



Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

EIGHTH ASSEMBLY

4 AUGUST 2015

www.hansard.act.gov.au

Tuesday, 4 August 2015

Petitions:	
Lyneham—urban open space—petition No 9-15	2169
Giralang shops—petition No 3-15 (Ministerial response)	2169
Estimates 2015-2016—Select Committee	2170
Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee.....	2175
Leave of absence	2175
Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee	2175
Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services— Standing Committee	2177
Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services— Standing Committee	2178
Ministerial delegations to China and Singapore (Ministerial statement).....	2179
National disability insurance scheme—implementation report (Ministerial statement)	2187
Melaleuca Place—anniversary (Ministerial statement)	2189
Liquor Amendment Bill 2015	2193
Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Amendment Bill 2015	2204
Questions without notice:	
Construction industry—alleged bullying.....	2209
Construction industry—alleged bullying.....	2210
Transport—light rail	2211
Health—infrastructure	2212
Planning—variations	2215
Schools—autism	2216
Transport—light rail	2217
Capital works—projects	2218
Schools—safety	2219
Papers	2222
Legislative Assembly delegation to Taiwan	2222
Papers	2223
Legislation program—spring 2015	2224
Committee reports—government responses	2225
Papers	2225
Financial Management Act—instruments	2228
Papers	2228
Planning and Development Act 2007—variations Nos 309 and 327 to the territory plan	2230
Planning and Development Act 2007—variation Nos 321, 331, 337 and 347 to the territory plan	2232
Papers	2237
Public housing (Matter of public importance)	2244
Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Amendment Bill 2015	2257
Water Resources (Catchment Management Coordination Group) Amendment Bill 2015	2260
NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Repeal Bill 2015	2265
Adjournment:	
Sport—racism	2270
ACT Telstra business awards	2271

Sport—racism	2272
DonateLife Week	2273
Netball World Cup.....	2274
Greenhills Centre	2276
Lions Club Gungahlin	2277

Tuesday, 4 August 2015

MADAM SPEAKER (Mrs Dunne) took the chair at 10 am, made a formal recognition that the Assembly was meeting on the lands of the traditional custodians, and asked members to stand in silence and pray or reflect on their responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

Petitions

The following petition was lodged for presentation, by Mr Rattenbury, from 1,553 residents:

Lyneham—urban open space—petition No 9-15

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

The following residents of the Australian Capital Territory draw to the attention of the Assembly the potential loss of Urban Open Space (PRZI) in Lyneham through sub-leasing and development, in particular by the current proposal to sub-lease and develop Lyneham Neighbourhood Oval.

Your petitioners, therefore, request the Assembly to prevent further loss of Lyneham's Urban Open Space by (1) not entering into further sub-leases of Urban Open Space to any business enterprise, (2) not allowing further development on Urban Open Space by any business enterprise, and (3) not rezoning any land currently zoned Urban Open Space for the benefit of any business enterprise.

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.

Ministerial response

The Clerk: The following response to a petition has been lodged by a minister:

By **Mr Gentleman**, Minister for Planning, dated 23 July 2015, in response to a petition lodged by Mr Coe on 5 May 2015 concerning Giralang Shops.

The terms of the response will be recorded in *Hansard*.

Giralang shops—petition No 3-15

The response read as follows:

I understand the petition brings to the attention of the Assembly that Giralang has been without local shops for a decade, and that the petitioners request the Assembly to express their support for the completion, without further delay, of the full approved development of the shops currently under construction. Further, they call upon the Assembly to enact legislation, if necessary, to limit further legal appeal by those opposing the development.

The redevelopment of Giralang shops is currently subject to judicial review in the ACT Court of Appeal.

This matter has been the subject of an ongoing and drawn out appeal since its approval during 2011. Initially the matter was appealed in the ACT Supreme Court, then in the ACT Court of Appeal, and eventually in the High Court.

On 10 December 2014, the High Court ordered that the matter be remitted to the ACT Court of Appeal for further hearing on limited grounds.

The submissions which the parties will make at the re-hearing by the Court of Appeal are now limited to a narrow point of providing the Court with an update in relation to the cases since 2013, relied upon by each of the parties.

Parties to the matter already made written submissions, and the matter is now listed for one day of hearing on 30 July 2015.

I expect that the re-hearing by the Court of Appeal will bring final resolution to this long-standing matter.

In its submissions, the ACT government has made all possible efforts to emphasise the significant delays caused by the legal action, and the resultant impacts on the Giralang community.

When Minister Corbell used his call-in powers on 17 August 2011 to approve the redevelopment of Giralang shops, the ACT government already showed its support for the development.

It is open to the Assembly to “express their support for the completion, without further delay, of the full approved development of the shops currently under construction” as suggested in the petition. However, the timing of the decision of the Court of Appeal, after its hearing of the matter on 30 July 2015, is fundamentally in the hands of the Court.

Limitations on third party appeal rights are already in place in the ACT, and would not have prevented a judicial review appeal of this matter in the ACT Supreme Court, the ACT Court of Appeal, or the High Court. Judicial review of matters before the High Court is simply beyond the statutory jurisdiction of the Assembly.

I appreciate and welcome Mr Coe’s openness to resolve this matter by other legislative means should the current legal process continue for an unreasonable timeframe. I will consider other available legislative avenues should this matter not be resolved through the upcoming decision of the Court of Appeal.

Estimates 2015-2016—Select Committee Report

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (10.02): Pursuant to order, I present the following report:

Estimates 2015-2016—Select Committee—Report—Appropriation Bill 2015-2016 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016 (2 volumes), dated 29 July 2015, together with a copy of the relevant minutes of proceedings and answers to questions on notice and questions taken on notice

I move:

That the report be noted.

Yet again another estimates period and yet again another report, and I start by thanking all those involved with its production. I thank my fellow members on the committee: Ms Meegan Fitzharris as deputy chair, Dr Chris Bourke as a member and Ms Nicole Lawder as a member. I particularly thank all the secretariat staff for their assistance in the preparation of this report.

The appropriation bill is the bill that defines a lot of the activity for the coming year. This report has 148 recommendations and it is about 300-odd pages. It is a cracking good read, if you do not get enough paperwork. I thank the officials that appeared. This year we have virtually all of the questions answered that were taken on notice or placed on notice, which is a great outcome.

As you can read from the report, there was a lot of discussion about a broad range of topics and some quite revealing answers when those questions were put. First and foremost is the revelation that stamp duty is not necessarily going. We had the Chief Minister answering questions where we went from a position of, “We’ve abolished the tax,” to the position of, “We want to be the lowest taxing jurisdiction.” It is important that we get some clarity on that, and there are a number of recommendations—recommendations 38, 39 and following—about tax reform.

Members will note that there is not a dissenting report, which is a wonderful thing. We used the technique we used last year where if somebody recommended something significant and it was not agreed to it appears as a footnote. Members will see that there is a recommendation on page 94 that has gone to the footnotes where Mr Smyth and Ms Lawder recommended that the government detail exactly when stamp duty will be finally abolished in the ACT and that the government do so during the debate of the appropriation bill. That was not agreed to by all members of the committee so it has gone in as a footnote.

It is important that people get some certainty. When people were told that certain taxes were being abolished, they thought that meant they were going. But we see in this year’s conveyances the outcome for 2014-15 is \$220 million and by the 2018-19 budget it will be \$260 million. It is a very strange tax that has been abolished that continues to grow and grow. I think people deserve some certainty, so there is a recommendation that the government report on the first five years of the tax reform and outline its plan for the next five years, in particular, its commitment to the principle of revenue neutrality and its long-term goal of abolishing stamp duty over two decades. People deserve certainty, and they are not getting that from this process. What they are getting is larger rates bills without what many believe is the commensurate pay-off—the abolition of some of these taxes.

A business wrote to me last year saying their rates bill was about \$70,000 and this year it is \$98,000. That is an enormous increase at a time when land values have not gone up that much in the ACT to warrant that level of activity. A lot of people are feeling the pinch. We know from some of the groups that appeared, National Seniors for instance, that people are finding things difficult. That needs to be addressed.

There are some recommendations resulting from when the committee saw Shared Services concerning the appropriate withdrawal clauses in the provision of capital metro. We look forward to those provisions—the standard withdrawal or termination clauses—in those documents.

There was also a lot of discussion in the committee—there is a recommendation about it—about the government’s ongoing tax on community groups where they are basically taking money off them. They have extended the original deal by another two years but, again, a lot of the community groups did not know that was coming. Some groups who appeared before us talked about the lack of respect for community groups and the desire for a new framework where they are treated with respect. We look forward to the government responding to that.

Something dear to Mr Doszpot’s heart, there was a lot of discussion about Manuka Occasional Care and what is happening at the Telopea Park School, and there are recommendations about that. With regard to tourism, recommendation 46 is that the government update its tourism 2020 strategy to consider the 10 years to 2030 and take into account things like accommodation, attractions and annual events so that we start getting a long-term vision of where we are going and that we provide the facilities to allow that to happen.

Recommendation 47 is something dear to Mr Coe’s heart—that the government funds stage 2 of the Belconnen Arts Centre. There has been a lot of consideration about this. The government is always talking, as well you know, Madam Speaker—I am sure this is dear to your heart as well—about the importance of community arts facilities in the community. Recommendation 48 also points out that the Woden-Weston area does not have such a community arts facility and neither does the growing area of Gungahlin. It is about making sure that we have a long-term vision and a long-term plan to deliver on that.

Recommendation 49 is that the government should consider assisting the arts sector by determining a path to improve the wages paid to the arts community. This has come up in several estimates hearings over recent years. There still does not seem to be an answer and there certainly does not seem to be a commitment from the government.

There was a lot of discussion about the CBD development issues, and that can be seen at page 22. The Chief Minister in his capacity as Minister for Urban Renewal told the committee what was going on. Recommendation 50 is that the government, in conjunction with relevant stakeholders, promulgate a vision for Canberra’s CBD. We get a lot of talk, and many will remember Mr Corbell’s plan from 2004 which never saw the light of day after it was tabled. Sixteen key initiatives, none of which happened, and here we are a decade later.

Recommendation 51 is that the ACT government develop a vision for Canberra as a whole with three elements in it: short-term plans for five years, medium plans of about 15 years and a long-term plan for 50 years. Where are we going and what are we going to be like when we get there?

There was a lot of discussion about the loose-fill asbestos insulation scheme, and the section starting at page 124 looks at the matters that were considered. One of the recommendations that did not make it into the report but is listed as a footnote on page 129 concerns recommendation 20 from the public accounts committee's inquiry on this matter. The text that was proposed reads:

The Committee is concerned that government messages regarding the go-it-alone option are unclear. It is also concerned at an absence of clear principles by which the Asbestos Taskforce may accept or reject proposals by homeowners wishing to pursue the go-it-alone option. The Committee therefore recommends that—

the ACT Government reconsider its response to Recommendation 20 of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts inquiry report into loose-fill asbestos contamination of domestic dwellings and allow home owners to go it alone.

That recommendation did not make it in. I think it is something the government should consider for a group of people—not all—who would like to stay where they are and have the advantage received by some of those that knocked down before the scheme was announced.

There are a number of other recommendations concerning the Mr Fluffy saga at recommendations 54, 55 and 56 where the committee recommends the government provide an update. They have got the numbers now. They should be able to give us a financial status of the loose-fill asbestos buy-back scheme. Recommendation 55 is that the government consider how undetected loose-fill properties will be detected and brought to its attention. Recommendation 56 looks at the government providing further information to the Assembly on the contaminated site under the Nudurr Drive extension between Crace and Palmerston, which apparently is the home of the original clean-up of Mr Fluffy asbestos.

Some time was spent with the Capital Metro Agency. You can all imagine some of the issues that were canvassed. The recommendation asked the government to reconsider the decision to use eucalyptus mannifera as the replacement tree, and there are a couple of other recommendations as well.

The 148 recommendations cover a large range of the issues that were looked at. As to the NDIS and community services, the committee recommends that the government include in its quarterly reporting information on the level of staffing in Disability ACT and Therapy ACT during the transition. We know that a significant number of jobs will go as a result of the move to the NDIS, and it is important that the Assembly is kept up to date on what is happening and what should happen.

One of the nicer areas we talked about was aged carers. Recommendation 72 is that the government look at the need for grandparents' playgroups. That is not for the grandparents to play together; that is for the grandparents who are providing the role of carers. We well know a lot of grandparents are stepping in as many families have the need for both parents to be working. Recommendation 71 is that the government looks to work and identify and address needs in supporting aged carers—those who are looking after older people. Recommendation 72 is that we assist them in their roles as grandparents.

The committee heard from a number of community groups. One group that was very interesting was the RSPCA. They made it quite clear a lot of work needs to be done to improve animal welfare. I draw to the eyes of members recommendation 16 about potential changes given some of the cases that have appeared and the costs the RSPCA is incurring in delivering services.

We heard from the Conservation Council. Recommendation 9 is that the government establish a single nature conservation agency in line with previous announcements and as recommended by the select committee last year. It is important that we look after our natural environment as best we can. It would appear all of us in this place agree that we should have a central nature conservation agency; it just does not appear to happen. That is confusing to many people. There appears to be a drop of about \$700,000 in weeds management, and the committee recommends that the government restore the funding for weeds management to previous levels. It is important. As Geoff Butler said when he appeared, if we stop this effort the seeds that get into the ground can be there for a long time. It really is a question of prevention rather than cure.

One of the themes that emerged throughout the hearings—I commend Dr Bourke for pursuing this—is the issue of employment for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. Dr Bourke asked the question of just about every portfolio as to what is happening, and it is clear an amount of work is still to be done to ensure that Indigenous people are included in the workforce, as is appropriate. A couple of other issues were raised by the elected body, particularly a chamber of business for Indigenous business people so they get the support they need to get started, to keep going and to survive. And the provision of child care and child services in the Indigenous community is something I would bring specifically to the attention of the minister.

Unfortunately Ms Fitzharris is ill today and will not be able to speak, so I believe it is the intention to adjourn this debate when I finish speaking. I again simply say thank you to my fellow committee members—Ms Fitzharris, Dr Bourke and Ms Lawder—for their efforts and the way they took to it. There are 148 recommendations. There could have been more; there could have been less. People had a genuine view that we were there to help improve the budget outcomes, and there are 148 suggestions to the government on ways they can improve things.

I thank the secretariat and the clerks that assisted and wrote the report: Mr Hamish Finlay, Dr Brian Lloyd, Mr Andrew Snedden and assistant clerk Sarah Redden. To the administration, Lydia and Jenny, thank you very much for your efforts. I particularly want to bring to the attention of the Assembly the efforts of Mrs Nicola Kossek, who was the secretary for the committee. Nicola did a great job. When we start it is all a bit vague as you try and divvy up the time and get the ministers' diaries to agree with the agenda of the committee or vice versa. For your coordination throughout the whole process of the two weeks of hearing and the writing of the report, Nicola, on behalf of all the committee I thank you very much for your efforts.

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

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee Scrutiny report 34

MR DOSZPOT (Molonglo): I present the following report:

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee (Legislative Scrutiny Role)—Scrutiny Report 34, dated 28 July 2015, together with the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

MR DOSZPOT: Scrutiny report 34 contains the committee's comments on 10 bills, 24 pieces of subordinate legislation, eight government responses and government amendments to the Children and Young People Amendment Bill 2015 (No 2). The report was circulated to members when the Assembly was not sitting. I commend the report to the Assembly.

Leave of absence

Motion (by **Dr Bourke**) agreed to:

That leave of absence be granted to Ms Fitzharris for today's sitting due to illness.

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee Report 6

MADAM SPEAKER: I present the following report:

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee—Report 6—*The Conduct of Ms Burch MLA*, dated 19 June 2015, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

The report was circulated to members when the Assembly was not sitting.

Motion (by **Mr Rattenbury**) proposed:

That the report be noted.

MS BURCH (Brindabella—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Racing and Gaming and Minister for the Arts) (10.20): I would like to say a few words on this report. I am pleased that this investigation has come to a conclusion, and that it came to the right and obvious conclusion—that this complaint be dismissed.

This came about because Mr Hanson and the *Canberra Times* through Kirsten Lawson made a series of serious allegations against me. It is easy to make serious allegations, but it matters not how many times those allegations are made when they do not provide the truth. It is easy to stand and smear, and to put out commentary to the public without substance, and that, to me, is what this was about.

It provided an opportunity for Mr Hanson and others to bring my family and some very difficult times into this place—unprecedented scrutiny of me and of my family's actions. I found it, as I said then, heartbreaking and disturbing that that was allowed to be the case. Each and every member of the Canberra Liberals joined in that festivity, in trying to implicate me for something I did not do. They had no boundaries or barriers as to how they were prepared to use my son as a political football in this debate.

In short, when I read through this report, I looked with interest at the material that Mr Hanson provided to Dr Ken Crispin. What was missing, though, was the statements that I made in this Assembly, the responses to questions in question time in this Assembly and the public comments made by Menslink. Menslink have put into the public domain free and open comment that I have provided. This is my use of language, because every time I speak about this I get emotional. They provided the frank and open comment that I did not interfere or ask them to do anything improper.

I will finish by simply quoting a couple of paragraphs from the review. Paragraph 111 states:

In my opinion, the evidence does not establish that the Minister committed any breach of the principles expressed in the Code of Conduct either by failing to intervene in order to prevent her son visiting ACT schools or to ensure that such visits did not involve any breach of the Act.

Paragraph 129 states:

She also cooperated fully with the investigation as required ... I do not believe that the section required her to do more.

Paragraph 130 states:

There may be situations in which the general duty to act in the public interest will require a Member to offer a full and frank explanation on his or her own initiative. However, the section does not, in my opinion, impose a general requirement for Members who have not been guilty of any misconduct to provide pre-emptive explanations in case the finger of suspicion may come to fall upon them at some time in the future.

I will conclude by reading the final sentence in this report. Paragraph 133 states:

I recommend that the complaint be dismissed.

I hope, for all here, that that is where it ends. It was a difficult time for me. It was completely unnecessary. I believe it was made for political gain, as I said. It is very easy to use a position in this Assembly and the media to make allegations. You can say them a thousand times; it does not mean they are true.

I also take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for their support through this difficult time. I also make note of and accept that my adult son was found wanting, but that he is an incredibly bright young man. He has turned his future around, and I will not let Mr Hanson or any of the Canberra Liberals tear him down again from the successful young man that he has turned out to be.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services— Standing Committee Report 8

MR COE (Ginninderra) (10.22): On behalf of the chair, and as deputy chair, I present the following report:

Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services—Standing Committee—Report 8—*Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No. 309—Turner Bus Layover*, dated 9 June 2015, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

I happily present this report into the Turner bus layover. It was an inquiry that commenced on 23 October. We held one public hearing, we received a couple of submissions and heard from six witnesses.

The report includes five recommendations. The committee recommended that the draft variation to the territory plan No 309 proceed, and I understand that the Minister for Planning will be tabling this variation later today. The committee also made recommendations around prohibited uses of land justified by temporary use provisions, landscaping and upgrades in the Turner parklands, and the availability of open spaces in areas of high density living.

During the public hearings we heard of some interesting ways in which the land was procured by the ACT government and, in turn, by the Australian National University, and of the land swap which occurred in order to facilitate this outcome. There were some vagaries about the actual status of the temporary car park and under what provisions that was actually allowed. It was, I believe, temporary or an ancillary use of the block. That is something that needs to be ironed out for future land uses that may indeed be confusing to members of the public, especially when it is technically unleased public land or urban open space.

