional funding are disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget). In addition, agency annual financial statements and management, discussion and analysis (MD&A) explain significant variances between budgeted appropriation and appropriation drawn, budgeted expenditure and actual expenditure.

In addition, Agency statements of performance include actual GPO and cost by output together with variance explanations where there is a material variance from budget. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, MD&A and statement of performance, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government programs
(Question No 1138)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of rollovers of appropriation are published in agency annual reports and relevant instruments prepared under the Financial Management Act 1996 are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. Details of overspending programs are similarly disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget) and agency annual reports. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with relevant statutory requirements from time to time.

**Finance—government programs
(Question Nos 1139 and 1140)**

Mr Seselja asked the Attorney-General and Minister for Emergency Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.

- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of appropriation rollover instruments prepared under the *Financial Management Act 1996* are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with the *Financial Management Act 1996* from time to time. Details of programs requiring additional funding are disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget). In addition, agency annual financial statements and management, discussion and analysis (MD&A) explain significant variances between budgeted appropriation and appropriation drawn, budgeted expenditure and actual expenditure. Agency statements of Performance include actual Government Payments for Outputs and cost by output together with variance explanations where there is a material variance from budget. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, MD&A and statements of performance, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—government programs (Question Nos 1141 and 1142)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water and Minister for Energy, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of appropriation rollover instruments prepared under the *Financial Management Act 1996* are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with the *Financial Management Act 1996* from time to time.

Details of programs requiring additional funding are disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided. In addition the Department's annual financial statements and management, discussion and analysis (MD&A) explain significant variances between budgeted appropriation and appropriation drawn, budgeted expenditure and actual expenditure. The Department's statement of performance includes actual GPO and cost, by output, together with variance explanations where there is a material variance from budget. The Department's Annual Report for 2009-10, which includes the financial statements, MD&A and statement of performance, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—government programs (Question No 1146)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Gaming and Racing, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) In relation to each portfolio area, what were the top ten underspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (2) What was the cause of each underspend.
- (3) Will any funding be rolled over into the 2010-11 financial year as a result of the underspend.
- (4) What were the top ten program overspending programs in the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) Where was funding allocated from to accommodate the overspend.
- (6) What adjustments have been made to the 2010-11 budget as a result of the overspend and by how much and in what areas have adjustments been made.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Details of appropriation rollover instruments prepared under the Financial Management Act 1996 are tabled by the Treasurer from time to time. The Treasurer tables information on funds allocated from the Treasurer's advance in accordance with Financial Management Act 1996 from time to time.

Details of programs requiring additional funding are disclosed in the Budget Papers in the event additional funding is provided (as occurred in the 2010-11 Budget). In addition agency annual financial statements and management, discussion and analysis (MD&A) explain significant variances between budgeted appropriation and appropriation drawn, budgeted expenditure and actual expenditure.

Agency statements of Performance include actual GPO and cost by output together with variance explanations where there is a material variance from budget. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, MD&A and statement of performance, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government assets and liabilities
(Question No 1151)**

Mr Seselja asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Chief Minister*):

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities of ACT Government Departments and Agencies are published in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and the requirements of the Financial Management Act 1996, the Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Act 2004, and the Chief Minister's Annual Report Directions (which are endorsed by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts each year). Reports for 2009-10 will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government assets and liabilities
(Question Nos 1153, 1156, 1169, 1170 and 1171)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Women and Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Ms Burch: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the Financial Management Act 1996. Under GAAP, departments are required to disclose their assets and liabilities by output class where it is feasible to do so. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government assets and liabilities
(Question No 1154)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Business and Economic Development*):

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities of ACT Government Departments and Agencies are published in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and the requirements of the Financial Management Act 1996, the Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Act 2004, and the Chief Minister's Annual Report Directions (which are endorsed by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts each year). Reports for 2009-10 will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1155)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Mr Stanhope: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio.

Details of the assets and liabilities are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*. Under GAAP, departments are required to disclose their assets and liabilities by output class where it is feasible to do so.

Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1157)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Arts and Heritage, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for the Arts and Heritage*):

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.

- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities of ACT Government Departments and Agencies are published in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and the requirements of the Financial Management Act 1996, the Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Act 2004, and the Chief Minister's Annual Report Directions (which are endorsed by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts each year). Reports for 2009-10 will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1159)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*. Under GAAP, departments are required to disclose their assets and liabilities by output class where it is feasible to do so. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

Finance—government assets and liabilities (Question No 1160)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities of ACT Government Departments and Agencies are published in

accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and the requirements of the Financial Management Act 1996, the Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Act 2004, and the Chief Minister's Annual Report Directions (which are endorsed by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts each year). Reports for 2009-10 will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government assets and liabilities
(Question Nos 1161 and 1162)**

Mr Seselja asked the Attorney-General and Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*. Under GAAP, departments are required to disclose their assets and liabilities by output class where it is feasible to do so. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government assets and liabilities
(Question Nos 1163 and 1164)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water and Minister for Energy, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles as required by the *Financial Management Act 1996*.

The Department's Annual Report for 2009-10, which includes the financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government assets and liabilities
(Question No 1168)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Gaming and Racing, upon notice, on 26 August 2010:

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the Financial Management Act 1996. Under GAAP, departments are required to disclose their assets and liabilities by output class where it is feasible to do so. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Finance—government assets and liabilities
(Question No 1172)**

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Territory and Municipal Services*):

- (1) For each portfolio area, what were the top ten assets as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by specific asset, not asset class.
- (2) What were the top ten liabilities as at 30 June 2010 and what was their value, broken down by each specific liability.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government does not account for assets and liabilities by portfolio. Details of the assets and liabilities are published in agency financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) as required by the Financial Management Act 1996. Under GAAP, departments are required to disclose their assets and liabilities by output class where it is feasible to do so. Annual Reports for 2009-10, which include agency financial statements, will be tabled shortly in accordance with established procedures.

**Taxation—change of use
(Question No 1173)**

Mr Seselja asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 26 August 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Planning*):

What was the average amount of change of use charge paid by developers, per unit, from (a) 2003 to May 2010 and (b) May 2010 to date, and how many units has this been applied to.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) In relation to the period 2003 to May 2010 an answer to the Member's question cannot be provided without a manual examination of all relevant records for the seven year period. Given that this would require significant resources I consider that this is not an appropriate use of ACTPLA's resources.

The Change of Use Charge Internal Audit Review was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 26 August 2010.

- (b) No change of use charge for residential development has been paid since May 2010.

Canberra Institute of Technology—executive positions (Question No 1177)

Mr Doszpot asked the Minister for Education and Training, upon notice, on 21 September 2010:

- (1) On what dates were the Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT) executive positions E522, E523, E524, E525 and E526 (a) first created/established and (b) advertised one or more times in the ACT Gazette.
- (2) If the position referred to in part (1) were never advertised in the ACT Gazette why not and how was the positions advertised, if at all, and filled.
- (3) What was the substantive ACT Public Service classification rank level, for example, Teacher Band 4 or the relevant executive classification level, of the (a) contact officer and (b) selection panel chairperson for each of the recruitment processes used for appointments to CIT positions E522, E523, E524, E525 and E526 following their creation.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) E00522, E00523, E00524 – 19 December 2007; E00525, E00526 – 14 January 2008
(b) E00522, E00523, E00524 – 7 August 2008; E00525 – Not advertised in Gazette; E00526 – 27 November 2008.
- (2) E00525 was advertised only in the press because CIT was seeking an applicant with specialised skills in the nature of managing student issues across a large educational institution. It was decided that a larger pool of suitable applicants would be gained by advertising through the press. E00526 was filled initially through a press advertisement because CIT was seeking an applicant with proven skills in the area of business development and industry engagement. It was decided that a larger pool of suitable applicants would be gained by advertising through the press.

- (3) (a) E00522, E00523 – Executive 1.2; E00524 – Executive 1.3; E00525, E00526 – employment agency representative (initial filling); E00526 – Executive 1.2 (subsequent filling)
 - (b) Chief Executive.
-

**Cahill, Mr Ron—judicial review
(Question No 1185)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 21 September 2010:

- (1) In relation to the aborted judicial review and the police investigation into, and the assessment by the Director of Public Prosecutions, of the alleged improper conduct of former Chief Magistrate Ron Cahill, which agencies of the ACT Government became engaged in the process at all stages during those activities.
- (2) What was the financial cost to each agency referred to in part (1).
- (3) What was the cost to each agency in full-time equivalent (FTE) staff time and other non-financial resources.
- (4) Did any agency engage temporary staff, contract staff or other staff or consultants to undertake any work associated with those activities; if so, (a) which agencies engaged these staff, (b) how many did each agency engage, (c) in what work were these staff engaged, (d) what was the FTE hours spent by these staff for each agency and (e) what was the cost for each agency.
- (5) Did any agency seek any form of legal or other expert advice from sources external to government; if so, (a) which agencies sought that advice, (b) what was the nature of the advice sought for each agency and (c) what was the cost for each agency.
- (6) In relation to the judicial review commission, (a) who were the appointees, (b) when did their appointments start, (c) when did their appointments terminate, (d) what was the cost of any fees paid to them and (e) what costs were associated with (i) administrative support, (ii) travel, (iii) accommodation, (iv) meals and (v) other.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The agencies of the ACT Government involved in the “aborted” judicial commission and the police investigation into the alleged improper conduct of former Chief Magistrate Cahill were:
 - (a) ACT Government Solicitor (**ACTGS**); and
 - (b) Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (**DPP**) (who referred the matter to the Australian Federal Police for investigation).
- (2) (a) The financial cost to ACTGS in relation to the judicial commission was \$11,661.96. This figure includes disbursements (\$1,359.46), fees paid to counsel and counsel assisting the Commission, and the fees paid to Commission members (which are detailed further below).

- (b) The financial cost to the DPP in relation to the judicial commission was \$7,161.00. This cost was incurred after the DPP sought an independent legal opinion from the NSW DPP.
 - (3) (a) Several lawyers within ACTGS provided legal services in relation to the judicial commission as part of ACTGS' normal business. No extra resources were allocated.
 - (b) The matter was dealt with as part of the normal business of the DPP. No resources were separately allocated.
 - (4) ACTGS and the DPP did not engage any temporary staff, contract staff or other staff or consultants.
 - (5) (a) ACTGS sought legal advice from external counsel. The cost to the ACTGS for these services was \$1,062.50.
 - (b) The DPP sought a legal opinion from the NSW DPP, for which the DPP paid \$7,161.00.
 - (6) In relation to the judicial commission:
 - (a) The appointees were: the Honourable James Wood AO QC, the Honourable Jerrold Cripps QC, and the Honourable Ted Mulligan QC.
 - (b) The appointees were appointed on 10 November 2009.
 - (c) The appointments were terminated on 17 November 2009.
 - (d) The total fees paid to the appointees was \$6,240.00.
 - (e) The costs associated with the judicial commission are as follows:
 - (i) administrative support \$0
 - (ii) travel \$0
 - (iii) accommodation \$0
 - (iv) meals \$0
 - (v) other: a barrister was appointed as counsel assisting the commission. ACTGS paid counsel assisting \$3,000.00 for
-

**Emergency Services Agency—headquarters
(Question No 1187)**

Mr Smyth asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 21 September 2010:

- (1) What is the latest estimate of the capital cost of constructing the Emergency Services Agency (ESA) Headquarters, specifically the headquarters office, B183 and the Workshop and Vehicle Compound being built at Fairbairn.
- (2) If the capital cost for the ESA Headquarters has increased from the \$16.017 million as provided in E10-406, what are the reasons for this increase.