The committee would like to extend our thanks to everyone who provided information and evidence to the inquiry, including directorate officials, organisations and members of the community. I would especially like to extend my thanks, on behalf of the chair, to Mr Hamish Finlay, the secretary of the committee, and for the great administrative support provided by Lydia Chung and Mr Panduka Senanayake.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services— Standing Committee Report 9

MR COE (Ginninderra) (10.26): On behalf of the chair, and as deputy chair, I present the following report:

Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services—Standing Committee—Report 9—*Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No. 327—Capital Metro—Light Rail Stage 1 Gungahlin to Civic*, dated 9 June 2015, including a dissenting report (*Ms Fitzharris and Dr Bourke*), together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

Madam Speaker, as you can imagine, and as I am sure others in this space can, we had an interesting discussion on capital metro, and indeed on the associated land use changes which have to be facilitated in order for the government to get their way.

The ninth report for the Eighth Assembly of the planning, environment, territory and municipal services committee did not include any recommendations. Of course, the committee was somewhat divided, as one might imagine; therefore we could not come to a view as to whether to support the variation to the minister.

I think there are many issues with the capital metro project. One of those issues—by no means the least but perhaps not the most significant—is of course what the impact will be on surrounding residents, especially along the Northbourne Avenue corridor. However, it is also relevant for Franklin, Harrison and Gungahlin residents that this government can well place an electrical substation or other ancillary piece of infrastructure pretty much anywhere within one kilometre of the proposed light rail line, and that is certainly something that is of concern to us.

I am not sure how many people in the inner north realise that they could well have an electrical substation in their front yard as a result of this territory plan variation, if it is indeed tabled today, as we expect it will be. I understand it was authorised for publication on 11 June, so it does have effect as from that date.

There are so many issues with this capital metro project. It seems that the government is absolutely determined at all cost, whether it be financial cost, social cost or community cost, to ram this project through the Assembly and to do so before the people of Canberra have had an opportunity to have their say.

The most prudent course of action right now, the responsible course of action, would be for the government to put this project on hold and to allow the people of Canberra to definitively have their say on this project at the October 2016 election. However, as we all very well know, there are not enough people opposite who have the courage to say that their communities do not want this project. There must be members opposite who are hearing it loud and clear from their constituents. They must be hearing from their communities and from their electorates that light rail should not be rammed through before they have had their say. And that is exactly what this government is going to be doing. That is why the opposition will be doing all we can at every forum to try and reveal the true cost of this project and the many flaws of this project, and why there is a real imperative to not sign contracts before the October 2016 election.

I am pleased that we were able to have a public hearing. However, I still do not feel that the people of Canberra have had an opportunity to present their views by way of a public hearing at the Legislative Assembly. The committee made no recommendation, but I understand that the Minister for Planning will be tabling the variation later today.

The committee would like to extend its thanks to the minister and the directorate officials who provided information and evidence to the inquiry. Once again I would like to thank Mr Hamish Finlay for his professionalism as secretary of the committee, and also Lydia Chung and Panduka Senanayake for their administrative support to the inquiry.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Ministerial delegations to China and Singapore

Ministerial statement

MR BARR (Molonglo—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Tourism and Events) (10.33): I would like to report to the Assembly on two ministerial delegations that I led this year—to Beijing, China, from 12 to 14 April, and to Singapore and China, from 22 to 24 June. As is clear, these missions were very short but they were focused and highly successful delegations.

The three primary objectives of the April mission to Beijing were to progress the Canberra-Beijing sister city relationship; to encourage cultural, education, business and tourism links between Canberra, Beijing and China through the support of the ACT government for the *Qing: Life in China 1644-1911* exhibition to be exclusively held at the National Library of Australia here in Canberra next year; and to encourage and grow the exchange of international students through events and meetings at Peking University and Renmin University, two of Beijing's premier educational institutions, in conjunction with their partner universities in Canberra, the Australian National University and the University of Canberra.

The three primary objectives of the June mission to Singapore and China were to reinforce the ACT government's commitment to foster trade and investment links with Singapore; to reinforce the government's commitment to strengthening the Canberra-Shenzhen relationship and commitments under the memorandum of understanding signed in October 2014; and to welcome two Canberra students travelling to Shenzhen as part of the Canberra-Shenzhen innovation intern exchange program, the first education outcome of the MOU signed between the ACT and Shenzhen.

Before I detail the mission activities, Madam Speaker, allow me to reinforce the significance of our sister city relationship with Beijing and China's significance to the ACT more broadly.

Beijing is China's global economic hub. It is also China's capital city. It has a population exceeding 20 million people and it is that nation's political and educational centre. Beijing's museums and universities, all with histories dating back millennia, have made Beijing the centre of culture and art in China.

The sister city relationship that we share has been highly collaborative, beneficial and rewarding through its 15-year history. Most recently, during our 2013 centenary year, the Beijing municipal government gifted Canberra the stunningly impressive Beijing garden, located on the shores of Lake Burley Griffin. In 2008 Canberra was privileged to host the Beijing Olympic torch relay, a particular honour, as Canberra was the only Australian city selected to participate in that year's relay. In 2010, to celebrate the 10th anniversary of our sister city relationship, Canberra's Chinese community generously presented our city with the impressive Confucius statue that is located on Woolley Street in Dickson. Such is the value to Canberra of our generous and prominent Chinese community, a community that is highly active in Canberra's multicultural landscape and plays a key role in strengthening our engagement with China.

It is probably not widely realised that around two per cent of our city's population was born in China and that Mandarin is the most commonly spoken language in Canberra after English. Further to this, Chinese students form the largest international student group at Canberra campuses. There are around 5,500 Chinese students enrolled in our education system.

In addition, and to further reinforce the significance of China to the ACT economy, the ACT regularly receives more visits from Chinese tourists than from tourists from any other country. Chinese people in general have a high awareness of Canberra and a strong desire to visit our city, which is supported by Tourism Research Australia data that indicates that Canberra received around 29,000 Chinese visitors in the year ending December 2014, an increase of 36 per cent on the previous year.

This strong visitation trend was supported by the outstanding success of Canberra's involvement in the 2015 AFC Asian football cup tournament. The match between China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 18 January 2015 was a sellout. A significant number of visitors from the Sydney Chinese community

travelled to Canberra to attend the game. The match achieved an average viewership of over 16 million in China, with a peak viewing audience of around 30 million.

The delegation that I led to Beijing in April was my first visit to Beijing as Chief Minister. I found the warmth and hospitality afforded during the mission especially impressive. Indeed, each time an ACT trade mission travels to Beijing we are provided with enormous hospitality and access to Chinese officials at the highest levels. It is this welcome recognition, collaborative environment and shared respect that are testament to the relevance, importance and value of the Canberra-Beijing sister city agreement.

Our first official engagement for this delegation was to finalise discussions with Beijing's National Library of China prior to announcing a partnership with the National Library of Australia to bring the historic *Qing: Life in China 1644-1911* exhibition to Canberra. This exhibition is a one-off event that will be exclusive to our city. It scheduled to open in the first half of 2016 and will display 300 years of Chinese life, culture and tradition. The ACT government will be supporting the staging of the exhibition through our special event fund, contributing \$200,000 in matched funding to promote the exhibition to Australian audiences and encourage visitors to come to the ACT and experience the exhibition, along with everything else our city has to offer.

The partnership with the National Library of Australia follows previous highly successful exhibition partnerships that brought the *Handwritten* and *Mapping our World* exhibitions to Canberra in 2011 and 2013 respectively. Fifty per cent of visitors to each of those exhibitions were from interstate, and the combined ACT government investment for these two exhibitions of \$400,000 delivered \$38.1 million in economic return for the ACT.

Investment in the *Qing* exhibition also contributes to the ACT government's efforts to diversify and deepen our relationship with China, encouraging business, education and tourism engagement. It strengthens our sister city relationship and confirms the importance of trade, tourism and economic and cultural ties between our two cities.

Following this announcement, I met with Her Excellency Ms Frances Adamson, the Australian ambassador to China, and Mr Michael Clifton, the Austrade senior trade commissioner to Beijing. This was an opportunity to brief and update the ambassador on the ACT government's high-level priorities on key developments and projects in Canberra and to discuss the Australia-China relationship as well as the specific Canberra-Beijing sister city relationship.

Discussion also focused on the opportunities presented following the recent completion of negotiations for a China-Australia free trade agreement. The agreement presents major trade and export opportunities in the tourism, education, healthcare and professional services sectors. Each of these fields present significant opportunities for the ACT's private sector and research partnerships, and they complement the ACT government's high-level priorities of transport reform, ongoing urban renewal and continuing work to build Canberra as Australia's premier knowledge capital.

The delegation then met with the mayor of Beijing, Mr Wang Anshun. In that meeting, discussion focused on mission objectives, the collaborative opportunities these would deliver for both Canberra and Beijing and the mutual benefits shared via our sister city agreement. Given Mayor Wang's position in Chinese society—as the leader of Beijing, the third-largest city in the entire world, and one of the most significant and important people in China—our sister city agreement ensures that we have ready access and support for exchanges of economic and cultural benefit.

Mayor Wang was fully aware of the quality and popularity of Canberra's universities amongst Chinese students choosing to travel overseas, and was pleased that the ACT government is delivering initiatives that will encourage further education collaboration between Beijing's and Canberra's most prominent educational institutions.

Mayor Wang visited our city himself in November 2014, when he was greeted by the then Chief Minister, Katy Gallagher. Mayor Wang spoke first-hand of Canberra and its people. He indicated that he was particularly pleased that Canberra had agreed to host the *Qing* exhibition, stating that it was a superb opportunity to grow the cultural exchange between Australian and China.

The delegation's next two engagements highlighted the opportunities and benefits flowing from our exchange of higher education services and programs. Peking University hosted the delegation as part of their annual ANU Day activities, which recognise and promote the close relationship between the two universities. Joining with ANU vice-chancellor Professor Ian Young as part of the day's activities, I delivered an address to a gathering of staff and students from Peking University highlighting the importance of universities to the territory's economy and promoting the ACT's education credentials.

With one in nine Canberrans either studying at or employed by one of our universities, Canberra's participation in the knowledge economy is stronger than anywhere else in Australia. The higher education and research sector contributes around \$2.6 billion each year to Canberra's economy, supports around 16,000 jobs and teaches 44,000 students annually. This includes almost 12,000 international students. With these impressive figures in mind, presenting to Peking University on behalf of the ACT government was an important event in promoting the ACT's education credentials and reinforcing our significant support for the ANU.

Continuing the education focus, later that day the delegation attended Beijing's Renmin University to join with University of Canberra vice-chancellor Professor Stephen Parker and Renmin University vice-president Professor Yi Zhihong as they renewed an agreement reaffirming their commitment to a student articulation program, staff exchanges and joint research collaboration. Again, it is pleasing to be able to support the University of Canberra by demonstrating the ACT government's interest in seeing its successful partnership with Renmin University continue to go from strength to strength.

The agreement between the two universities was introduced in 2004 and has to date allowed more than 450 undergraduate students from Renmin University to study in Canberra in areas including business, administration and commerce; tourism and management; applied economics; international studies; and advertising, marketing and public relations. In addition, this partnership has delivered a range of other successful initiatives, including an academic exchange program in public administration and a PhD student exchange program.

Between 22 and 24 June I led a brief ministerial trade delegation to Singapore and, again, to China. Singapore continues to emerge as a critical trading partner for the ACT and my visit provided an opportunity to meet with senior members of the Singapore business community to raise awareness of Canberra and to highlight the ACT government's commitment to foster trade and investment links with Singapore, specifically around education, tourism, ICT and innovation. A number of Canberra businesses have already established strong connections to Singapore and are using it as a base for developing new opportunities. This includes Intelledox, who deliver world-class enterprise software solutions to corporate and government clients.

On the morning of 22 June, I attended a business breakfast hosted by Mr Bill Foo. Mr Foo was extremely generous in giving his time to coordinate an event that was attended by senior members of Singapore-based investment companies with interests in a range of sectors, including science and technology, tourism infrastructure, property and telecommunications. Mr Foo was appointed chairman of Unigestion Asia in Singapore in 2001. Unigestion is an asset management company established more than 40 years ago that has \$US17.8 billion of assets under management worldwide as well as 189 employees across 21 countries. Mr Foo has also served as vice-chairman of the ANZ bank's south and south-east Asia branch and chief executive officer and general manager of the ANZ bank in Singapore. At this meeting I had the opportunity to discuss the ACT's aspiration and commitment to foster trade and investment links specifically around education, tourism, ICT and research.

I then had the opportunity to meet with Mr Ho Meng Kit, the chief executive officer of the Singapore Business Federation. The federation is the peak business chamber that champions the interests of the Singapore business community in trade, investment and industrial relations. Its membership base comprises all registered Singapore companies with a share capital, in Singapore dollars, of \$500,000 and above. It represents 21,500 member companies as well as key local and foreign business chambers. The Business Federation acts as a bridge between the business community and government, working with these stakeholders to build an environment conducive to doing business. It also plays an important role in supporting and promoting trade expansion and improving overseas market access for its members.

My meeting with Ho Meng Kit established a platform for future engagement with the Singapore Business Federation and its members between the ACT government as well as business to business interaction between Canberra and Singapore. By way of example, an immediate outcome of the meeting was an offer by Mr Ho Meng Kit to support an inbound trade delegation to Canberra later this year with relevant members of the Singapore Business Federation. This will provide invaluable access and opportunity for Canberra businesses to establish links with Singapore.

My visit to China on 23 and 24 June focused on the city of Shenzhen and a meeting with the vice-mayor of Shenzhen, Mr Ai Xuefeng. As I mentioned earlier, in October last year, the ACT government signed a memorandum of understanding with the city of Shenzhen. The meeting provided an opportunity for me, in my capacity as Chief Minister, to reinforce the ACT government's commitment to strengthening the Canberra-Shenzhen relationship.

It is appropriate for me to acknowledge the role of Mr Guangwei Liang, the honorary chairman and patron of the Canberra region branch of the Hong Kong-Australia Business Association, in helping to introduce our two cities to each other and also his continuing engagement in this relationship. We are grateful for his contribution. Mr Liang is also the chairman of Huaqiang Holdings Ltd, which manufactures high-tech electronic components and products. The company was founded in 1979 and is based in Shenzhen.

One of the outcomes of the memorandum signed last year is the Canberra-Shenzhen innovation intern exchange program. I was very excited to have the opportunity to introduce the first two Canberra students, Ms Elise Terrell and Mr Blair Ney, to the vice-mayor; they have since embarked on a two-month internship placement in innovative companies in Shenzhen. The innovation intern exchange program aims to bring together future innovation leaders from our two cities to foster long-term collaborative relationships. Ms Terrell and Mr Ney are living and working in Shenzhen and will develop their understanding of cultures and innovation ecosystems and become future ambassadors who will seek collaboration and partnerships between Canberra and Shenzhen.

Shenzhen is a city of innovation. The ACT, being Australia's higher education and research capital, is also a city of innovation. We have Australia's most highly skilled workforce and the greatest proportion of knowledge workers of any region in Australia. We look forward to working with Shenzhen to reciprocate the Canberra-Shenzhen innovation intern exchange program, with two students from Shenzhen travelling to the ACT. My government also looks forward to continuing open dialogue with the city of Shenzhen to consolidate the commitments under the memorandum.

As part of my visit, I was also invited by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade in Guangzhou to address a group of China-based Australian alumni about the importance of the Australia-China and Canberra-Shenzhen relationships. The events again provided an opportunity to highlight the importance of universities to Canberra's economy and to promote our city's education credentials. The economic and cultural exchanges facilitated through collaborative partnerships such as those that I have outlined here today are the reasons why my government is committed to maintaining and maximising our robust international trade and export programs.

The ACT government has led regular trade missions to Beijing over the last 15 years, with many ACT companies establishing successful relationships and conducting positive trade in China through the introductions made on these missions. The Canberra-Beijing sister city relationship continues to be a fruitful and rewarding one for both cities.

I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the success of this delegation to Dr Han Yongjin, the Director of the National Library of China; Ms Anne-Marie Schwirtlich, the Director-General of the National Library of Australia; Her Excellency Ms Frances Adamson, the Australian ambassador to China; Mr Michael Clifton, the Austrade senior trade commissioner to Beijing; the mayor of Beijing, Mr Wang Anshun; Professor Lin Jianhua, the president of Peking University; the ANU vice-chancellor, Ian Young; the Renmin University vice-president, Professor Yi Zhihong; and the University of Canberra vice-chancellor, Professor Stephen Parker.

Similarly, Canberra's growing relationship with Singapore and the city of Shenzhen stands to contribute to ongoing cooperation and collaboration within our city to accelerate the emergence of Canberra as a truly global city. I wish to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the success of this delegation to Mr Bill Foo; Mr Ho Meng Kit; Mr Philip Green, the Australian High Commissioner to Singapore; Mr Guangwei Liang, the chairman of Huaqiang Holdings; Mr Ai Xuefeng, the vice-mayor for international affairs for the city of Shenzhen; Mr Paul Tighe, the consul-general to Hong Kong; and Mr Dominic Trindade, the consul-general at the Australian Consulate-General Guangwei.

I present the following paper:

Ministerial Delegation to Beijing, China—April 2015 and Ministerial Delegation to Singapore and China—June 2015—Ministerial statement, 4 August 2015.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the statement.

MR HANSON (Molonglo—Leader of the Opposition) (10.55): I thank the Chief Minister for his statement. I think that something that we should all be able to agree on in this place is the importance of our relationship with China in terms of investment into the ACT, in terms of trade, both import and export, and in terms of other sectors of our industry and community here, in particular the education sector. We know that there are so many Chinese students here studying in the ACT. I congratulate the Chief Minister on his endeavours to strengthen that relationship and seek opportunities for greater investment and trade between Australia, in particular the ACT and China.

Unfortunately, this is done in the context of what is a very damaging and, in some descriptions, xenophobic campaign that is currently being run by the CFMEU. At the same time as Mr Barr is travelling in China explaining how we want to increase opportunities we have the CFMEU running what is described as a xenophobic campaign saying exactly the opposite. This becomes very complicated obviously, because of the fact that the CFMEU has such close relationships with the Labor Party. Chinese business, Chinese politicians, people that want to invest in Australia do not understand what is going on because they know that the CFMEU is an integral part of the Labor Party. They know, for example, that there are Labor Party members who are CFMEU organisers. In fact, there are sub-branch presidents who are Labor Party members.

We know that there are CFMEU members in the Labor Party. We know that the seven-member delegation that went to the Labor Party national conference included the head of the CFMEU. Those links are well established as are the financial links, the tens of thousands of dollars that are paid from the CFMEU into the coffers of the Labor Party and also, I note, into the coffers of the Greens.

At the moment we have this very difficult situation where on the one hand the Chief Minister is saying, "We want to increase trade with China, we want to increase opportunities with China, we want to increase investment from China, we want to build the relationship," but at the same time his mates, members of his party in senior positions, the people that are bankrolling him, are running what is described as a xenophobic, anti-China trade political campaign. This situation cannot go on. The Chief Minister, if he is going to maximise, if he is going to make sure that we get everything we can out of our relationship with China, with those investments, has got to pick a side. He has got to make sure that there is clarity here. He cannot walk both sides of the road.

He cannot go along to the Labor Party conference and his Dickson sub-branch meeting and say, "Comrades, comrades, I am with you on the blockades," and then turn up at Beijing and other Chinese delegations and say, "Members of the Chinese investment community, I am with you." Which one is he? Which is he going to be? Is he going to be the union delegate there with the organisers saying, "Yes, I support your campaign against trade with China," or is he going to be going to China and saying, "No, we want to increase those investments"? This is the problem, this is the compromise that the Chief Minister confronts. And at the moment he is trying to have both those conversations. He might get away with it in some circles but not here and certainly not amongst members of the Chinese community in Canberra and not amongst members of the business community in Canberra who see how compromised Mr Barr is and how he is trying to have two different conversations.