- (3) Has there been any further revision to the \$61.623 million that is committed to leases by the Heads of Agreement; if so, what (a) is the magnitude of this revision and (b) are the reasons for this revision.
- (4) What is the latest estimate of the capital cost of constructing the ESA training facility and associated works at Hume.
- (5) If there have been any changes to the cost of the project referred to in part (4), what are the reasons for these changes.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The latest estimate of the capital cost of constructing the ESA Headquarters is as follows:

	Capital \$'000
B183	4,211
HQ Office	7,462
Workshop & Vehicle Compound	3,708
Total Fairbairn Headquarters	15,381

- (2) The capital costs of the Fairbairn Headquarters have not increased from the estimate provided in E10 406.
- (3) At this stage, there has been no change to the amount committed to leases under the Heads of Agreement. However, the Territory has been advised that the Canberra Airport Group has re surveyed the net lettable area at Fairbairn with the completion of the Headquarters and Workshop buildings. It is not yet possible to quantify the financial impact that this may have.
- (4) There are two projects at Hume; they are the upgrade to Snowy Hydro Aero Medical site and a new Rural Fire Service hangar facility along with the new ESA Training Facility. The current estimates of the capital cost for both projects are as follows:

	Capital \$'000
Hume Helipad	2,788
Hume Training Centre	9,945
	12,734

- (5) Both projects at Hume have included variations surrounding the following matters:

	\$'000
Transfer of Hume related design and ICT costs, which had allocated previously across the Fairbairn sub-project estimates, to Hume given the Hume sub-projects are sufficiently progressed for these costs to be estimated reliably.	431
Redevelopment of the design aspects of the outdoor training props, to meet both environmental requirements and end users operational training needs	898
Other variations within the Training Centre, particularly the redesign of the fire tower to meet ActewAGL requirements	205
Total	1,534

**Health—mental health
(Question No 1189)**

Ms Bresnan asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 22 September 2010:

- (1) How many times has the Mental Health Strategic Oversight Group met since the introduction of the *ACT Mental Health Services Plan 2009-2014*.
- (2) Will the Strategic Oversight Group provide advice on mental health budget submissions, including from community and non-government organisations, for the 2011-2012 budget; if so, what will be the process for providing this advice.

Ms Gallagher: I am advised that the answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The Mental Health Strategic Oversight Group has met four times since the introduction of the ACT Mental Health Services Plan 2009 – 2014.
2. The Mental Health Strategic Oversight Group will not provide advice on individual mental health budget submissions, including from community and non-government organisations, for the 2011 – 2012 budget. It will provide advice on strategic priorities for the 2011 – 2012 budget in line with the priorities established in the ACT Mental Health Services Plan 2009 – 2014.

**Bicycles—parking facilities
(Question No 1199)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 23 September 2010:

- (1) Does the ACT Planning and Land Authority (ACTPLA) assess all development applications to ensure they meet the bicycle parking guidelines.
- (2) Is a two-level bicycle cage acceptable under the bicycle parking guidelines.
- (3) What enforcement mechanisms are in place to ensure that an appropriate bicycle parking facility is built once the development has been approved.
- (4) What processes are available to members of the public who wish to report bicycle parking facilities that do not meet the guidelines.
- (5) Did ACPLA assess and approve the proposal for bicycle parking in the new Sirius building in Block 46 Section 8, Woden.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) ACTPLA assesses development applications to ensure they meet the Bicycle Parking General Code when required to do so by the relevant development code in the Territory Plan.
- (2) A two-level bicycle cage may be acceptable provided it meets the relevant requirements of the Bicycle Parking General Code and in particular *Australian Standard 2890.3 – Bicycle Parking Facilities (AS2890.3)*.

- (3) Where an alleged breach of relevant legislation is identified, on completion of an appropriate investigation ACTPLA may undertake corrective action utilising the enforcement provisions of the legislation.
 - (4) If it is a condition of a development approval that requires bicycle parking to be provided and the facilities are not provided, members of the public can lodge a formal complaint with ACTPLA via the approved complaint form available on the ACTPLA website.
 - (5) Yes, ACTPLA approved bicycle parking in the new Sirius building on Block 46 Section 8, Phillip. The approved plans identified the location for a bicycle facility (196 bicycles) to comply with AS2890.3. Lockers and change room facilities are located near the bicycle parking facilities.
-

Environment—fuel storage facilities remediation (Question No 1201)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 23 September 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) In relation to the 2010-11 Budget Measure, Remediation of Fuel Storage Facilities, which fuel storage facilities on which sites will be remediated under this initiative.
- (2) Has remediation commenced on any of these sites.
- (3) How many will be complete in this financial year.
- (4) What, on average, is the cost of remediation for each site.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The current program includes site remediation at the former water police jetty at Belconnen, Namadgi Visitors Centre, Namadgi Glendale Workshop, Googong Depot and Tidbinbilla Depot. Further sites will be remediated in the following financial year.
 - (2) No site works have commenced however project planning has commenced. Works are not expected to commence before the new year.
 - (3) Five sites.
 - (4) Each site will vary in scope and level of remediation however on average the cost will be \$100,000.
-

Roads—John Gorton Drive (Question No 1202)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 23 September 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport*):

- (1) How much has been spent on the construction of John Gorton Drive to date.
- (2) What work has been completed on the road to date.
- (3) When will construction of this road be complete.

Mr Corbell: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Expenditure to date - \$2.2 million
 - (2) Works completed for Stage 1 under construction:
 - Earthworks 80%
 - Bridge Structure 15%
 - Creek Crossing (Culverts) 95%
 - (3) Stage 1 will be completed by June 2012
Stage 2 is currently under design and is expected to be constructed within the next five years.
Future stages will be linked to the land release program and are expected to be constructed over the next 10-15 years.
-

Land—Molonglo Valley (Question No 1203)

Mr Seselja asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 23 September 2010 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) How many blocks have been sold in Molonglo to date.
- (2) What was the average sale price per square metre.
- (3) When will construction of homes on these blocks be able to commence.
- (4) When will the urban infrastructure that services these blocks, including utilities connections and roads, be completed.
- (5) How many of the blocks of land suitable for housing in the ACT that will be released by the Government in 2010-11 have urban infrastructure already in place, including roads and utilities.

Ms Gallagher: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Land Development Agency (LDA) has sold 309 single residential blocks and two multi-unit sites in Molonglo as at 30 September 2010.
- (2) The average sale price per square metre was \$701.
- (3) Mid 2011.

(4) Mid 2011.

(5) Sites for 2,625 dwellings have urban infrastructure in place. This total does not include proposed releases by LDA joint ventures.

Questions without notice taken on notice

Environment—tree felling—Wednesday, 22 September 2010

Mr STANHOPE (*in reply to a question by Ms Le Couteur*): The subject tree was provisionally registered in August 2009 having been assessed by the Tree Protection Unit, Territory and Municipal Services, as meeting the criteria for provisional registration under the provisions of the *Disallowable Instrument Tree Protection (Criteria for Registration and Cancellation of Registration) Determination 2006* (“the Instrument”). The tree was entered on the Provisional Register for its size, stature and aesthetic landscape value.

A development application for the construction of the student accommodation was lodged with the ACT Planning and Land Authority (ACTPLA) prior to a decision being made on the provisional registration of the tree.

The Instrument explicitly states that the Conservator may not consider a tree for registration if it meets any of the criteria for cancellation. There are four such criteria. One precludes registration if, on advice from ACTPLA, doing so will significantly compromise the broader strategic planning objectives of the Territory Plan. ACTPLA provided advice to that effect and the tree could not, therefore, be registered.

You also asked when the Conservator negotiated. The Conservator did not negotiate with any party. The Conservator received submissions from interested individuals and groups and sought advice from relevant Government agencies as required by the Instrument.

Mr STANHOPE (*in reply to a supplementary question by Ms Hunter*): Listing and removal of trees on the Tree Register are not matters of Government policy. These decisions are made independently by the Conservator of Flora and Fauna in accord with relevant legislation.

Provisional and final registration transparent decisions that involve the opportunity for public comment and are made in conformity with relevant statutes.

Once a tree is on the Tree Register it can only be removed in the circumstances outlined in *Disallowable Instrument Tree Protection (Criteria for Registration and Cancellation of Registration) Determination 2006* i.e. the tree no longer meets the criteria for registration; or represents an unacceptable risk to public or private safety; or is shown to be causing substantial damage to a substantial building, structure or service that will require ongoing and extensive remediation measures.

In addition the Conservator may only cancel the registration of a tree if all reasonable remedial treatments and risk mitigation measures have been determined to be ineffective.