They are not stupid people. They understand the games that are being played, and I think Mr Barr needs to be clear. Does he support investment? Does he support trade? Does he support growing the relationship with China, which would be good for Australia and good for the ACT? Or does he support the CFMEU campaign? I think it would be very useful if Mr Barr were to provide some clarity around this and come out, as many people in the business community have, as many people across the political spectrum have, and say, "We do not support the xenophobic campaign by the CFMEU. We support trade opportunities with China."

Until he does that, people will question who is pulling the strings of Andrew Barr. Is he motivated by the best interest of investment here in the ACT and the people of the ACT or is he doing the bidding of the CFMEU and Mr Dean Hall? Until Mr Barr provides an unambiguous clarification of whether he supports this xenophobic CFMEU campaign this is the cloud that hangs over Mr Barr and over this Labor Party. I support these endeavours but they are utterly compromised until Mr Barr provides that clarification of who is pulling his strings.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

National disability insurance scheme—implementation report Ministerial statement

MS BURCH (Brindabella—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Racing and Gaming and Minister for the Arts) (11.02): I am very pleased today to provide a progress report on the implementation of the national disability insurance scheme. On 7 May and 4 June 2014, in separate resolutions, the Assembly called for regular reports on the implementation of disability reform in the ACT. I am pleased to be able to provide another update today. It is very timely as on 1 July we marked a significant milestone with the first anniversary of the NDIS trial here in Canberra.

Our main areas of focus are to provide reassurance to people with a disability and their families during the transition and to advise affected staff on the opportunities that the NDIS presents. The NDIA has published ACT participant numbers for each of the first three quarters of the trial. The ACT is performing well with 91 per cent of participants in the third quarter having an approved plan. This compares with 85 per cent nationally. Disability ACT is working with its residents to build their capability to exercise choice and control.

We know that the transition to the NDIS and the transformation of support for people with a disability represent a big change. This is why Disability ACT is working alongside its residents and families to prepare for the NDIS and support their transition to non-government accommodation providers. Disability ACT has developed a model transition pathway so that residents and their families can clearly see their way into the NDIS.

We are providing one-on-one support to residents and their families to prepare an individual plan that outlines residents' goals and visions, secures tenancy arrangements and discusses transport options. Assistance is also provided to identify the residents' preferred non-government provider and to prepare and implement a transition plan to a new provider. Residents and families have had the opportunity to attend NDIS information sessions and learn firsthand from people that have been through the planning process. Disability ACT has facilitated two meet-the-provider expos to allow families to explore non-government providers and to ask questions directly of the providers.

A key part of the process is supporting people with a disability to make their own choices. The government has engaged the ACT Disability, Aged and Carer Advocacy Service to deliver workshops to build the capability of residents to make good choices, to plan effectively to achieve their goals and aspirations and to negotiate with service providers and the NDIA. We are also working with Advocacy for Inclusion to offer up to 15 households the opportunity to participate in a self-advocacy program to enable residents to maximise the opportunities of the NDIS.

Consistent with the phasing schedule, 21 residents from 10 households have phased in to the NDIS. Two households have transitioned to non-government organisations and another two are expected before the end of August this year and another 16 households have selected a preferred provider.

Therapy ACT is supporting the transition to the non-government organisations also. We are seeing changes to the service model of Therapy ACT which has continued to provide services for ACT residents from birth to age 65. A dedicated transition team is working with staff and families to facilitate referral to the NDIS, develop quotes for therapeutic services and engage with the non-government sector to build robust services that give families choice into the future. Therapy ACT is also continuing to provide assessments to a significant number of clients that are on the waiting list to ensure participants have a proof of eligibility and functional need that is required to enter the NDIS.

I have mentioned previously the ACT Child Development Service. From January next year intake, referral and assessment services to determine eligibility for the NDIS and to provide pathways for intervention will be delivered by the ACT Child Development Service. This will be subject to a separate statement in the Assembly in the near future.

While we are excited about the future of disability services under the NDIS we know that service providers also need to be prepared. This is why we are working in collaboration with disability organisations to maximise opportunity and minimise the financial impact of the changing market. Service funding agreements with existing providers were stepped down from 1 July last year in line with the expected client phasing schedules.

Since the beginning of this year five organisations have requested changes to their quarterly payment structure to account for delays in client phasing. We as a government are working with each of these organisations to quantify the financial impact and to reimburse agencies for services provided to individuals.

The ACT government established a joint community-government working group to develop a transparent and responsive process to assist organisations that are experiencing short-term cash flow issues due to delay of clients phasing in to the NDIS. Disability ACT and the Health Directorate are working with providers on a case-by-case basis to determine if any reimbursement is required due to the delays in participants' phasing. Reimbursement is based on identification of a material gap. A block funding working group, including representatives from government and the non-government sector, has been established to review the mechanism to verify the identification of any gaps in funding related to the delays in client phasing.

Information linkage and capacity building, or ILC, has formerly been referred to in many ways as tier 2 supports. They have had their contracts extended to 30 June next year to allow the commonwealth time to develop and implement the ILC policy framework and a transition plan for the ACT. Our government is also working with the NDIA to develop and implement ILC arrangements beyond 30 June next year.

The ACT government continues to deliver on the memorandum of understanding it negotiated with the unions to support the implementation of the NDIS. A case management approach has been implemented to support a staff of 523. Over 87 per cent of all staff have been contacted by a case manager. Of these, 56 per cent

of permanent staff have requested voluntary redundancy and 16 per cent have requested redeployment, and 53 per cent of all staff have requested training support. The expectation is that during the next financial year an increased number of households will select a new service provider and the step-down of staff will be managed through the redundancy and the redeployment provisions.

The ACT government is investing in the capabilities of Disability ACT and Therapy ACT staff to support them to remain in the sector should they choose to do so. Training support has been requested by 210 staff in Disability and 69 in Therapy ACT. This training includes certificate III or IV as well as diploma level of study, and the majority of training is being provided by CIT. It also includes a small number of staff who have returned from or commenced undergraduate study at university.

At 30 May this year the staffing financial impact was \$6.1 million. This includes payments for voluntary redundancies, training, financial planning and career advice. At 29 May this year 45 staff had attended the Lighthouse Innovation Centre mentoring and coaching program to explore opportunities for the establishment of a new business or their own private practice. Of those who attended, one new business has achieved registration with the NDIA and a further three are well advanced in their application for registration. Staff can access flexible working arrangements if they want to trial working in a community organisation whilst continuing employment within the ACT public service.

As we enter the second year of the ACT NDIS trial we will continue to learn from the progress to date, continue to engage with people with a disability, their families, staff and service providers and will continue to champion the greatest development for people with a disability that most of us have ever seen, and that is a transition that will change their lives and the service provision here in the ACT. I am immensely proud of the way Disability ACT and the Community Service Directorate have been managing this transition.

I present the following paper:

National Disability Insurance Scheme Implementation Report and the Role of the ACT Government—Ministerial statement, 4 August 2015.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Melaleuca Place—anniversary Ministerial statement

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for Planning, Minister for Roads and Parking, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, Minister for Children and Young People and Minister for Ageing) (11.12): As Minister for Children and Young People, I thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Assembly

today about the work being undertaken with children at Melaleuca Place. Melaleuca Place officially opened on 10 July 2014. It supports some of the most vulnerable and traumatised children in the ACT. It was specifically designed to provide a service for children and young people who have suffered from complex trauma and who have been involved in the child protection system in the ACT.

Melaleuca Place leads trauma-informed practice in the ACT and there are currently 27 children receiving therapeutic services. It receives referrals from Child and Youth Protection Services. Melaleuca Place is a key initiative that supports the ACT government's "A step up for our kids" strategy and is complemented by the deployment of therapeutic assessors who will ensure all children in care receive a trauma-informed response.

Research demonstrates that many children involved in the child and youth protection system are exposed to a number of negative experiences earlier in life that increase their risk of experiencing not only trauma and disrupted attachments but also developing mental health issues. We therefore know that children in statutory care display consistently higher rates of behavioural and other mental health problems, as well as compromised cognitive and adaptive functioning, than children in the general population. We also know from research that addressing these issues early increases the opportunity to achieve better life outcomes. Early intervention is vital.

In addressing this kind of trauma within the ACT it was acknowledged that there was a need for a dedicated trauma-informed service, and in 2013 the ACT government committed to the provision of such a service. After some significant research, consultation and planning across government and the community, Melaleuca Place opened its doors. Indeed, one of my first duties as Minister for Children and Young People was to formally open Melaleuca Place and I was especially pleased to return there last month to celebrate the first-year anniversary.

Melaleuca Place is staffed by therapists from a range of disciplines including social workers, psychologists, a speech therapist and an occupational therapist. In addition to this group we also employ a child psychiatrist one day a week. All therapists have received extensive training in trauma and its impact on children. It is the intention of the government to ensure this staff group continues to receive training that keeps their knowledge of best practice up to date.

The work undertaken by Melaleuca Place with children is in the context of their care and support networks, utilising trauma and attachment-informed interventions. These therapeutic interventions aim to provide a sense of stability and safety through consistency and predictability, nurturing attachments also and allowing young people, their carers and family the time and space to heal, recover and move towards achieving more positive life outcomes.

We are seeking to ensure that we respond to the needs of all children who are in out-of-home care with a therapeutic plan. Melaleuca Place has been at the forefront of this over the past year. Child and Youth Protection Services have restructured with a focus on ensuring that children in out-of-home care receive trauma-informed services that are specific to their needs. Indeed, the recent restructure puts a greater emphasis on

the development of a therapeutic plan and there has been an increase in staff numbers who will undertake this very important task. “A step up for our kids” further emphasises this and the Out of Home Care Taskforce is working to ensure that all potential service providers develop their staff to be trauma informed in their work with children and young people in the future.

I have frequently referred to ‘trauma-informed’ service and when I say trauma-informed let me explain to the Assembly what I mean by that. Trauma-informed means that we respond to the needs of each individual child in a way that helps them feel more secure and safe at a physical, psychological and emotional level. Trauma may show itself in many ways. A child might respond to trauma by becoming aggressive but another child may respond by becoming withdrawn or frozen in dealings with people. We will work with the individual to ensure the response that they need is tailored for them and that they feel secure and safe.

An example of this might be a young person who has been exposed to extreme abuse and neglect in their life and may act out aggressively. A fight response is due to trauma. By responding to the issues that inform the behaviours, as opposed to focusing directly on the behaviours themselves, staff can support children in their support networks to respond to behaviours in a more therapeutic way. In instances like this the emphasis is on nurturing and support and not being punitive in relation to what is perceived at face value to be “bad behaviour”.

Although Melaleuca Place has been in operation for just over a year, it is emerging as a service that is valued by the children and their support networks. Internal feedback reviews indicate that service users are happy with the type and quality of service received and that the therapeutic approach implemented by staff is beginning to have an impact. Most significantly, Melaleuca Place has been able to effectively engage with all of the referred families, with none of the families dropping out. This has led to a 100 per cent engagement rate over the first 12 months of operation.

The therapeutic work looks at the trauma the child has experienced and how this has impacted on every aspect of their life. Working with children and their support networks has to be undertaken at a place that the child is comfortable with and ensures ongoing emotional investment in the plan. Regular reviews are undertaken and each child who attends the service is viewed as being unique in how they may respond to trauma.

To quote an African proverb, it takes a village to raise a child. Melaleuca Place has developed a service model that focuses on children in their community. Therapists are mindful that there are many people and organisations involved with each child both from a natural support perspective, such as friends, parents, carers and extended family, and an organisational perspective, through the delivery of community, education and health services. Therapists therefore ensure that everyone is aware of the therapeutic plan and that the plan is acted upon in a consistent manner. This is one of the major benefits of having a dedicated service like Melaleuca Place, as it coordinates and implements a trauma-informed response to every aspect of the child’s life.

I would like to illustrate the work done at Melaleuca Place by telling you about the experience of a child. Let's call him Dean. Dean's early childhood was marked by experiences of extreme neglect and abuse. This includes being physically abused, witnessing domestic violence, parental substance misuse, emotional abuse, neglect and alleged sexual abuse. When Dean was two years old he began to display violent and aggressive behaviours towards carers, peers and other significant people in his life. He also suffered from night terrors and anxiety and there were sexually inappropriate behaviours towards others. This has continued and now Dean is 10 years old. As we can see, this child has had a very traumatic life and his behavioural, emotional and psychological functioning has been severely impacted.

This child has been involved with our child and youth protection services since birth, and he has been made subject to a final child protection order until he attains 18 years of age. Dean has had a number of out-of-home placements, he was referred to Melaleuca Place by his child and youth protection services case worker who identified that he was in need of targeted interventions that would address his behaviours. Therapists at Melaleuca Place undertook an assessment of Dean's needs, and this included a review of medication that had been prescribed to treat his anxiety and sleep disorders.

The skilled therapists at Melaleuca Place drew up in consultation with others a plan that sought to address both the short-term and longer-term needs for this child. There was an immediate focus on ensuring that everyone involved with Dean was well aware of his history of trauma and how this could impact on his behaviours. The therapists at Melaleuca Place have worked with Dean and his support networks, for example, his carer and his teachers, to implement a predictable and consistent routine, increasing his sense of self-worth, building his resilience, enhancing his emotional wellbeing, social skills and confidence. This has seen Dean's engagement and performance at school improve. Work with Dean continues, and there have been improvements in his life and how he views himself. The therapists at Melaleuca Place continue to support Dean and work with him and his support networks so that further goals will be attained.

This is how Melaleuca Place has a significant and lasting effect on the lives of children and young people. The ACT government is committed to ensuring all Canberrans can lead a productive life, engage with the community, and have a voice. Melaleuca Place is helping some of Canberra's most vulnerable children to ensure that this goal is in reach for them as well.

I would like to end by thanking all of the staff at Melaleuca Place and indeed the CSD staff generally for their professionalism and dedication to working with some of Canberra's most vulnerable young people. I present a copy of the statement and present the following paper:

Melaleuca Place—Anniversary—Ministerial statement

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Liquor Amendment Bill 2015

Debate resumed from 4 June 2015, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR HANSON (Molonglo—Leader of the Opposition) (11.23): This bill does a number of things with regard to the Liquor Act. There are five main parts to it. It adds five additional members to the Liquor Advisory Board, including the Director-General of JACS and the Victims of Crime Commissioner. It makes the Director-General of JACS the chair of the board, replacing the Commissioner for Fair Trading in the process. It extends the ability for the issuer of liquor licences—the Commissioner for Fair Trading—to take into consideration associations beyond just formal legal or financial associates of the applicant. The commissioner will be able to seek “criminal intelligence”.

It creates “secondary supply” offences of serving alcohol to an underage person by anyone at a private place unless it is with the authority of a parent or guardian. It also creates “secondary supply” offences of serving alcohol to an underage person by a parent or guardian unless it is consistent with the responsible supervision of the child.

Each element of the bill would appear, on the surface, to be well intentioned, and I am sure that was the intention of the drafters. But there is no doubt, when you refer to the scrutiny report and consider some of the implications of this bill, that there may be some reasonably far-reaching consequences.

The old expression is that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I think there are significant concerns. If we grant new powers to commissioners and apply new penalties to parents and other adults, we should understand not just the intent of this bill but the effect of this bill, and what this will actually mean. Therefore I foreshadow that at the conclusion of my speech I will move that this bill be referred to a committee for review. This is not urgent legislation. It is legislation about which we need a full and comprehensive understanding. Given the significant number of issues raised in the scrutiny report, I think it would be prudent to do so.

I will turn to each element of the legislation. The first is about the numbers being added to the advisory committee. This does not seem to have any significant impact but there has been no case made as to why we need these additional members. Certainly the addition of someone who is already the Director-General of the JACS Directorate makes me wonder why an advisory committee that advises government contains the person essentially who should be receiving that advice—the Director-General of JACS. It does seem somewhat odd.

The second element of the bill that I have concerns about is that the bill makes that individual the chair of the advisory committee. So you have someone advising government, and the chair of that committee advising government is the person who is

going to receive the advice. That seems odd. Surely, if we are going to have a body that is advising government, the chair should be independent. On the surface that is something that seems to be entirely logical; otherwise if you are going to appoint someone who is a director-general of a directorate to advise themselves on liquor licensing, what is the point of having that body to provide that advice? So I have significant concerns and I believe that it would be appropriate to have an independent chair.

The next element that I have concerns about is the ability for the commissioner to take into consideration associations beyond just formal legal or financial associates of the applicant for the liquor licence. Again there may be good reasons for this to occur, but I do have concerns that these new and additional powers that extend the ability for the commissioner essentially to reject applications and get criminal intelligence on the people that the applicant associates with are pretty far reaching.

Before we start extending powers, expanding powers and taking away rights, we need a more comprehensive understanding of the implications. Again there are concerns that have been raised on this issue in terms of how far those inquiries go, how public it becomes and why the application has been rejected. If an applicant applies and someone provides some criminal intelligence but it is not then tested in any sense in court, does the applicant have the right to defend that association? Those are questions that need to be investigated, and that is why we have committees.

The next couple of issues are a bit interrelated. They are about the supply of alcohol to minors. The first element of that is where somebody supplies alcohol to an underage person without the authority of their parent or guardian. I quote from the scrutiny committee report:

it will be very hard for a person at a private place to assess whether they are exercising responsible supervision, being an assessment that will have a bearing on whether they are charged with a criminal offence;

a wide area of discretion will be left to a police officer to decide whether to lay a charge; and

it will be left to the courts to determine, over time, the matters relevant to making the assessment, thereby in effect requiring the exercise of legislative power.

It went on to say:

The Committee raises no question as to policy objective, but it may be argued that a criminal offence should not have these characteristics. It should be noted further that the activity being regulated commonly occurs in households in the Territory, and many people will be brought within its ambit. The mere fact of being charged with an offence may affect a person's reputation, and there may be circumstances where they are required to disclose merely the fact of being charged.

This is the point, Madam Deputy Speaker. Teenage parties occur in many households across Canberra every Friday and Saturday night. There are issues regarding the

policing of whether a minor has been supplied alcohol, whether they had permission, whether it was done in a responsible way and whether the individual supplying alcohol knowingly did that. Was it responsible? What constitutes approval and what does not is very ambiguous, and the elements of proof are ambiguous.

The determination and decision as to whether to press charges are essentially in the hands of the police officer. I would suggest there will be a wide variety of expectations and views as to what is appropriate. In some households, in some cultures, the use of alcohol is permissible. For some people under the age of 18 from a European background, the discretion is exercised that alcohol is a part of the cultural norm. In other households, perhaps people of Muslim faith from the Middle East, it is banned for everybody.

Where is that determination? Where is the line drawn? The problem is that it is not made clear in this legislation. It is up to the authority knocking on your door, from the police. Perhaps one police officer has one view, while another holds another view. It will be very unclear to parents, to adults hosting a party, what the rules are, what constitutes permission and whether they are going to get into trouble or not.

Similarly, it extends to the fifth element that I have concerns with, which is where parents supply alcohol to their child. In essence it says that if you do it in a responsible way, that is okay. If you do it in an irresponsible way, it is not and it becomes an offence. Who makes that decision? Is it the police officer that turns up? Is that the way that we exercise laws in this place? I think that if this comes into effect, anybody reading this, any parent, would be none the wiser about what actually constitutes “responsible” or “irresponsible”, because it then becomes very subjective in the minds of the police or any individual serving that alcohol. I will quote again from the scrutiny report:

it will be very hard for a person at a private place to assess whether they are exercising responsible supervision, being an assessment that will have a bearing on whether they are charged with a criminal offence;

a wide area of discretion will be left to a police officer to decide whether to lay a charge; and

it will be left to the courts to determine, over time, the matters relevant to making the assessment, thereby in effect requiring the exercise of legislative power.

There are serious concerns that we are basically giving away the discretion as to what becomes a criminal offence to the police. That should not be a matter for a police officer to determine. A police officer on the ground turns up to a private home, gets in between a parent and their child—maybe a parent and their 17-year-old child—and it is now up to a police officer in this town to determine whether a criminal offence has occurred. And based on what? Based on their assessment, based on what they think: is that responsible service of alcohol or not? I want the minister or Mr Rattenbury, in responding on this legislation, to explain to me the number of scenarios. Explain to me where it is and where it is not responsible. The explanatory statement explores the impact on parents. It says:

The amendments ensure that parents ... are ultimately responsible for determining when and how their children are exposed to alcohol. The offences are not designed to restrict the practice ... where some parents choose to permit the occasional consumption of limited amounts of alcohol, under supervision within the family environment. Supply of alcohol by a parent would only be an offence ... if it was not consistent with responsible supervision of the child.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me pose this question. If you have a 17-year-old at the dining room table at night and they have a glass of wine, is that responsible service of alcohol? I do not know; people will have a view on that. Some people would say no; some people would say yes. Let us say that they then have a second glass. Is that responsible or not? Some people would say yes; some people would say no. How about a third glass? There are people who would say yes; some would say no.

Ultimately, it is up to us as legislators to determine what the law is. It should not be done by voting for a law that leaves it to the discretion of somebody else to say, "I'm going in there and saying my view is that it's zero glasses," while for another person it is three. We should not leave it ambiguous and so that it is up to someone else to make that decision down the track—perhaps a stressed, tired police officer at 1 o'clock in the morning, getting between a parent and their child. That is the person that is going to make the decision as to whether to lay charges based on their discretion.

Before we make laws in this place that govern the behaviour between an adult and their child, we have a responsibility to make sure that we are providing clarity; and that we are very comfortable that the effect of this legislation will not be potentially ambiguous, potentially inconsistent in the way it is applied and potentially punitive in the way it is applied.

I understand the intent of the legislation. It seems well intended. I understand that we are trying to make sure that, where there is some irresponsible adult out there plying kids with alcohol, there is an offence. I understand that. But the problem is that in trying to capture those situations where some adults are deliberately plying kids with alcohol in extreme amounts, irresponsibly, you are catching everybody else out. You are not making it clear where that boundary is, where that line is, and we need to do so.

It is irresponsible to send off a piece of legislation to a police officer, who will be scratching their head about it, making them the arbiters of what is lawful and what is unlawful in this town, in terms of pressing charges, and the courts, again, will have to make a decision as to where that threshold lies. For other offences we have a very prescribed level. For example, with drink-driving, we say that at .05 you are over the limit. This is a bit like saying, for drink-driving, that what we are going to do is say to the police, "If you think the person's had too much then press charges; then go to the court and if you think they've had too much, you can find that person guilty." That is the same as what we are basically saying, because we are not prescribing a certain level of alcohol limit. We are not giving any other elements of proof. We are simply saying to the police and the courts, "You make that call. That's too hard for us. We haven't done the homework. We haven't done the rigour. It's too hard for us; you work out what that is."

You will have this inconsistently applied. It will be a bit like with drink-driving, where one police officer and one court determine that .02 seems a bit unrealistic and they say, “I don’t like that,” whereas another court or another police officer might think .08 is right.

That is why, when we write legislation, it has to be clear, precise and unambiguous for the courts and for those enforcing those laws—the police. And this is not. So let us make sure that we get this through the committee. We need to have a better understanding of what this law is actually trying to achieve, how it can be better written and better designed. We need to make sure that those who have to apply this law in the courts and on the ground, having gone into private homes to enforce this law, know what they are doing. Otherwise people will be hauled up on charges and potentially will be found guilty of what we in this place would never have thought was meant to be a crime, what they never knew was a crime and what community expectation would say is not a crime.

Let us take the responsibility ourselves. Let us make sure that we have a better look at this legislation. Madam Deputy Speaker, I move:

That the Liquor Amendment Bill 2015 be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety for further inquiry and report back to this Assembly by the end of this calendar year.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Attorney-General, Minister for Health, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Capital Metro) (11.40): The government will not support referral of this bill to committee, and the reasons for that are due to the significant overreach we have heard from those opposite this morning. This is not a contentious bill; the proposals in it are not considered to be the contentious elements of liquor licensing reform in the ACT. I anticipate much more debate on the next bill that the government ultimately brings because, regardless of its contents, it will deal with more difficult and complex issues around liquor licensing in the territory. This bill, however, deals with some relatively straightforward precepts.

Mr Hanson has raised a number of concerns, but he has asserted that his primary concern is the characteristics of the offence, which is new section 204A, relating to the offence of supplying alcohol to a minor in a manner which is not consistent with the proposed provisions—that is, it has to be undertaken by a parent or guardian or authorised by a parent or guardian of the young person and where the supply is not consistent with responsible supervision.

The construction of this offence is consistent with the construction of similar offences in Queensland and the Northern Territory. I note Mr Hanson is asserting that there is too broad a discretion for police to determine whether to lay a charge and that it is difficult for people to make an assessment about whether their behaviour could be subject to the offence. It is simply not the case to assert that we do not generally construct offence provisions in this manner. In fact, a number of other criminal offences are constructed in this manner already, and which are common across the statute book. The offence of neglect and what constitutes neglect or the offence of

offensive behaviour and what constitutes offensive behaviour are examples of offences in the statute book which can be similarly characterised to the provision proposed in this bill this morning.

It is about recognising that we are, nevertheless, trying to provide some guidance on the range of matters that could be relevant to determining whether supply is consistent with the responsible supervision of a child or a young person. It is a construction that is common with the broadly understood industry acceptance about the responsible service of alcohol. Clearly it would be irresponsible of somebody to continue to ply a minor with alcohol to the extent that they were completely intoxicated. However, it would be responsible to supervise a young person if they had a glass of alcohol at a function or event under adult supervision. Clearly it would be irresponsible if the adult purported to be supervising the young person was themselves very badly intoxicated.

These are the types of matters that will come into play. But the bottom line is that it is not unusual for police discretion to be exercised in deciding whether to charge particular offences. For some offences, the capacity for police to exercise discretion is important as it is not possible in the construction of the offence to encompass all conduct that is intended to be made criminal. Discretion is also important to ensure that laws are applied fairly and do not have harsh or intolerable results. It is common practice for ACT Policing—as it is for any other police service—to maintain a level of discretion about whether to charge people for a significant number of offences in this jurisdiction and others.

Ultimately, it is worth observing that it is unlikely that legislation can ever be drafted with such precision and clarity that interpretation would not be required. Unless we are going to have a very prescriptive list, it is always going to be the case that some level of interpretation and discretion will need to be exercised by our police and our courts. Our courts operate within the confines of the rule of law, and it is open to the legislature, based upon judicial interpretation, to further codify the operation of a provision into the future if that is deemed necessary.

This is not overreach on the part of the executive in the construction of this offence. We are simply saying that currently in the ACT there is no offence that stops anyone over the age of 18 purchasing alcohol and then supplying it to a person under the age of 18 for their consumption. It is not an offence. This is a loophole that all stakeholders have recognised needs to be closed, and we are closing it. But we are closing it in a way that recognises that adults—that is, parents or guardians of a person under the age of 18—still have the discretion to allow that young person to consume alcohol as long as it is done responsibly and as long as it is done under their supervision or with their permission.

That is a sensible provision that recognises that families seek to introduce young people to alcohol in a supervised environment, and that is a good thing. It is far better that young people are introduced to alcohol and its impacts and effects in that supervised, responsible adult environment than being left to explore that in an unsupervised environment or with other adults who clearly do not have their best interests at heart.

That is the purpose of the change. It would be a backward step to delay its introduction and passage today because it is a reform that has been strongly supported by all stakeholders and is a loophole that needs to be closed. The government will not be supporting this referral to committee this morning.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (11.47): I will also not be supporting the referral to committee today, and I will go through a couple of the reasons for that. The bill makes relatively minor amendments to the ACT's Liquor Act. In fact, most of the amendments implement recommendations from the two-year review of the 2010 Liquor Act provided to the government in 2014.

The first amendment, which Mr Hanson spoke about in his remarks, expands the role of the Liquor Advisory Board. The review found there was a lack of clarity around the role of the Liquor Advisory Board which compromised its operational functionality. The bill reforms the Liquor Advisory Board by allowing for the appointment of several new members: the Director-General of the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, the Victims of Crime Commissioner, a member to represent young people, a member to represent off-licensees, a member with knowledge or expertise in the area of health and the effects of alcohol, and a member to represent the community.

This broader membership is to be accompanied by a new board function by which it can advise the Attorney-General on measures to support harm minimisation and community safety principles. I think this is a good change. Previously the board's role was focused on operational matters only. The board will be a good source of policy and legislative advice on achieving the important goals of harm minimisation and community safety.

I note that Mr Hanson was particularly concerned about whether the chair of the board should be somebody other than the JACS director-general. I think you could mount a pretty good argument either way. The advantages to having the director-general or somebody from JACS playing that role carries certain positives; having an independent person carries certain positives. For my mind, the real value is the broadening of the membership of this board and bringing in people such as the Victims of Crime Commissioner. It is fair to say that none of these people are shrinking violets; people like the Victims of Crime Commissioner will be very forthright in putting their views, and I do not think that particularly sways the argument either way about who needs to be the chair of the board.

I am happy to proceed on the basis that has been proposed. I think the real leap forward here and the important issue is the broadening of the membership of the advisory board to bring in a range of other stakeholders who have knowledge in this space of alcohol consumption and the alcohol industry. Traditionally, this board has been made up essentially of industry players, so it is a very positive development to have this broadened membership.

The bill also addresses the issue of secondary supply—that is, the supply of people under the age of 18 by adults. This is an area where Mr Hanson made some extensive comments today. The bill makes it an offence for a person to supply liquor to a child or young person at a private place unless the person is the parent or guardian of the

child or young person or has been authorised by the parent or guardian to supply the liquor and the supply is responsible.

I note the comments of the scrutiny committee which suggested that the assessment of what is responsible could be difficult and unclear. Whilst it may seem it is not black or white, I note similar discretions are regularly exercised in the criminal law. I cannot see a better way to frame this offence. I also note the comments the attorney provided to the scrutiny bills committee. He provided a detailed response to the comments made by the scrutiny committee, and they go to some length in responding to this reservation. I do not think it leads to a situation where any parent would be none the wiser, as Mr Hanson put it, on what responsible service of alcohol is.

I think you can create a straw man here. It is quite clear that common sense indicates what responsible service of alcohol is. I do not think anybody is seeking to create an offence whereby a parent who is of the view that it is appropriate, either culturally or physically, to allow their under-18 child to sip a glass of wine over family dinners to see what it is like is charged. Anybody would recognise that sort of thing is not irresponsible service of alcohol. But a 19-year-old adult who buys a lot of alcohol to supply their underage friends at a party is quite a different scenario, and that is what is being put forward. Improving secondary supply laws was highlighted through the review, and strengthening the laws was supported by health groups, ACT Health and ACT Policing. Again, Mr Hanson made a great deal of his concern that police would be put in an impossible position, yet ACT Policing supported these provisions being put into law.

My view is that this is an appropriate area to regulate. There are various harms associated with the use of alcohol and these impact young people as well. It is reasonable that the laws prevent the irresponsible supply of alcohol to young people, even in a private home. This change will bring the ACT in line with the Northern Territory, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania and Victoria in regards to secondary supply laws. I do not support the argument put forward by Mr Hanson. Considerable thought has been given to this. The stakeholders who have supported the insertion of these provisions into law recognise the negative effects of the harms of excessive or irresponsible alcohol consumption for minors particularly. This a considered and proportionate response to an important issue.

The third amendment in the bill relates to the Commissioner for Fair Trading's ability to determine who is a suitable person to hold a licence or permit under the act. The bill includes a new protection by allowing the chief of police to disclose criminal intelligence to the commissioner. It also allows the commissioner to request information about people suspected to be able to significantly influence a licensee or permit holder.

Under the existing Liquor Act the commissioner already has a range of considerations when deciding who is suitable to hold a licence. The commissioner considers issues such as previous convictions and whether they have previously been bankrupt or personally insolvent. As the explanatory statement notes, the measures are to help ensure the liquor industry is not infiltrated by criminal elements. I am told this is an industry that is unfortunately susceptible to that risk. The suitability provisions mirror those in place for the security industry, which is also another susceptible industry.

The flipside to these licence protections is that it may be harder for a person to get a liquor licence. There may be a person who has had a criminal past or some connections to criminality but is genuinely trying to operate legally in this business. It is a scenario one might imagine. But I think the balance proposed in the bill is acceptable. Importantly, the applicant can appeal decisions about their suitability assessment to ACAT for review. We see a situation where the protections are in place to protect the public when visiting licensed premises and in general as well as to try and prevent the furthering of criminal activities in the ACT. Similar suitability tests for these licences are also in place in other jurisdictions.

The commissioner already has to take into account a range of suitability factors. There is a level of discretion. This bill seeks to add further information so that the commissioner has a broader picture to take into account. This does not suddenly mean people will be put in a less disadvantageous position. In fact, it strengthens the hand of the commissioner. Equally, the protections of being able to appeal through the ACAT mean that the commissioner cannot make arbitrary decisions; he is limited by administrative decisions and decision-making processes and powers. That is why we have review of those, because they are bound to go through steps of natural justice of making fair and balanced decisions and the like. If they do that, they will be fine. If they breach that duty, the ACAT is able to reverse the decision.

This again strikes a suitable balance in a challenging area of policy. It is appropriate for ensuring that our liquor industry licence holders are suitable citizens for having such a significant responsibility. I will be supporting the change in this bill. I do not think it is a requirement to go to committee at this point. The points Mr Hanson has canvassed today have been addressed, some of them in the scrutiny report and some in the attorney's response. We have just come back from an eight-week recess where there has been significant time to canvass these issues. To have them canvassed for the first time this morning is a surprising situation.

Question put:

That the motion be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 7

Mr Coe
Mr Doszpot
Mrs Dunne
Mr Hanson

Ms Lawder
Mr Smyth
Mr Wall

Noes 8

Mr Barr
Ms Berry
Dr Bourke
Ms Burch

Mr Corbell
Mr Gentleman
Ms Porter
Mr Rattenbury

Question so resolved in the negative.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Attorney-General, Minister for Health, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Capital Metro) (12.01): I would like to respond further to some of the issues raised in the debate today and I thank members for their comments on the bill. As I indicated when I introduced the bill,

these reforms are an immediate package of reforms in response to the review of the Liquor Act which I publicly released in May last year. That review report identified a number of opportunities to further reform the ACT's licensing regime, and the potential changes identified in that report varied in their complexity and their potential impact. As I have indicated previously, it is my intention to facilitate a detailed discussion of the broad range of measures identified in the review report and approach the reform agenda in a staged way.

This bill represents the first stage of that approach. As members would know, I have also released an issues paper to provide the community and stakeholders with the opportunity to consider and provide views on proposals for further reform which are more complex and potentially more contentious and it is my intention to make sure that all stakeholders are able to raise their concerns about these review options and how we respond to them. That issues paper discusses matters such as reduced trading hours, liquor outlet density restrictions, taxation and pricing matters and the regulation of advertising and promotion of alcohol.

Let me turn now to the specifics of the bill before us. As members have discussed this morning, the bill includes amendments to expand the role and membership of the Liquor Advisory Board, and I would concur with the comments of Mr Rattenbury that the real objective here is to broaden the range of stakeholders who are engaged in discussions about liquor regulation, alcohol regulation, and its impacts on our community as a whole because the purpose of the liquor licensing law is to address harm. It is not just about regulation of an industry; it is about regulating and reducing harm.

That has to be our primary focus and the expansions of the membership of the board are designed to reflect that broad intent. So including health representatives, victims of crime representatives, representatives of young people and for the first time representatives of off-licensees is designed to properly broaden the membership of the board. Obviously other representatives of key interests will continue to be represented including other parts of the hospitality industry, the liquor regulator, the Commissioner for Fair Trading and representatives of the police.

I note Mr Hanson's concerns that it should not be chaired by a public servant. At the moment it is already chaired by a public servant, so there is no change in that respect. It is currently chaired by a person who is a public servant and it will continue to be chaired by a person who is a public servant. I think it is to the benefit of the operation of that advisory body that it is chaired by someone with a level of seniority—further seniority than the Commissioner for Fair Trading has when it comes to advising government—because the matters that are raised at the Liquor Advisory Board in practice in the past have not just been about technical regulatory matters, they have been about broader liquor policy. It has not been within the capacity or the remit of the Commissioner for Fair Trading to get into those discussions about legal policy about liquor policy matters. His remit is a narrow one around technical regulation of the act itself.

So by appointing the director-general the government is saying that the purpose of this forum is in part to have discussions and give advice to government on policy issues,

and ultimately it is the director-general that is responsible to me on policy matters. I think it is a very valuable two-way communication channel between these industry and community representatives and me as the minister that the principal adviser to me is also the person hearing those concerns first hand from industry. So I think that reform makes a lot of sense.

I have already addressed the issues around secondary supply so I will not go into those again. Finally, I will address the issues around the use of criminal intelligence information holdings in determining whether or not a person is a fit and proper person to hold a liquor licence. These provisions are not unusual, nor are they unique. They exist already in the security industry where, before someone can be granted a licence to work as security guard, for example a bouncer on the door of a pub or club, they have to get an approval, get a licence, and be subject to the assessment not just of their criminal record but with regard to any criminal intelligence holdings about them held by police forces either in this jurisdiction or in others.

Those changes were introduced into the security industry because there was a real concern that, whilst people may have avoided any formal conviction for a criminal offence, they may nevertheless be involved with individuals or organisations who are involved in criminality—and the most obvious concern is people in the security industry working as bouncers or security guards who may have an association, for example, with a criminal motorcycle gang or other criminal group and who are using that position of trust for their own improper advantage.

So these provisions exist already for people who work on the front door of licensed premises. It does not make a lot of sense to me that we have a higher threshold for determining whether or not someone is a fit and proper person to work at the front door of a licensed premise than for the people who actually are responsible for the management of that licensed premises. The government's position is that the rule should be the same.

If it is the view of the Liberal Party that stricter rules should apply to bouncers than apply to the liquor licensee, I would be interested to understand their justification for that position. I do not really believe there is one. The provisions are the same provisions as apply for people who work in the security industry more broadly and they will help to prevent criminal infiltration of the liquor industry by allowing the Commissioner for Fair Trading to refuse a liquor licence or the transfer of a liquor licence if they believe in all the circumstances, having regard not just to the person's criminal history but also any criminal intelligence held by police, that they are not a fit and proper person to hold a liquor licence.

I do not want people gaining liquor licences who have connections, direct or indirect, with criminal organisations and I do not think anyone else in this place should want that either. So these are important changes, they are important reforms, but they are largely non-contentious. There will be a further round of reform. The government has not determined its position on the range of matters outlined in the recent review document into our liquor licensing laws but we recognise that there is more work to be done.

We recognise we need to focus on reforms in a way that helps to continue to reduce the harm caused by alcohol in our community but also in a way that allows people to enjoy themselves responsibly and to ensure that we have a sustainable hospitality sector as part of a vibrant city and economy. I thank members overall for their support of the bill, and I trust that it will be adopted by the Assembly today.