Mr STANHOPE (*in reply to a supplementary question by Ms Bresnan*): There has been no dismissal of the Tree Register, real or apparent. The decision in this case was made in accordance with the relevant legislation.

The Government's commitment to preserve urban trees wherever appropriate remains and is reflected in its continuing support of a range of policies and programs.

The ACT Tree Register currently contains 36 individual trees and three groups of multiple trees. In addition, 15 trees are listed on the Provisional Register and the Conservator is currently assessing a further 43 individual trees and one group of trees for their suitability for inclusion on the Provisional Register.

The Conservator and relevant staff from the Department of Territory and Municipal Services have an active program of identifying and provisionally registering suitable trees.

Childcare—staff—Thursday, 23 September 2010

Ms BURCH (*in reply to a question by Mrs Dunne*): The Department is currently collecting information from all services about their plans to implement the National Quality Standards in relation to the new staff to child ratios for children under two years .

Of the 121 licensed long day care services 106 provide child care for children aged under two years.

I am advised that approximately 30 % of these long day care services currently meet the staff to child ratios of 1:4 for children under two years and will not require additional staff.

The remaining 75 centres provide approximately 1200 places for children under 2 years.

Based on this number of under two year old places currently provided, it is estimated approximately that 60 additional staff will be required to maintain the current licensed places.

Canberra Hospital—obstetrics unit review—Thursday, 23 September 2010

Ms GALLAGHER (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Hanson*): I am advised that the answer to the Member's question is:

Any information in relation to the Public Interest Disclosure (PID) investigation is prohibited from disclosure under the section 33 of the PID Act except for prescribed circumstances.

It is therefore inappropriate for me to seek any particulars in relation to the investigation.

**Health—mental health crisis assessment and treatment team—
Thursday, 23 September 2010**

Ms GALLAGHER (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Hanson*): I am advised that the answer to the Member's question is:

If AFP assistance is required in a situation involving an individual with mental health concerns, then it would generally be the case that the situation is one in which there are heightened levels of concerns around personal safety for both the individual and/or others and a level of situation containment is required. This may include possible risk of violence or aggression, and/or cases where the individual is refusing mental health intervention that is urgently required. Consequently, in these cases it is expected that there is an increased risk that some level of force may be required, compared to those situations in which CATT attend without the requirement for AFP involvement.

Where AFP attend a situation without CATT, they must make their own judgments about the potential level of risk to officers, the individual and others and the need to use restraint or force to ensure safety. Their response is guided by Police training principles and not solely mental health protocols or considerations.

CATT will contact the AFP for assistance in transporting an individual to the Canberra Hospital for further psychiatric assessment where there are identified risks to safety for others or where an individual is refusing further assistance that is judged to be clinically imperative. It is often the case that CATT has had prior involvement with the individual in the days leading up to this decision being taken and is more familiar with their psychiatric history and general background. In these situations CATT will provide the AFP with both written and verbal information regarding the individual to assist the AFP in their interaction with the individual. This is different from situations involving the AFP alone, where the AFP may be called to an unpredicted event, such as a domestic disturbance, where the mental health concerns may not necessarily be evident at the time and without any background knowledge.

CATT is not in the position to use force or restraint to transport individuals involuntarily to hospital and the application of such force would place both clinicians and the individual at risk of injury. Furthermore, it is the experience of CATT clinicians that AFP use minimal force, if any, when transporting mental health consumers to hospital or generally engaging with them in the community. The presence of AFP itself, is often sufficient to de-escalate or contain potentially risky situations where issues of violence and aggression have been identified.

In September 2010 there were 63 occasions where Emergency Actions were initiated by AFP, without CATT or other Mental Health Officers necessarily being present. Of these 63 cases, there were 48 instances where no force was required by the AFP to transport the individual to the Canberra Hospital Emergency Department (TCH ED) for further psychiatric assessment. For the remaining 15 cases, AFP were required to use force ranging from minimal "escort holds" to the use of restraint (including handcuffing). For all of these 15 cases, the documentation reviewed suggests the individuals were either in possession of a weapon, engaging in aggressive or violent behaviour at the time, or actively resisting or non-compliant with the direction to attend hospital for further psychiatric assessment.