Question put:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 8

Noes 7

Mr Barr	Mr Corbell	Mr Coe	Ms Lawder
Ms Berry	Mr Gentleman	Mr Doszpot	Mr Smyth
Dr Bourke	Ms Porter	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Ms Burch	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Amendment Bill 2015

Debate resumed from 4 June 2015, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (12.14): I am pleased to speak today on the Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Amendment Bill 2015. The bill is for an act to amend the Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Act 2012. The bill contains amendments to extend and enhance the operation of the energy efficiency improvement scheme which was established by and is provided for in the act. I say at the outset that we will not be opposing this bill. By extending the operation of the energy efficiency improvement scheme the bill increases opportunities for priority households in the ACT, also known as low income households, to reduce energy costs and usage.

As I mentioned, the bill proposes amendments to the act. The act established the energy efficiency improvement scheme which commenced on 1 January 2013. Under the act it was legislated to run for three years until 31 December 2015. The objectives of the act are to encourage the efficient use of energy, reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with stationary energy use in the ACT, reduce household and business energy use and costs and increase opportunities for priority or low income households to reduce energy use and costs.

The act imposes an energy savings target for the total reduction in greenhouse gas emissions to be achieved by retailers expressed as a percentage of total electricity sales in the ACT. The key requirement of the act was to review the scheme in its second year of operation, and I was pleased to see that the targets for priority households were being met across the activities.

This bill proposes several amendments to the act, including extending the operation of the energy efficiency improvement scheme to 2020, requiring additional notice to be given when increasing a future energy saving target or emissions multiplier, providing a mechanism for the administrator to register approved abatement providers who are eligible to undertake EEIS activities in the ACT and create abatement that may be purchased by a retailer to meet an energy savings target, providing a mechanism for the administrator to recognise abatement created in the ACT under recognised activities in other jurisdictional schemes, enabling the administrator to develop codes in relation to the eligibility of approved abatement providers and in relation to the acquisition of approved abatement factors, enabling the existing requirements on retailers or their contractors undertaking activities under the EEIS to be extended to approved abatement providers, enabling the shortfall penalty rate for a retailer not meeting their abatement target to be set by disallowable instrument, and providing greater clarity regarding when an electricity retailer transitions from a tier 2 to a tier 1 retailer.

As I have mentioned, we are pleased that by extending the operation of the EEIS the bill will increase opportunities for low income households in the ACT to reduce their energy usage and costs. Under the act a low income or priority household includes residential premises where the resident receives any of the following: an ACT government energy concession, a commonwealth pensioner concession card or healthcare card, a Department of Veterans' Affairs pensioner concession card, TPI gold repatriation healthcare card or widows repatriation healthcare card or gold repatriation healthcare card or is within a class of people prescribed by the relevant regulations.

Under the current Labor-Greens government, rates and fees have been increasing for ACT households. Increasing opportunities for low income households in the ACT to reduce energy costs as well as usage is a good thing and is welcomed by the Canberra Liberals. But this is a cost of living bill and, unfortunately for most Canberrans, it seems more likely to push up their cost of living rather than bring it down. According to the environment directorate's website, which I looked at today, the government is proposing a priority household target of 20 per cent. This may mean that 80 per cent of efficiency improvements could go elsewhere. In a worst case scenario, 20 per cent of low income priority households may benefit from the scheme but the remaining 80 per cent possibly goes to big businesses.

Regular households in this scenario stand to receive little or no benefit at all. This means that most Canberra families will receive no benefit under this scheme; they will only see increased costs. Worse still, these increased costs will be used to subsidise big business, large corporations or even perhaps government departments' electricity bills.

This bill will increase Canberrans' cost of living. When a large business decides it wants to save money by upgrading its heating and cooling system, it will be Canberra families that will foot the bill to subsidise it. If a supermarket or hardware store wants to upgrade its lights, it is Canberra families who will pay. This is what we saw after the introduction of the original act back in 2012. At that time Mr Seselja spoke on the bill as it was proposed.

A *Canberra Times* article of 14 June 2013 highlighted a 3.5 per cent increase in electricity prices from July 2013 due to network charges and the introduction of the EEIS, according to the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission which determined that approximately one-third of the increase was due to the effects of the EEIS. A year later, in June 2014, we saw another *Canberra Times* article bemoaning that electricity charges were going up 4.3 per cent from 1 July 2014. Luckily we saw the repeal of the carbon tax to offset those growing costs for Canberra families.

We will support this bill today in that it increases opportunities for low income households in the ACT to reduce energy costs as well as usage but our concerns remain the same as they were when the act was introduced in 2012, that for most Canberra households it will push up their cost of living rather than bring it down. It was, in fact, the repeal of the carbon tax that brought electricity bills down for Canberrans more recently. We will support the bill today.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (12.21): The ACT's energy efficiency improvement scheme has been running since 2013 and was intended to drive energy efficiency across the ACT by imposing an obligation on energy retailers to deliver a specified number of energy efficiency savings across households with a focus on low income households in the ACT. In the independent energy efficiency improvement scheme review by Jacobs we are told:

The EEIS is estimated to have abated around 238,000 tons of carbon emissions since commencement, with 50,719 activities undertaken in 24,386 homes. Average emissions abatement for household is 9.8 tons of CO₂ equivalent. A fixed emissions benefit is ascribed to every household undertaking a given activity.

The next point from the Jacobs review I think is very important. It goes to some of the observations that Ms Lawder was just making:

The estimated net present value energy cost savings is \$1,614 per participating household, or \$318 in annual savings. Based on an assumed cost of \$37 a ton CO₂ equivalent, on average the cost to each household was estimated to be around \$18.68 for 2013 and \$33.25 in 2014.

Modelling of the recommended target level demonstrates net savings for households on average, noting, of course, that not all households will participate. Actual savings for participating households are expected to be higher, as has been observed in the first three years of the program. It is important to note that while costs associated with the scheme will end with the end of the scheme, savings will continue to accrue for the lifetime of the implemented measures. Aggregate lifetime bill savings from the residential sector are estimated at \$106 million in present value terms.

I think that demonstrates that the scheme has provided good economic outcomes for households right across the ACT but in addition the EEIS plays an important role in the territory's drive towards becoming a carbon neutral jurisdiction especially in the context of the ACT's renewable energy target of 90 per cent of electricity coming from renewable sources by 2020. Put simply, we know that energy efficiency measures are cheaper than generation activities and that they improve quality of life at the same time. We know that improving household energy efficiency in the territory will mean that we can reach our 90 per cent target more easily and at lower costs than if we did not undertake those activities. Importantly, the amount of renewable energy we need to purchase in 2020 is based on projected energy consumption which assumes improvements in energy efficiency resulting from the EEIS.

It is because of the ACT's renewable energy target that many of the parameters under the scheme are expected to change under the extension of the scheme and that is an important but technical part of this legislation. Effectively the cost of a tonne of abatement will rise due to the ACT producing more zero carbon electricity through to 2020. Consequently the regulatory impact statement for the scheme produced in May this year flags that the extended target out to 2020 is likely to be reset at 8.6 per cent, as to keep the same target while the cost of abatement rises considerably would result in an increased cost of the scheme overall. The level of activity under the scheme should stay about the same and the pass-through costs will drop slightly. It delivers a much stronger incentive to engage in activities that save natural gas. A tonne of abatement on gas will be cheaper than a tonne of abatement on electricity.

A number of changes to the act were flagged in the regulatory impact statement and many of those are being implemented today. Firstly, this bill extends the life of the scheme to the end of December 2020. It increases the notice that is required to be given by the minister to make increases to any of the targets under the scheme, increases the period of time in which a minister must make a determination in advance of putting both the EE target—the energy efficiency target—and the priority household target up from three months to six months, and where the emission multiplier goes up this now also needs six months notice rather than the current period of three months.

This bill also sets up the capacity for abatement providers under the new section 17A outside of tier 1 retailers and their contractors to be approved under the act. This will allow other parties to undertake abatement activities which would allow tier 2 retailers who have fewer than 500 customers but still have obligations under the act to have the capacity to buy abatement.

This is likely to be a better outcome for them rather than simply paying the penalties under the act but not delivering the abatement. I think this is a very good improvement to the scheme and will hopefully also open up the market for energy efficiency services in the territory, creating new business opportunities for those with both the expertise and the wherewithal to enter this space. I think that is a good opportunity from an economic point of view that this change to the legislation will hopefully unlock. Changes also require that the abatement providers must lodge compliance plans before undertaking abatement activity to ensure that, of course, those who do come into the market do so on a basis of integrity and not some attempt to perhaps make a quick and easy buck.

The bill changes the term “emissions factor” to “emissions multiplier”, removing from the act the term “emissions factor”, which means that CO₂ equivalent of associated activities at a particular point with the supply of electricity or gas is replaced by the term “emissions multiplier” which is the term under the act for determining a retailer’s obligation of tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent. This term is changed throughout the act where it occurs.

The bill also extends the definition of “eligible activities” to “activities that are undertaken under an approved energy efficiency scheme in an interstate scheme” and outlines the conditions under which an interstate scheme can be approved by the minister, which include that the scheme would complement, not detract from, the achievement of the scheme and that the compliance with the scheme is monitored and enforced.

There are also some changes to the low income household target. Interestingly it appears that the retailers were overshooting the target so as to avoid any penalties associated with not meeting the target and were hitting about 30 per cent instead of the 25 per cent that was legislated until 2015. Now the government is proposing to reduce the target to 20 per cent and one would assume that the retailers may still overshoot this target and that perhaps the reality of 25 per cent will still be delivered. In effect there will not be any significant policy impact for low income households but I am pleased that the target will not be any lower than is proposed. There are a number of other technical amendments consistent with the policy changes that have been outlined and I do not intend to speak to those.

I would like to make a few general observations about the scheme because one of the criticisms of the scheme is that the range of activities that have been implemented has been limited. So far four major activities have occurred: energy efficient light bulbs, door seals, standby power controllers and refrigerator removals. Customer feedback has been generally positive except in the area of standby power controllers where a high level of dissatisfaction was expressed, perhaps because people did not like using the devices.

Of course, the challenge of a scheme such as this is ensuring that the efficiencies that are estimated are actually delivered and if customers are not pleased with what has been installed they are unlikely to want to use those devices. Standby power controls are probably the least reliable in terms of the longevity of the savings. Once the other measures are installed they will continue to be used. SPC usage could be more variable if not utilised effectively or if users do not like it. So that is an area that will need to be monitored.

One of the items that clearly is missing on the list is insulation—ceiling insulation and wall insulation. I have had directorate officials explain that the gains to be made from insulation are not as big as one would imagine in the ACT but I would rather suspect the political fallout from the federal insulation scheme continues and there is a real caution about insulation from a technical perspective and from a safety perspective. And that is a real shame. One would think that there is a cautious way in which we could include home insulation, an activity that has been undertaken safely over a long period.

Indeed, if savings that are to be made through the next reiteration of the scheme are best made in the area of gas supply, then insulation will come to the forefront again surely as gas heating is something that many Canberrans enjoy but which many Canberrans probably also pay over the odds for because their houses are poorly insulated. This is something, again, that will warrant further monitoring and I hope that we can reach a point where we can move past what I suspect is a lingering nervousness over the fallout of the home insulation scheme that was implemented a couple of years ago and recognise that home insulation is a very valid and appropriate form of energy efficiency and that it worked very well for many years. I think we can get back to that place of steady and constant implementation and, I guess, installation of that energy saving opportunity.

With those few remarks I am pleased to support this bill. I think it improves, through experience, some elements of what is a very good scheme already and continues it for a longer period. I think that is worth while because there is certainly more to be done in the ACT in terms of improving the energy efficiency of our households. On that basis I am pleased to support the bill today.

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 12.32 to 2.30 pm.

Questions without notice Construction industry—alleged bullying

MR HANSON: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations. I refer to a recent online survey of Master Builders ACT members which found that 71.8 per cent of members had been intimidated and 41 per cent physically intimidated by members of the ACT branch of the CFMEU. I also refer to the recent hearings of the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption. Have any instances of bullying or intimidation by CFMEU members on projects funded by the ACT government been brought to your attention?

MR GENTLEMAN: I thank Mr Hanson for his question. I do not recall any instances of bullying being presented to me as Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations in regard to government contracts.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Hanson.

MR HANSON: Minister, are you aware of any instances of requests for bribes or donations to the CFMEU in return for industrial peace on projects funded by the ACT government or have any been brought to your attention?

MR GENTLEMAN: No.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Minister, what is the government's policy in instances where officials are convicted of bribery?

MR GENTLEMAN: It would depend I guess on what official we are talking about. Are we talking about a government official or a member of the public? If it was a government official, we would certainly have to take some action with an investigation. Of course, that is the process we would take.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Minister, will the ACT government adopt a zero tolerance approach to intimidation and bullying on ACT government building sites?

MR GENTLEMAN: We have had strong policies on bullying and intimidation across the ACT government, and in particular on those areas that we control. So, indeed, it would be pertinent for us to take action in those circumstances.

Construction industry—alleged bullying

MRS JONES: My question is to the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations. I refer to recent hearings of the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption in relation to the ACT branch of the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union, or CFMEU. What action has the ACT government taken to stamp out bullying on building sites?

MR GENTLEMAN: The ACT government is very sure that we take action where necessary. In these particular cases, when these are reports to the workplace safety commission, we send the commission in to investigate those reports and take action.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mrs Jones.

MRS JONES: What analysis has the ACT government done on the impact of inappropriate behaviour by the CFMEU on the ACT government projects failing to be completed on time and on budget?

MR GENTLEMAN: I am not sure how that relates to the original question, but we do take detailed studies on the application of our tenders to build government agencies. It is important that we continue to take those overarching studies and ensure that, as the overriding agency controlling those tenders, the commissioner for workplace safety is on the spot when needed.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR COE: Minister, what analysis has the ACT government done to measure the impact inappropriate behaviour by the CFMEU has had on private sector building projects in the ACT?

MR GENTLEMAN: We have not been presented with any detailed evidence of inappropriate behaviour by the parties mentioned by Mr Wall. Indeed, if there were delays in ACT government projects we would bring that to the fore.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Minister, what analysis has the ACT government done on the impact of inappropriate behaviour by the CFMEU on federal government projects occurring in the ACT?

MR GENTLEMAN: I am not the minister for federal government work in the ACT, but it is important, of course, that we have safe workplaces. That is why we have a Work Safety Commissioner in the ACT. Of course, that work in a federal sense is overlooked by the Fair Work Commission as well. The Work Safety Commissioner in the territory has a very strong record of looking into safe aspects of work sites, including bullying.

Transport—light rail

MR COE: My question is to the Minister for Capital Metro. Minister, it was revealed last month by the *Canberra Times* that the ACT government was actively costing the capital metro light rail project to international investors at “up to \$A900 million, with further stages in excess of \$A1 billion”. This quote was included in a letter of introduction signed by an LDA official. Minister, is the territory able to afford light rail from Gungahlin to the city at a cost of \$900 million?

MR CORBELL: I thank Mr Coe for his question. As Mr Coe would know, the cost of the capital metro project is the cost outlined in the business case for capital metro, which was released late last year. The correspondence that Mr Coe refers to was prepared before the release of that business case. The costing of capital metro is unchanged. The affordability bound is unchanged. And it is as set out in the business case.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Minister, were you aware of this letter before it was sent out and had you seen a draft of the business case prior to the letter being sent?

MR CORBELL: I had no knowledge of this letter until it was brought to my attention by the *Canberra Times*.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Lawder.

MS LAWDER: Minister, when did you become aware of this letter?

MR CORBELL: I refer Ms Lawder to my previous answer.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Lawder.

MS LAWDER: Minister, will the proposed extension to Russell cost in excess of \$1 billion?

MR CORBELL: I thank Ms Lawder for the supplementary. As those members opposite know, the government has set out the process by which we will be ascertaining whether or not to proceed to a Russell extension as part of stage 1 and the business case processes associated with that. I refer Ms Lawder to my previous answers in this place and in the estimates committee in relation to that process.

Health—infrastructure

MS PORTER: My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, with the federal Liberal government's slash and burn approach to job cuts that continues to hurt Canberrans, can you please update the Assembly on how this budget and previous budgets have been creating and sustaining jobs, particularly through infrastructure projects within your Health portfolio?

MR CORBELL: I thank Ms Porter for her question. This budget alone invests \$1.5 billion to increase and support health services for the Canberra community. That means investing in better services, better equipment, better facilities and more beds. Through the health infrastructure program, in this and in many previous budgets, we have already completed large infrastructure project facilities for Canberra, including the Canberra Regional Cancer Centre, the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children and the nurse-led walk-in centres for Belconnen and Tuggeranong.

All of these projects are generating jobs for Canberrans. Indeed, more than 2.4 million working hours have been achieved through the development of the health infrastructure program to date. That means the working hours of Canberrans—hundreds of Canberrans who have been supported in their jobs by these projects.

Let us look at what that breaks down to: over 200,000 working hours on the southern car park at the Canberra Hospital, over 287,000 working hours on the adult mental health unit, and nearly 700,000 hours on the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children. These facilities are of course now completed, and they are providing essential services to support the delivery of health services in our city.

In this year's budget we are providing funding for a range of additional projects that will also support jobs and investment in our city. In particular, there is a \$17.3 million investment in a central sterilising services facility, a \$2½ million redevelopment at Canberra Hospital to provide for more bed capacity, and a grant to help fund 400 extra car parking spaces at the University of Canberra public hospital. This brings the total health infrastructure projects investment to more than \$900 million since 2009.

We all understand in this place the impact of job cuts on the ACT economy, and we know that since the current federal Liberal government was elected we have seen over 14,000 public servants lose their jobs in Canberra. But the response by this government has been to invest in key infrastructure projects, including in the health services portfolio—

Mr Smyth: Don't mislead.

MADAM SPEAKER: Withdraw, Mr Smyth.

Mr Smyth: I withdraw, Madam Speaker, but the minister cannot use a number—

MADAM SPEAKER: No, you just withdraw, Mr Smyth; don't argue.

MR CORBELL: Those opposite are apologists for Tony Abbott's job cuts, but we are not. We are interested in creating jobs in our city, through investment in essential health infrastructure that meets the needs of our community. Of course ACT Health is one of the biggest employers in the ACT, with more than 700 staff engaged in ACT Health, including around 5,000 alone at the Canberra Hospital, as well as hundreds of people working out of our community health centres in Tuggeranong, Phillip, Civic, Belconnen and Gungahlin. We also have the fantastic work of the dedicated maternal and child health nurses; there are 50 of those staff. This all supports jobs in our community. (*Time expired.*)

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, in regard to these infrastructure projects already underway, can you update the Assembly on their progress?

MR CORBELL: I thank Ms Porter for her supplementary. We are, of course, continuing to bring forward projects. Projects that are underway already include the \$23 million emergency department expansion at the Canberra Hospital that will add a further thousand square metres and 21 extra emergency department beds. We are investing in smaller projects as well, such as the improvement of traffic calming measures in the Canberra Hospital multistorey car park. We are investing in major essential infrastructure upgrades, including the \$16½ million upgrade of Hospital Road, on which work started yesterday. There is the replacement equipment for the medical imaging department at the Canberra Hospital—over \$360,000 worth of investment—and an upgrade, similarly, to pharmacy dispensary at the Canberra Hospital. Work on the new building 15 at the Canberra Hospital is close to completion. This will house more than 250 additional staff. We also have the new car park at Calvary hospital, providing an extra 515 spaces for staff, patients and visitors.

All of these projects are important capital works and service delivery projects for ACT Health, but they are also employing Canberrans. That is critically important at a time when we have a federal government that continues to take the axe to our city. We have seen the downturn in consumer confidence; we have seen the downturn and impact on housing investment. We want to right that, and we will do everything we can as a Labor government to do that, including investing in better health services and in health infrastructure that delivers services we need and creates jobs in our city.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, what infrastructure projects are in the pipeline, and how are they progressing?

MR CORBELL: I thank Dr Bourke for his supplementary question. We have an excellent range of additional projects coming through the health infrastructure pipeline. In particular, it is worthy to note that the Winnunga Nimmityjah Aboriginal Health Service recently received a \$1.3 million grant from the government to extend their Narrabundah premises. This will provide for the construction of additional facilities so that they can meet demand, and it will also provide for jobs in the construction sector. Equally, construction on the new central sterilising services project is expected to commence in the coming year, with completion due in late 2017 or early 2018.

The University of Canberra public hospital is also moving ahead. Construction on this facility is expected to start early next year. This is a very important investment in health infrastructure and will sustain hundreds of jobs in the construction sector during its development stage. Finally, it is worth highlighting work on the Ngunnawal bush healing farm. Preliminary works are now close to completion in relation to this essential facility that will establish a dedicated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander alcohol and other drug residential rehabilitation service, again supporting jobs and investment in our city as well as improving health infrastructure for all Canberrans.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, would you please outline how the investments in the health infrastructure program have improved the care available to Canberrans?

MR CORBELL: Thank you, Dr Bourke, for your supplementary. Yes, you are right to highlight that the health infrastructure program is improving the care available for Canberrans when they need it most. Take, for example, the Canberra Region Cancer Centre. We have seen almost 30,000 occasions of service for cancer patients since its opening in August last year. The centre now employs over 400 oncologists, radiologists, nurses, support staff and technicians. The Centenary Hospital for Women and Children began offering services in 2012. This is providing staffing in the hundreds, who are every day caring for women and children in their time of need. More than 9,000 births have occurred at the centre since it opened.

We have upgraded and completely replaced the adult mental health unit. This has provided for a modern, state-of-the-art facility that is much more conducive to caring for those who have acute mental illness and other mental health problems and focusing on providing them with a supportive and safe environment whilst they go through their recovery. We have built the brand-new Gungahlin Community Health Centre, which is providing a fantastic range of services in the growing district of Gungahlin.

It is worth highlighting another great service that has commenced operation in recent weeks, which is the new renal dialysis service at the Tuggeranong health centre. This is the first time we have provided dedicated dialysis services in the Tuggeranong valley. It is a great new service for the Tuggeranong valley. It means that more people who live in the south can get the dialysis care they need closer to home, reducing their journey time, in modern, contemporary, clean and very welcome facilities with state-of-the-art equipment for those patients. *(Time expired.)*

Planning—variations

MR SMYTH: My question is to the Minister for Planning. Minister, the report on consultation for territory plan variation 347 shows that significant concerns were raised by nearby business owners, the National Trust and interested residents about the impact of future development on the Belconnen town centre and other surrounding retail and commercial areas. The recently approved territory plan variation will allow development to take place without developers having to pay the lease variation charge or comply with the multi-unit housing code. Minister, why is the government allowing the University of Canberra to unfairly compete with the private sector and other businesses?

MADAM SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr Smyth, I could not hear all of the question. Could you repeat the question?

MR SMYTH: I can do it all again.

MADAM SPEAKER: No, just the question.

MR SMYTH: I can do it all again if you want me to.

MADAM SPEAKER: No, it is all right. I got that bit.

MR SMYTH: Minister, why is the government allowing the University of Canberra to unfairly compete with the private sector and other businesses?

MR GENTLEMAN: I do not agree with the premise in Mr Smyth's question. I do not believe that the government is allowing the university to compete unfairly with other businesses. It is a different scenario for the university and the work that it does for the territory. It is a learning institute and it is important that it is able to grow its institution through this variation. The government is very supportive of the university growing in the territory and, of course, bringing with it knowledge from other jurisdictions, including overseas, and the ability for it to have some income along with that.

The opportunity at the university is completely different from the opportunities that we would see in the Belconnen town centre, and we want to ensure that the Belconnen town centre has the opportunity to grow. With that, we are going through the Belconnen master plan as we speak and looking at opportunities for the Belconnen town centre to grow as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Minister, how will allowing the University of Canberra to develop commercial office space help the Belconnen town centre?

MR GENTLEMAN: It is about integration with Belconnen town centre around the UC. There are different opportunities, as I said in my first answer, for the University of Canberra. It will allow the university to bring some facilities along with it and help grow the university. We expect there will be job opportunities as well at the UC.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Minister, in the recent master planning process for Belconnen, why was the University of Canberra explicitly excluded from the boundary in which the master plan applied?

MR GENTLEMAN: The boundary for the Belconnen town centre is for the town centre itself. It was not for the University of Canberra.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Minister, why is it appropriate to allow the University of Canberra to develop land without it being required to pay the lease variation charge as every other developer must?

MR GENTLEMAN: The government provides incentive for developers to make changes in the territory. Out of those outcomes we expect the territory to grow. In this case, as I said in my first answer, it is about knowledge growth in the territory, and jobs growth as well.

Schools—autism

MR DOSZPOT: My question is to the Minister for Education and Training. Minister, regarding the report of the incident involving the boy in a cage at an ACT public school, given several deadlines have been announced as to when the report will be delivered and each deadline has been missed, can you provide the latest update on when the internal report into the incident of the cage-like structure erected in March in one ACT public school will be released, and will it be tabled in the Assembly?

MS BURCH: For members' interest, the investigation, as I understand it, has been concluded. I am awaiting the decision from the independent delegate. I will clarify that, as the director-general and I have said, this is, in many ways, an HR review. I will come back and provide to the broader community, including Assembly members, what I can. The community rightly has an interest in this matter, but as to whether I will put the entire HR review to you, Mr Doszpot, it is highly unlikely.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: Minister, will the terms of reference be made public when the report is released; and if not, why not?

MS BURCH: With respect to part of that answer, I would ask you to refer to what I just said. Mr Doszpot, you asked that question around the terms of reference in the estimates committee and the Education and Training Directorate gave you an answer. The terms of reference will not be made public. The decision as to whether they are, post the conclusion and a decision by the delegate, is yet to be determined.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Minister, is this particular incident the only such time that a structure has been erected in an ACT school?

MS BURCH: It is the only one that I am aware of, and it is something that I find is of great concern to me, which is why, four months ago now, I brought it to attention. I did not hesitate once I was aware of it. I was clear on the actions that needed to happen to bring it into the public domain. I briefed Mr Doszpot then; I have offered him briefings since then. Every step along the way I have been very open about what I can say to the community. They can snigger over there, but let us be very clear: I have always said I want this completed in a timely manner but with regard to respect to the people involved.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Minister, how can parents have confidence that such an incident will not be repeated?

MS BURCH: I just signed today an MOU across Catholic, independent and government schools, and that was around transparency in an annual statement of assurance to all in our community that each and every one of our schools, government or non-government, complies with the relevant laws and obligations under the Education Act and the other parameters of being a registered school. I think that is a clear statement of the confidence that our community can have in all of our schools.

Transport—light rail

MR WALL: My question is to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, it was revealed last month by the *Canberra Times* that the ACT government was actively costing the capital metro light rail project to international investors at “up to \$A900 million, with further stages in excess of \$A1 billion”. This quote was included in a letter of introduction signed by a Land Development Agency official. Chief Minister, on what date was this letter signed?

MR BARR: I will need to take that on notice but, as the Minister for Capital Metro indicated, it was well before the business case was finalised.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Chief Minister, when did you first become aware of this letter, and by what means?

MR BARR: I was aware that the Land Development Agency was undertaking a range of investment facilitation activities. As to this exact letter, I would need to check the record as to the time. I was aware in general last year that these activities were being undertaken, as they were all sanctioned by me.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Chief Minister, why did the letter include the figure of \$900 million when the previously published figure for the light rail business case was \$614 million?

MR BARR: That was an estimate from an official in another agency, a mid-level official who had no authority to make such assessments. He was not in a position to make such statements. So the wording of the letter indicated, as has been quoted extensively, no exact figure in relation to the project.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Chief Minister, what confidence do you have in your government promoting the city when you have people who are not authorised spruiking the wrong figures about major infrastructure projects?

MR BARR: In relation to this particular matter, the official concerned put a range—the letter was deliberately ambiguous. That is a reasonable approach given the time at which the correspondence was undertaken, before the final business case. The letter was worded in that way for that reason.

Mr Coe: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Point of order, Mr Coe. Stop the clock, please.

Mr Coe: Madam Speaker, the question was: how can the Chief Minister have confidence in his government? I ask that he be directly relevant to that question.

MADAM SPEAKER: I draw the Chief Minister's attention to the terms of the standing order and ask him to be directly relevant in his answer to the question.

MR BARR: This government has an outstanding record of attracting new investment into this community, and we will continue to approach national and international markets in order to seek new investment. I know those opposite have campaigned against the ACT government seeking investment. They have been described as economic lunatics by their own Prime Minister, Treasurer and the minister for infrastructure in the federal arena. I will not be taking any lectures on economics from the economic lunatics opposite.

Capital works—projects

MS LAWDER: My question is to the Chief Minister and Treasurer. We have seen cuts in funding to several projects previously promised by the government. The number of beds at the University of Canberra hospital has been reduced, the scope of the duplication of Ashley Drive has been reduced and funding for the refurbishment of Belconnen High School has been significantly cut. Chief Minister, why has funding been cut for numerous capital works projects in hospitals, schools and roads while funding for light rail is being increased?

MR BARR: I thank Ms Lawder for the question. The insinuation in her question is wrong, and I would invite Ms Lawder to watch this space in relation to future government investments in infrastructure.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Lawder.

MS LAWDER: Chief Minister, is the extension of the light rail route to Russell under active consideration and how much extra would this extension cost?

MR BARR: Yes, and that matter is to be determined.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Chief Minister, why have you cut 60 beds at the new UC hospital but you are going ahead full steam with light rail?

MR BARR: We have not, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Chief Minister, will annual payments for the capital metro send the territory budget back into the red when it is completed? If not, what services will be cut or taxes increased to cover the cost of operating capital metro?

MR BARR: No, and the government will make further announcements in relation to future budgets at budget time.

Schools—safety

DR BOURKE: My question is to the Minister for Education and Training. Minister, how is the ACT government working with school communities to improve the safety of the roads and car parks of ACT government schools?

MS BURCH: I thank Dr Bourke for his question. As members will be aware, I am very pleased to have joined the Chief Minister yesterday at Ainslie School to announce a broad suite of measures designed to make our school traffic precinct safer.

The safety of children going to and from ACT schools is extremely important and something that this government takes seriously. While our school zones have historically been safe, there is growing community concern about traffic incidents near our schools. Indeed, last year ACT Policing issued 1,372 traffic infringement notices and cautions in school zones. This is far too many.

This is why, in my capacity as Minister for Police and Emergency Services, I made road safety around our schools a priority in the recent purchase agreement with ACT Policing. It is also why I was pleased to announce, with the Chief Minister and Chief Police Officer yesterday, that there would be a blitz targeting speeding and dangerous parking in our school zones. Members will also be aware that this government is considering trialling a 30 kilometre per hour speed limit at selected high risk schools.

In addition to this specific policing response, schools and school communities can work in a variety of ways with government. Each of our schools is unique, which means their problems and their solutions require an individual response. This makes engagement with our school communities critical to ensuring that safety continues at our schools.

When an issue at a school is identified, the school communities are engaged at the very beginning of the assessment process to outline the processes and seek feedback about traffic and parking arrangements already in place at that school. Once assessment has been completed, response measures are discussed with the community and agreement sought on measures to be implemented as required. ACT schools, school P&Cs, school boards and others connected to the school are actively engaged with the director in identifying and working through safety solutions. Possible solutions at an individual school are varied and reflect the circumstances of those schools.

Whatever the solution, the government is committed to making sure that our school precincts are as safe as they can be.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, could you provide more detail concerning how parents and students can be involved in the government's response?

MS BURCH: Parents and students are a critical part of the success of any program to make our school precincts safer. There will be an opportunity to comment on yesterday's announcements through the time to talk website. However, there are also other ways for parents and families to get involved beyond time to talk and the individual school consultations I mentioned earlier.

Members would be aware of the national ride to school day which promotes not only an active lifestyle but encourages and builds confidence in riding safely. The ACT government has built learn-to-ride facilities at Southern Cross Early Childhood School and at the Charnwood-Dunlop School, where students can learn the road rules and build their confidence in riding on roads. The NRMA science and road safety day lets students participate in a road safety show, discuss the road safety messages in class with their teachers and then complete student workbooks designed to reinforce the road safety messages. Fraser Primary School conducts a walking school bus program designed to teach students good active travel behaviours.

These are just some examples of the activities where active participation by parents and students is helping to solve and work through these issues. However, I think the best way parents and students can be involved is to lead a discussion at their own schools. Individual school responses to traffic management and communication with parents play an important part in road user behaviour and safety during school pick-up and drop-off times.

A number of Canberra public and non-government schools have implemented supervised pick-ups and drop-offs, and that is making a difference to those schools. That is why, by working with the local school communities, together we can make those precincts safer and, indeed, make sure our kids come and go from school safely.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, how does ACT Policing communicate to school communities to provide awareness and education in relation to road safety?

MS BURCH: I thank Ms Porter for her interest in this area. Police do engage with schools and their communities in a range of ways. Perhaps the most well known of these would be the famous Constable Kenny Koala. Constable Kenny has made 173 visits to schools across the ACT in the 2014-15 financial year to deliver the “stay OK on the road” program in our schools. This program is aligned with the school curriculum and is centred on themes that include using safety equipment such as seat belts and helmets, safe behaviours when walking or riding on or near our roads and road rules for cars and roads.

In term 2 of last year ACT Policing launched a pilot kids in vests program at four Belconnen primary schools, modelled on a Western Australian program, since adopted by South Australia and Victoria. The program issued children with high visibility vests as part of Constable Kenny’s “stay OK on the road” presentation and encourages each and every child to wear the vest when arriving at or departing from school, whatever their means of transport. In addition to the in-schools programs ACT Policing in the last 12 months has used social media to promote road safety campaigns including the school zone targeting strategy and back to school road safety campaign.

ACT Policing has conducted Facebook and Twitter online road safety forums to interact with the community around road safety and traffic laws and enforcement. ACT Policing will continue to use social media to promote road safety campaigns and is currently exploring the inclusion of students and schools in a localised promotion of road safety messages through their own social media pages.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, can you update the Assembly concerning ACT Policing operations in school zones?

MS BURCH: I am more than happy to update the Assembly on ACT Policing operations in our school zones. As I mentioned earlier, I did announce with the Chief Minister and the Chief Police Officer yesterday that ACT Policing will be conducting a blitz on school zones in the coming weeks to make sure that the safety of our school students is in the front of everyone’s mind. While we will have this current blitz, it is important to point out that safety in schools has always been a high priority for ACT Policing and this government, and this will continue.

Each school zone in the ACT has at least one specific traffic law enforcement event per school term. In the 2014-15 financial year, ACT Policing conducted 950 school targeting events and issued 737 traffic infringement notices and 557 traffic cautions relating to speeding offences in school zones. This ACT Policing strategy will continue for the 2015-16 period.

Going back to the 2014-15 financial year, traffic operations conducted targeted operations relating to specific traffic complaints around schools, including speeding drivers in school zones around Majura Primary, St Clare's and St Edmund's, Ngunnawal Primary and Calwell Primary, and dangerous driving around Burgmann College in Gungahlin. My colleagues on this side and I are committed to making our school traffic precincts safe, and we will continue to do that and make sure we do all we can to see that ambition fulfilled.

Mr Barr: I ask that all further questions be placed on the notice paper.

Papers

Madam Speaker presented the following papers, which were circulated to members when the Assembly was not sitting:

Auditor-General Act—Auditor-General's Reports—

No 4/2015—ACT Government support to the University of Canberra for affordable student accommodation, dated 12 June 2015.

No 5/2015—Integrity of Data in the Health Directorate, dated 19 June 2015.

No 6/2015—Bulk Water Alliance, dated 24 June 2015.

No 7/2015—Sale of ACTTAB, dated 26 June 2015.

Enlarged Cotter Dam Project—Icon Water Limited Voting Shareholder Information—Statement on the Enlarged Cotter Dam, dated 10 June 2015, pursuant to the resolution of the Assembly of 21 March 2012.

Madam Speaker presented the following papers:

Electoral Act, pursuant to section 54—ACT Legislative Assembly—Electoral Boundaries Redistribution 2015—Redistribution Report, dated 22 July 2015.

Assistant Speakers—Warrant of nomination, pursuant to standing order 8—Mr Smyth (8 and 9 July 2015) and Mr Doszpot (10 July 2015), dated 29 June 2015.

Acting Speaker—Instrument of Appointment, pursuant to standing order 6A—Assistant Speakers Smyth (8 and 9 July 2015) and Doszpot (10 July 2015), dated 29 June 2015.

Legislative Assembly delegation to Taiwan Paper and statement by Speaker

MADAM SPEAKER: I present the following paper:

Remuneration Tribunal Act—Members of the ACT Legislative Assembly—
Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2 of 2015, pursuant to Clause 6.1—
Determination of Assembly travel as representatives of the Legislative
Assembly—Travel to Republic of Taiwan in August 2015, dated 29 June 2015.

Members, in tabling the determination of Assembly travel, I have confirmed advice given previously by email that I will be leading a delegation of members to visit Taiwan during the period 17 to 23 August 2015. I will be accompanied by Dr Bourke and Mr Wall. My senior adviser will also be attending.

The visit has been made at the invitation of the government of Taipei, through the representative of the Taiwan economic and cultural office here in Canberra. I made the determination of Assembly travel after conferring with the Deputy Speaker. We agreed the determination was necessary in order to make it clear that delegates were attending, as intended by the Taiwan economic and cultural office, as MLAs representing the Legislative Assembly.

The government of Taipei is compiling an on-ground itinerary, including a range of elements that have been suggested by delegates. The government of Taipei is paying all travel and accommodation costs associated with the visit, along with other incidental costs, but delegates will have to pay any other costs not covered by the government of Taipei from their own personal pocket.

In planning for this trip, I have taken advice from the Clerk and the office of the Chief Minister, and the delegation is taking a briefing from the commonwealth Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Delegates will take a further briefing, prior to departure, from the Taiwan economic and cultural office. I will report back to the Assembly in the September sitting period. Delegates will need to update their declaration of interests upon their return and my senior adviser will make a formal declaration to me as his employer.

Members, I was delighted that the government of Taipei extended this invitation to members of the Legislative Assembly. It will enable members to meet with key government representatives, visit a number of government, industrial and social facilities and services across the country, and strengthen the valuable ties Canberra and the Assembly have already established with Taiwan.

Papers

Madam Speaker presented the following papers:

Ombudsman Act, pursuant to section 21—Ombudsman complaint statistics—
Quarterly report for the period April-June 2015 and annual statistics for 2014-15,
dated 17 July 2015.

Standing order 191—Amendments to—

Children and Young People Amendment Bill 2015 (No 2), dated 11 June 2015.

Electricity Feed-in Tariff Schemes Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, dated
10 and 11 June 2015.

Gaming Machine (Reform) Amendment Bill 2015, dated 11 June 2015.

Legislation program—spring 2015

Paper and statement by minister

MR BARR (Molonglo—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Tourism and Events): For the information of members, I present the following paper:

Legislation Program—Spring 2015—Key Themes and Government Priority Legislation Items.

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

Leave granted.

MR BARR: I welcome everyone back to the spring session. I can advise that the second half of the year is going to be very busy. Coming up in this sitting period, we will be taking a range of steps to improve our city's criminal justice system. Under the Crimes Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, we will introduce a notification procedure that requires ACT Policing to inform an Aboriginal legal aid organisation when a forensic procedure is to be carried out on an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person. It will also improve identification procedures in the Crimes (Forensic Procedures) Act 2000 and the Children and Young People Act 2008, and will make other technical and operational amendments to other aspects of the criminal law.

The Crimes (Sentencing) Amendment Act 2014 commenced on 5 December 2014 and prevents a sentence of periodic detention being imposed which extends beyond 30 June 2016. The Crimes (Sentencing) Amendment Bill 2015 represents the second stage and will introduce a new community-based sentencing option. The Crimes (Child Sex Offenders) Amendment Bill 2015 will make amendments to the Crimes (Child Sex Offenders) Act, the Crimes (Child Sex Offenders) Regulation 2005 and other ACT legislation to provide further enforcement and related mechanisms to better protect safety for our children.

The Victims of Crime (Financial Assistance) Reform Bill will introduce a new scheme to provide financial assistance to victims of crime. The Corrections Management Amendment Bill 2015 will make amendments to ensure that a detainee can be transferred to an interstate health facility for appropriate treatment and care if that care cannot be provided in the ACT.

The amendments to section 101 of the Terrorism (Emergency Temporary Powers) Act will protect our community. It is proposed to amend section 101 to extend the act for five years.

The Spent Convictions Bill 2015 will do the right things by Canberrans with historical convictions for consensual homosexual offences. It will provide a scheme for them to apply to have a conviction expunged—that is permanently erased—from their criminal record.

The Children and Young People Amendment Bill 2015 (No 3) contains amendments required to ensure that key reforms outlined in the step up for our kids out of home care strategy can be given effect.

In addition to pursuing these strategic initiatives, the government will introduce a significant number of additional pieces of legislation to ensure responsible and appropriate economic management of the territory as well as a range of routine legislation to ensure that the statute books remain current and up to date. I commend the program to the Assembly.

Committee reports—government responses Papers

MR BARR (Molonglo—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Tourism and Events): For the information of members, I present the following papers:

Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee—Report 3—*Report on Annual and Financial Reports 2013-2014*—Government response.

Health, Ageing, Community and Social Services—Standing Committee—Report 5—*Report on Annual and Financial Reports 2013-14*—Government response.

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee—Report 3—*Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2013-2014*—Government response.

Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services—Standing Committee—Report 7—*Report on Annual and Financial Reports 2013-2014*—Government response.

Public Accounts—Standing Committee—Report 11—*Report on Annual and Financial Reports 2013-14*—Government response.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the papers.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Papers

Mr Barr presented the following papers:

Public Sector Management Act, pursuant to sections 31A and 79—Copies of executive contracts or instruments—

Long-term contracts:

Andrew Taylor, dated 1 July 2015.

Anthony Polinelli, dated 14 July 2015.

Bruce Fitzgerald, dated 20 May 2015.

Elizabeth Clarke, dated 28 May 2015.

George Tomlins, dated 27 May 2015.

Jon Cumming, dated 6 July 2015.

Kate Starick, dated 20 July 2015.

Mark Brown, dated 5 June 2015.

Michelle Wicks, dated 12 June 2015.

Nicole Feely, dated 17 May 2015.

Samuel Engele, dated 24 June 2015.

Sean Rooney, dated 30 May 2015.

Stuart Friend, dated 29 May 2015.

Tracy Savage, dated 20 July 2015.

Wilhelmina Blount, dated 2 June 2015.

Short-term contracts:

Andrew Pedersen, dated 4 and 5 June 2015.

Andrew Whale, dated 15 and 16 June 2015.

Benjamin Ponton, dated 16 May and 17 June 2015.

Calvin Robinson, dated 15 April and 17 June 2015.

Christopher Webb, dated 10 and 17 July 2015.

Derek Kettle, dated 13 July 2015.

Elizabeth Beattie, dated 25 and 26 May 2015.

Goran Josipovic, dated 23 June 2015.

Gordon Elliott, dated 2 and 3 June 2015.

Jacinta Evans, dated 2 and 3 July 2015.

Jancye Winter, dated 7 and 8 July 2015.

Janelle Corey, dated 17 July 2015.

Jonathan Sibley, dated 30 June and 3 July 2015.

Judith Gosper, dated 15 and 16 June 2015.

Kim Smith, dated 22 May and 1 June 2015.

Loretta Zamprogno, dated 13 July 2015.

Luke Jansen, dated 26 May 2015.

Lyndall Kennedy, dated 7 May and 2 June 2015.

Malcolm Prentice, dated 15 June 2015.

Melanie Saballa, dated 1 and 3 July 2015.

Meredith Whitten, dated 30 June and 3 July 2015.

Michael Deasey, dated 13 July 2015.

Michael Reid, dated 25 May 2015.

Richard Baumgart, dated 30 June 2015.
Rosemary O'Donnell, dated 28 May 2015.
Sean Moysey, dated 27 and 28 May 2015.
Susan Chapman, dated 16 and 17 June 2015.
Tracey Allen, dated 29 June 2015.
Yu-Lan Chan, dated 17 and 23 June 2015.

Contract variations:

Andrew Parkinson, dated 29 May and 1 June 2015.
Anita Hargreaves, dated 25 and 30 June 2015.
Anita Perkins, dated 20 July 2015.
Austin Kenney, dated 16 and 17 July 2015.
Austin Kenney, dated 29 June 2015.
Bronwen Overton-Clarke, dated 30 June 2015.
Brook Dixon, dated 17 July 2015.
Conrad Barr, dated 30 June 2015.
Danielle Chesher, dated 20 and 21 May 2015.
David Matthews, dated 21 and 22 May 2015.
Fiona Barbaro, dated 16 and 26 June 2015.
Francis Duggan, dated 23 and 29 June 2015.
George Tomlins, dated 27 May 2015.
Helen Pappas, dated 20 May and 30 June 2015.
Joanne Garrisson, dated 2 and 3 July 2015.
Leanne Cover, dated 26 and 30 June 2015.
Margaret Cicolini, dated 22 June 2015.
Mark Collis, dated 16 and 17 July 2015.
Maureen Sheehan, dated 16 and 22 June 2015.
Philip Canham, dated 2 June 2015.
Robert Gotts, dated 6 and 7 July 2015.
Stephen Gniel, dated 29 and 30 June 2015.
Therese Gehrig, dated 19 and 22 June 2015.
Thomas Gordon, dated 25 and 29 June 2015.
Wendy Cuzner, dated 29 and 30 June 2015.
Yu-Lan Chan, dated 20 July 2015.

Auditor-General Act—Auditor-General's Report No 7/2014—Financial Audits
2013-14—Government response.

Territory-owned Corporations Act, pursuant to subsection 9(2)—Icon Water Limited—Summary of changes to the constitutions of subsidiary companies—Statement to the Assembly.

Financial Management Act—instruments Paper and statement by minister

MR BARR (Molonglo—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Tourism and Events): For the information of members, I present the following paper:

Financial Management Act, pursuant to section 18A—Statement of authorisation of expenditure from the Treasurer’s Advance in 2014-2015, including a statement of reasons.

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

Leave granted.

MR BARR: Section 18A(3) of the Financial Management Act 1996 requires that where I as Treasurer have authorised Treasurer’s advance expenditure under section 18, I must present to the Legislative Assembly within three sitting days after the end of the financial year a summary of the total expenditure authorised for that financial year. The appropriation act for 2014-15 provided \$29.5 million for the Treasurer’s advance. The final expenditure against the Treasurer’s advance was \$29.033 million.

The Treasurer’s advance is made available for urgent and unforeseen expenditure. Details of the expenditure authorised during 2014-15 are provided in the statement of authorisation. On each occasion, other avenues of cash management were explored prior to providing a Treasurer’s advance to the relevant agency. I present the statement of authorisation and commend the paper to the Assembly.

Papers

Mr Barr presented the following papers:

Financial Management Act—Instruments, including statements of reasons, pursuant to:

Section 15—Directing a transfer of funds between output classes within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, dated 30 June 2015.

Section 16—Directing a transfer of appropriations from the Justice and Community Safety Directorate to Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, excluding a statement of reasons, dated 18 June 2015.

Section 16A—Authorising appropriation for payment of accrued employee entitlements within—

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, dated 24 June 2015.

Community Services Directorate, dated 24 June 2015.

Section 17—Varying appropriations relating to Commonwealth funding to—
Canberra Institute of Technology, dated 30 June 2015.

Education and Training Directorate—

Dated 30 June 2015.

Dated 30 June 2015.

Health Directorate—

Dated 30 June 2015.

Dated 30 June 2015.

Territory and Municipal Services Directorate—

Dated 30 June 2015.

Dated 30 June 2015.

Section 18A—Authorisation of expenditure from the Treasurer's Advance to—
Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate—

Dated 24 June 2015.

Dated 24 June 2015.

Dated 24 June 2015.

Dated 24 June 2015.

Community Services Directorate, dated 24 June 2015.

Justice and Community Safety Directorate, dated 24 June 2015.

Section 19B—Varying appropriations related to Commonwealth Grants—

Bushfire Mitigation NP—Justice and Community Safety Directorate,
dated 30 June 2015.

Demand-Driver Infrastructure Programme NP—Chief Minister, Treasury
and Economic Development Directorate, dated 30 June 2015.

Commonwealth/State and Territory Joint Group Training Program NP—
Education and Training Directorate, dated 30 June 2015.

Ms Burch presented the following paper:

ACT Arts—

Policy Framework Review—Consultation Report, dated May 2015, pursuant to
the resolution of the Assembly of 26 November 2014.

2015 Policy.

Planning and Development Act 2007—variations Nos 309 and 327 to the territory plan

Papers and statement by minister

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for Planning, Minister for Roads and Parking, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, Minister for Children and Young People and Minister for Ageing): For the information of members, I present the following papers:

Planning and Development Act, pursuant to subsection 79(1)—Approvals of Variations to the Territory Plan, together with background papers, a copy of the summaries and reports, and a copy of any direction or report required—

No 309—Turner Bus Layover—Turner section 25 part block 8, dated 28 July 2015.

No 327—Capital Metro—Light Rail Stage 1—Gungahlin to Civic, dated 27 July 2015.

In accordance with the provisions of the act, these variations are presented with the background papers and copies of the summaries and reports. I ask leave to make a statement in relation to the papers.

Leave granted.

MR GENTLEMAN: I would like to present government responses to the standing committee reports on variations to the territory plan. These responses and the standing committee reports pertain to variation 309, the Turner bus layover, and variation 327, capital metro light rail stage 1, Gungahlin to the city. On 23 October 2014 the Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services started an inquiry on variation 309.

On 9 June 2015 the standing committee completed their report on variation 309. The standing committee made five recommendations for variation 309, one of which was that I approve it. The other four recommendations generally relate to the landscaping of this area of Turner, surrounding the bus layover site, and the ancillary works related to the bus layover development and have been adequately addressed in the report on consultation and changes made to variation 309. The government response to the standing committee report on variation 309 satisfactorily addresses the committee's recommendation and I have tabled the government response for the information of members.

I now turn to the bus layover itself. Variation 309 signifies a vitally important part of Canberra's public transport infrastructure. The location chosen by the extensive background studies demonstrates that it is the most suitable and efficient site for a bus layover facility. Variation 309 amends the Turner map and code and permits public transport facility as an assessable use on part block 8 section 25 in Turner so a bus layover can be developed. Variation 309 also removes the public land overlay meaning that when the site is developed for a bus layover and it will be consistent with maintenance rules and guidelines.

Variation 309 received 46 submissions during the public consultation period. The main issues raised related to the loss of parkland in the context of city growth, alternative sites that should be considered, the proposed landscape plan that should be implemented, the current and future use of part block 8 section 25 Turner, the need for a long-term master plan for the area, the potential impact of the proposal on traffic and road safety and compliance with noise levels and impacts on property values.

Changes to variation 309 were made following public consultation to responses to those concerns raised. Prior to public consultation, draft variation 309 proposed to rezone the site from PRZ1 urban open space to TZ1 transport zone. However, public submissions indicated that if the proposed bus layover does not proceed then the land would no longer be available for urban open space uses. Accordingly, the draft variation was amended to retain PRZ urban open space zoning of the site. While “public transport facility” will be added to the Turner precinct map and code to allow development of a bus layover, the retention of its current zoning would allow the site to be returned to parkland if the layover was no longer required.

With the satisfactory responses and amendments made to variation 309 to address those issues raised, further assessment and support from the standing committee, I feel confident that the community’s concerns have been adequately addressed.

On 26 November last year the Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services started an inquiry on variation 327, capital metro stage 1, and they completed their report on 11 June this year. The standing committee did not form an agreed view on the draft variation as it stated in the report:

The members of the Committee hold differing views on the merits of the Capital Metro project as a whole.

I would like to point out that the variation itself does not give any approval to the light rail project—it establishes definitions for light rail and associated key infrastructure in the territory plan. This is intended to remove any potential ambiguity around the permissibility of light rail in the ACT. It also provides a clear assessment path for future light rail proposals. It is a shame that some members of the committee missed that point. It further explicitly stated that the draft variation should not be considered as an endorsement or a condemnation of the capital metro project itself. And, whilst no recommendations were made, the committee did show support for the introduction of the terms “light rail” and “light rail depot” to the territory plan.

In regard to the concerns of submitters to the draft variation, the standing committee believed that the concerns raised regarding the development of the light rail could be addressed and managed to the satisfaction of the submitters. Furthermore, the standing committee’s dissenting report from the chair, Ms Meegan Fitzharris MLA, and member Dr Chris Bourke MLA recommended that I, as the Minister for Planning, approve draft variation 327.

The government has now responded to the report and dissenting report, and I now have tabled the government responses to the report for variation 327. I would like to

take this opportunity to thank the members of the standing committee for their consideration of the report on these two important variations. Variation to the territory plan 327, capital metro light rail stage 1, introduces the terms, “light rail” and “light rail depot” to the territory plan. It rezones parcels of land on a number of blocks to “transport zone” to allow for undertaking light rail associated road works; it amends transport zone objective (b) to cover light rail to ensure that any light rail developments are consistent with the relevant zone objectives; and it rezones a small triangular area in block 1 section 42 Mitchell from hills, ridges and buffer zone to general industry zone to accommodate the proposed light rail depot. The nature reserve overlay over the site is also removed.

Draft variation 327 was released for public comment in August last year for six weeks and attracted 10 public submissions. The majority of submitters opposed the light rail proposal in its entirety. The development of light rail stage 1 from Gungahlin to Civic is a public transport initiative committed to by the ACT government and led by the Capital Metro Agency. Three submissions raised concerns about potential impacts of the proposed light rail stage 1 Gungahlin to Civic. These included concerns about the impacts on the Belconnen Dog Obedience Club, block 601 in Gungahlin; the National Archives of Australia, blocks 1 and 4 section 15 in Mitchell; and equestrian uses at Mitchell and EPIC.

DV327 does not include detailed design considerations for the proposed light rail development. In this regard I am confident potential impacts on surrounding uses are matters that will be examined and assessed at the environmental impact statement and development assessment stages of the proposal. These submissions have been referred to the Capital Metro Agency for consideration during these stages and as such no changes were made to the variation since the public consultation period.

As the Minister for Planning I have directed the Planning and Land Authority to adjust the proposed TSZ1 transport zone along the southern end of Flemington Road to ensure this major road reserve will be entirely included in the TSZ1 transport zone. Light rail is an important part of planning for an integrated transport network, and as the Minister for Planning it is my role to decide the planning merits of making light rail a permissible use in the territory plan. For this reason I have approved variation 327.

Planning and Development Act 2007—variation Nos 321, 331, 337 and 347 to the territory plan

Papers and statement by minister

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for Planning, Minister for Roads and Parking, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, Minister for Children and Young People and Minister for Ageing): For the information of members I present the following papers:

Planning and Development Act, pursuant to subsection 79(1)—Approvals of Variations to the Territory Plan, together with background papers, a copy of the summaries and reports, and a copy of any direction or report required—

No 321—Pialligo agricultural area—Changes to the Pialligo precinct map and code, dated 29 July 2015.

No 331—Lyons section 53 blocks 1, 4, 5 and 8 (Strathgordon Court), dated 28 July 2015.

No 337—ACT Government Land Release Program—Greenway section 28 block 2—Zoning changes and changes to the Greenway precinct map and code, dated 1 July 2015.

No 347—University of Canberra—Block 1 Section 3 Bruce, dated 27 July 2015.

I ask leave to make a statement in relation to the papers.

Leave granted.

MR GENTLEMAN: The first two variations I would like to talk about are 331 Lyons and 337 Greenway. Variation 331 to the territory plan rezones blocks 1, 4 and 8 section 53 Lyons from the residential RZ4 medium density zone and block 5 section 53 Lyons from the PRZ1 urban open space zone to the residential RZ5 high density zone. Variation 337 Greenway rezones block 2 section 28 Greenway from the commercial CZ6 leisure and accommodation zone to residential RZ4 medium density zone.

The variations for the sites in Lyons and Greenway were part of the first omnibus of seven draft variations to the territory plan that were released in 2014. The ACT government is undertaking a major long-term program of public housing renewal through the replacement of a number of its older Housing ACT public housing properties, and this is being achieved through the public housing renewal program. The program is intended to improve outcomes for public housing tenants in the ACT and support the renewal of Canberra's urban areas.

Housing is critically important for the ACT community's overall economic and social wellbeing. Public housing assists Canberrans on low incomes to reach their potential, to make a contribution and to share the benefits of our community. Canberra has some of the oldest public housing in Australia. As these properties have aged, it has become more difficult to maintain them to current standards such as energy efficiency, and they no longer suit the needs of many tenants.

These variations support the redevelopment programs. Variations 331 and 337 are the fourth and fifth territory plan variations I have approved from that package of sites. The remaining draft variations are still under review and will be provided to me in due course.

The omnibus package of territory plan variations, including draft variations 331 and 337, were released for public comment between 7 November last year and 19 December last year. Draft variation 331 Lyons attracted one public submission. The main issue related to density of development, building heights, connectivity with the open space area, public transport, social housing distribution and environmental sustainability. A report on consultation was prepared for draft variation 331, responding to the issues raised in the submission.

Draft variation 331 was not amended as a result of public notification. This is because the issues raised in the single submission received had been raised previously during part of the public housing redevelopment consultations which informed draft variation 331, with a number of amendments to the Lyons precinct code relating to building height limits, separation between buildings, setbacks, provision of landscaped areas and protection of the public realm. I am satisfied that the issues raised by the community have been adequately addressed and, as such, did not feel it necessary to refer the draft variation to the Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services.

Draft variation 331 Lyons is the site of a public housing multi-unit property called Strathgordon Court. In order to offer good quality public housing that meets the needs of tenants now and in the future, tenants in these older properties like Strathgordon Court will move to more modern public housing.

There are many benefits arising from the rezoning of this land. Not only will the current tenants of Strathgordon Court have access to more modern, appropriate and sustainable housing, but also the rezoning will provide opportunities for a diversity of housing types and densities adjacent to Woden town centre and major transport routes. The rezoning will encourage urban intensification of development around the town centre while maintaining the residential amenity of surrounding low density residential areas of Lyons in accordance with the strategic directions of the territory plan.

Variation 331 varies the territory plan to facilitate the construction of a residential development with a maximum height of 10 storeys. Building heights along Hindmarsh Drive will be a mix of eight and 10 storeys. This approach is consistent with the development that has occurred further north on Melrose Drive at the old Burnie Court site, at the corner of Melrose Drive and Launceston Street.

The maximum heights of buildings opposite the private development of Woden Gardens is four storeys. This is in direct response to feedback received during pre-territory plan variation consultation from the residents of Woden Gardens, who requested an increase in height along Hindmarsh Drive and a decrease in the height of buildings adjoining Woden Gardens. The provision for the buildings to step down towards the suburb of Lyons is intended to retain an appropriate streetscape and respond to the adjoining areas while maximising site location and proximity to employment opportunities, access to services and public transport at Woden town centre.

I would like to move on to variation 337 Greenway. Variation 337 Greenway changes the land use zoning from commercial CZ6 leisure and accommodation to RZ4 residential. There has been limited demand for this site for CZ6 commercial uses and there is an existing supply of CZ6 land in Tuggeranong, including in the town centre.

When the draft variation was publicly notified it also attracted one public submission. The main issues related to run-off into the lake, increase in traffic, overflow parking, amenity, and the type of impact of commercial use. A report on consultation was

prepared for 337 responding to the issues raised in the submission. A traffic report was prepared that addressed the concerns about traffic. Draft variation 337 released for public notification had already been amended to address concerns raised by the comprehensive round of consultation undertaken by the Community Services Directorate in the housing redevelopment program.

The Greenway precinct code included provisions relating to site access, pedestrian access, the height of buildings, protection of trees and the provision of landscape areas on the site. As these changes were made to the draft variation prior to public notification, the final variation stands as amended. I am satisfied that the issues raised during public consultation on DV337 have been adequately addressed and I did not refer it to the standing committee.

The new RZ4 residential zoning is complementary to the residential land abutting the site to the north. The site is approximately one kilometre by road to the Tuggeranong town centre which provides commercial, retail, office, education, community, government services, leisure, entertainment and residential opportunities for the Tuggeranong community. The site also is close to a range of other facilities including playgrounds, open space and the dog park. Residential development on the site will provide for a diversity of housing types near the Tuggeranong town centre. The site will be released by the ACT government under its land release program.

The third variation I would like to talk about is variation 347 University of Canberra. Variation 347 broadens the territory plan uses allowed at the university by permitting merit track assessable development associated with the operation of a contemporary university. In doing so, the variation also seeks to guide future development at the university by imposing overall building height restrictions.

The variation incorporates additional design provisions and general requirements for future development at the university. The variation also limits the scale of non-student residential development to a maximum of 3,300 dwellings and allows a more qualitative approach to assessing multi-unit housing.

The variation provides for a range of commercial uses on the university campus but also includes controls to ensure that the university does not compete with other commercial areas of the ACT. The provisions include limiting the gross floor area per shop to 200 square metres and per supermarket to 1,000 square metres and an overall shop limit of 4,000 square metres for the entire site; limiting the scale of non-university-related public agency and business agency to 2,000 square metres and office to 5,000 square metres; and limiting the scale of non-university-related office space to 30,000 square metres for the entire site.

Draft variation 347 was released for public consultation from 14 May 2015 until 29 June 2015, attracting eight submissions and one petition containing 60 signatures. Of the eight submissions two were supportive, while the remaining six objected to the variation in some way. The main issues raised during consultation were the impact of increased commercial development at the University of Canberra on the Belconnen town centre and the permissibility and scale of a produce market at the Bruce campus.

Changes were made to variation 347 in response to the comments made. Two of the major changes were a limit on the overall scale of non-university-related office space to 30,000 square metres for the entire site, and a limit on the scale of produce market to offset the concerns raised about undermining the Belconnen Fresh Food Markets.

I am confident that the changes made to variation 347 satisfy the community's concerns and protect the Belconnen town centre, particularly from the perceived economic impacts detailed in some submissions. I would like to assure the community that through the upcoming Belconnen town centre master plan process the connections between the university and the town centre are at the centre of any plans for the town centre and its ongoing prosperity.

The University of Canberra master plan illustrates the desire for greater linkages and integration with the Belconnen town centre. Variation 347 implements the key recommendations of this master plan. Further development of the University of Canberra and the planned increase in campus population will provide for a more vibrant university and town centre.

Finalisation of variation 347 will allow the Belconnen master planning process to respond more accurately to development at the University of Canberra. Variation 347 is the culmination of a suite of legislative changes to the laws which govern the University of Canberra. Variation 347 formalises many of the uses currently allowed on the campus, thereby streamlining the development application process.

It also allows the university to provide high quality facilities, promote knowledge sharing and create a strong nexus with industry. These changes will ensure the national and international competitiveness and viability of the University of Canberra, and that our city remains a smart city attracting the best minds locally and from abroad.

The final variation in this set of variations is variation 321 Pialligo. Variation 321 implements key recommendations of the Pialligo master plan. The variation includes a range of amendments to the Pialligo precinct map and code. The variation will protect the agricultural character of the area while encouraging low-scale agricultural-related commercial development close to Beltana Road, to build on the existing character.

Variation 321 achieves this through defining an area within 60 metres of Beltana Road where moderately increased levels of ancillary development are permitted; restricting the levels of ancillary development in areas further away from Beltana Road to protect the agricultural land from overdevelopment; ensuring agricultural uses are not overly constrained by new residential development on adjoining blocks; including provisions to assist in the protection of unearthed archaeological artefacts if they are discovered in the course of undertaking an approved development; and controlling uses that are considered less compatible with the desired character of the area to where they are currently permitted.

Variation 321 also permits the use of the land at the corner of Pialligo Avenue and Beltana Road for an emergency services facility. This will permit the future development of a fire station on the site to improve the emergency services coverage of the area.

Variation 321 was publicly exhibited between May and June last year and attracted four written submissions. The main issues raised in the public submissions included concern with a restriction on the size of ancillary dwellings and commercial uses being too restrictive; development provisions in areas close to Beltana Road impacting on the ability to undertake primary activities in these areas; the requirement to update land management agreements affecting some blocks that were previously exempted; concerns with requiring property plans to be prepared in addition to the existing requirements for development in the broadacre zone; and not considering the potential to develop primary uses not related to agriculture or horticulture.

A number of amendments were made to variation 321 in response to public concerns with revisions to several rules and/or criteria. The active frontage provisions would now apply only to ancillary commercial development. The front setback controls were amended to allow small-scale produce stalls selling goods made on the block, provided adequate sight lines from driveways are still maintained. The provision requiring pitched roofs has been removed.

I am satisfied that the changes made to the draft variation have adequately addressed the issues raised during the public notification. Accordingly, I decided not to refer the draft variation to the Legislative Assembly Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services.

I ask the Assembly to support variations to the territory plan 331 Lyons, 337 Greenway, 347 University of Canberra, and 321 Pialligo agricultural area.

Papers

Mr Gentleman presented the following papers:

Subordinate legislation (including explanatory statements unless otherwise stated)

Legislation Act, pursuant to section 64—

Adoption Act—Adoption (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-182 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Agents Act—Agents (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-122 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Architects Act—Architects (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-194 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Associations Incorporation Act—Associations Incorporation (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-142 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act—Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-123 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Building Act—Building (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-198 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Canberra Institute of Technology Act and Financial Management Act—

Canberra Institute of Technology (Institute Board Member) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-149 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Canberra Institute of Technology (Institute Board Member) Appointment 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-150 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Canberra Institute of Technology (Institute Board Member) Appointment 2015 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-151 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Canberra Institute of Technology (Institute Board Member) Appointment 2015 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-152 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Canberra Institute of Technology (Institute Board Member) Appointment 2015 (No 5)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-153 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Casino Control Act—Casino Control (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-174 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Civil Unions Act—Civil Unions (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-143 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (Enforcement) Act—Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (Enforcement) (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-124 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Clinical Waste Act—Clinical Waste (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-157 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Community Title Act—Community Title (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-197 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Construction Occupations (Licensing) Act—Construction Occupations Licensing (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-193 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Cooperatives Act—Cooperatives (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-125 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Court Procedures Act—

Court Procedures (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-137 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Court Procedures Amendment Rules 2015 (No 2)—Subordinate Law SL2015-22 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Dangerous Goods (Road Transport) Act—Dangerous Goods (Road Transport) Fees and Charges Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-100 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Dangerous Substances Act—

Dangerous Substances (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-115 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Dangerous Substances (Government Analytical Laboratory) Exemption 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-184 (LR, 25 June 2015).

Electoral Act—Electoral (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-185 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Electricity Safety Act—Electricity Safety (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-195 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Emergencies Act—Emergencies (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-116 (LR, 5 June 2015).

Environment Protection Act—Environment Protection (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-158 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Industry) Act—Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Industry) (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-126 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Firearms Act—Firearms (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-117 (LR, 5 June 2015).

First Home Owner Grant Act—First Home Owner Grant (Objection Fees) Revocation 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-168 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Fisheries Act—Fisheries (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-159 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Freedom of Information Act—Freedom of Information (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-138 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Gambling and Racing Control Act and Financial Management Act—

Gambling and Racing Control (Governing Board) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-135 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Gambling and Racing Control (Governing Board) Appointment 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-136 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Gaming Machine Act—Gaming Machine (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-175 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Gas Safety Act—Gas Safety (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-196 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Guardianship and Management of Property Act—Guardianship and Management of Property (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-139 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Hawkers Act—Hawkers (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-127 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Health Act—Health (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-204 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Heritage Act—Heritage (Register Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-188 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Juries Act—Juries (Payment) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-199 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Land Titles Act—Land Titles (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-144 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Legal Profession Act—

Legal Profession (Bar Council Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—
Disallowable Instrument DI2015-180 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Legal Profession (Solicitors Practising Fees) Determination 2015—
Disallowable Instrument DI2015-133 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Legislative Assembly (Members' Staff) Act—

Legislative Assembly (Members' Staff) Members' Salary Cap Determination
2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-173 (LR, 25 June 2015).

Legislative Assembly (Members' Staff) Speaker's Salary Cap Determination
2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-172 (LR, 25 June 2015).

Liquor Act—

Liquor (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-145
(LR, 25 June 2015).

Liquor Amendment Regulation 2015 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2015-21
(LR, 26 June 2015).

Lotteries Act—Lotteries (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable
Instrument DI2015-155 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Machinery Act—Machinery (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable
Instrument DI2015-111 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Magistrates Court Act—Magistrates Court (Nature Conservation Infringement
Notices) Regulation 2015—Subordinate Law SL2015-20 (LR, 10 June 2015).

Nature Conservation Act—

Nature Conservation (Exempt Animals) Declaration 2015 (No 1)—
Disallowable Instrument DI2015-118 (LR, 10 June 2015).

Nature Conservation (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable
Instrument DI2015-119 (LR, 10 June 2015).

Nature Conservation (Scientific Committee) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—
Disallowable Instrument DI2015-121 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Nature Conservation (Scientific Committee) Appointment 2015 (No 2)—
Disallowable Instrument DI2015-206 (LR, 1 July 2015).

Nature Conservation (Transitional Provisions) Regulation 2015—Subordinate
Law SL2015-26 (LR, 9 July 2015).

Nature Conservation Regulation 2015—Subordinate Law SL2015-23 (LR,
2 July 2015).

Official Visitor Act—

Official Visitor (Children and Young People Services) Visit and Complaint
Guidelines 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-120 (LR,
15 June 2015).

Official Visitor (Corrections Management) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—
Disallowable Instrument DI2015-154 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Official Visitor (Mental Health) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable
Instrument DI2015-156 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Partnership Act—Partnership (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-146 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Pawnbrokers Act—Pawnbrokers (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-128 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Planning and Development Act—

Planning and Development (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-189 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Planning and Development (Lease Variation Charges) Amendment Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-205 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Planning and Development (Remission of Lease Variation Charges) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-216 (LR, 20 July 2015).

Planning and Development Act and Financial Management Act—

Planning and Development (Land Agency Board) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-200 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Planning and Development (Land Agency Board) Appointment 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-201 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Planning and Development (Land Agency Board) Appointment 2015 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-202 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Prostitution Act—Prostitution (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-147 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Public Place Names Act—

Public Place Names (Molonglo Valley District) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-215 (LR, 13 July 2015).

Public Place Names (Moncrieff) Determination 2015 (No 5)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-207 (LR, 2 July 2015).

Public Place Names (Pialligo) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-212 (LR, 9 July 2015).

Public Pools Act—Public Pools (Active Leisure Centre Fees) Determination 2015 (No. 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-179 (LR, 23 June 2015).

Public Trustee Act—Public Trustee (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-140 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Race and Sports Bookmaking Act—

Race and Sports Bookmaking (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-176 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Race and Sports Bookmaking (Rules for Sports Bookmaking) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-105 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Race and Sports Bookmaking (Sports Bookmaking Events) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-104 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Racing Act—

Racing Appeals Tribunal Appointment 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument

DI2015-208 (LR, 9 July 2015).

Racing Appeals Tribunal Appointment 2015 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-209 (LR, 9 July 2015).

Racing Appeals Tribunal Appointment 2015 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-214 (LR, 9 July 2015).

Racing Appeals Tribunal Appointment 2015 (No 5)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-210 (LR, 9 July 2015).

Radiation Protection Act—Radiation Protection (Council Member) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-134 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Rail Safety National Law (ACT) Act—Rail Safety National Law (Drug and Alcohol Analysts) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-110 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Rates Act, Land Tax Act, Land Rent Act—Rates, Land Tax and Land Rent (Certificate and Statement Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-164 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Registration of Deeds Act—Registration of Deeds (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-129 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Retirement Villages Act—Retirement Villages (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-130 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Road Transport (General) Act—

Road Transport (General) (Pay Parking Area Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-203 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Road Transport (General) (Road Safety Contribution) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-99 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Road Transport (General) Concession Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-101 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Road Transport (General) Driver Licence and Related Fees Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-95 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Road Transport (General) Fees for Publications Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-98 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Road Transport (General) Numberplate Fees Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-96 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Road Transport (General) Parking Permit Fees Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-171 (LR, 19 June 2015).

Road Transport (General) Refund and Dishonoured Payments Fees Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-97 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Road Transport (General) Vehicle Registration and Related Fees Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-94 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Road Transport (Offences) Amendment Regulation 2015 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2015-25 (LR, 2 July 2015).

Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Act—Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Maximum Fares for Taxi Services Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-187 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Sale of Motor Vehicles Act—Sale of Motor Vehicles (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-131 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Scaffolding and Lifts Act—Scaffolding and Lifts (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-112 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Second-hand Dealers Act—Second-hand Dealers (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-132 (LR, 15 June 2015).

Security Industry Act—Security Industry (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-148 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Surveyors Act—Surveyors (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-190 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Taxation Administration Act—

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Duty) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-106 (LR, 2 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Duty) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-161 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Home Buyer Concession Scheme) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-108 (LR, 2 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Land Rent) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-165 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication Buyback Concession Scheme) Determination 2015 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-93 (LR, 28 May 2015).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Motor Vehicle Duty) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-183 (LR, 25 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Over 60s Home Bonus Scheme) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-107 (LR, 2 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Pensioner Duty Concession Scheme) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-109 (LR, 2 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Land Tax) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-163 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Objection Fees) Revocation 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-169 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Rates) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-162 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Rates—Fire and Emergency Services Levy) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-166 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Rates—Rebate Cap) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-167 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Taxation Administration (Witness Allowances) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-170 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Tobacco Act—Tobacco (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-213 (LR, 9 July 2015).

Tree Protection Act—Tree Protection (Advisory Panel) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-186 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Unit Titles (Management) Act—Unit Titles (Management) (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-141 (LR, 18 June 2015).

Unit Titles Act—Unit Titles (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-192 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Unlawful Gambling Act—Unlawful Gambling (Charitable Gaming Application Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-177 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Utilities Act—Utilities (Gas Network Capital Contribution Code) Revocation 2105—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-178 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Water and Sewerage Act—Water and Sewerage (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-191 (LR, 29 June 2015).

Water Resources Act—Water Resources (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-160 (LR, 22 June 2015).

Work Health and Safety Act—Work Health and Safety (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-113 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Workers Compensation Act—Workers Compensation (Fees) Determination 2015—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-114 (LR, 4 June 2015).

Working with Vulnerable People (Background Checking) Act—Working with Vulnerable People Background Checking (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-181 (LR, 30 June 2015).

Public housing

Discussion of matter of public importance

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Lawder): The Speaker has received letters from Dr Bourke, Mr Coe, Mr Doszpot, Ms Fitzharris, Mr Hanson, Ms Lawder, Ms Porter, Mr Smyth and Mr Wall proposing that a matter of public importance be submitted to the Assembly for discussion. In accordance with standing order 79, the Speaker has determined that the matter proposed by Mr Smyth be submitted to the Assembly, namely:

The importance of locating public housing in the ACT close to public transport and key services.

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (3.51): Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this very important subject. It would not be hard to get the impression that the government's new found interest in renewing housing stock has nothing to do with the tenants. For 15 years the government has largely ignored the large flat complexes that ACT housing runs. As a former housing minister I am aware there was a big flat strategy that looked at some 19 complexes in an ongoing way so that we could renew them all over time. We started quite successfully with the removal of Macpherson Court, which became City Edge.

With much approval by this Assembly it was emptied of tenants, who were found suitable other accommodation. There were 144 bedsits in Macpherson Court which were old, tired, and not particularly healthy. City Edge, which has won many awards both for building and environmental quality of life, arose from that site. The new City Edge was sensational because it had in it private tenants who purchased and government tenants from a number of specialist groups, including general ACT Housing tenants and aged and disability accommodation as well.

The same happened with the old Lachlan Court on Brisbane Avenue. That had also reached the end of its life; the tenants were moved to other locations and it was developed into a very fine complex which suits the character of the area. In 2001 I remember going with the then housing minister, Mr Moore, to knock down the sign at Burnie Court. Burnie Court I think was 364 bedsits; it was transitional accommodation for public servants moving to the ACT in the late 60s and early 70s and it was never meant to be long-term accommodation, but long-term accommodation it became. It was not a very good location and it had a very poor reputation. Again, because we had a long-term strategy, it was next in line. The problem for the community was that, despite announcing its renewal in 2001, it took until about 2007 for this government to act on Burnie Court, such was its interest in public housing large flat complexes.

In the 15 years of this government there has been only one new announcement—the renewal of Fraser Court. With one complex in 15 years people could be forgiven for being a little bit cynical about this government's approach to public housing, particularly with regard to large blocks of flats and the outcomes in keeping people close to things like public transport and key services.

Lo and behold, because the government wants a train to keep Mr Rattenbury happy, it is willing to move all these tenants. There is a sudden flurry of activity in the announcement that we now have a Minister for Urban Renewal to make this happen. That role competes with the Minister for Housing. As you, Madam Assistant Speaker, and I found out in the recent estimates hearings, it is very hard to get a handle on who does what. It came down to the Chief Minister as the Minister for Urban Renewal looks after buildings and the Minister for Housing looks after people.

You cannot look after people without giving them the appropriate buildings to live in. Let's face it: the real driver for this sudden flurry of activity of urban renewal is so a government under pressure for its decisions about the tram can try to scrape up the money so it can say, "Look. We have a way to pay for this. We can access federal government additional funding for it and we have got some sort of plan."

But this is not a plan that suits the needs of public housing tenants. It is a broad division—there are public tenants who are self-sufficient, who hold down jobs, who have been in their homes for a long time and who pay their way, and there is a special group of people we have a responsibility to as a community who need some assistance, who are in public housing because there is not anywhere else for them and who often have multiple needs which mean they need to be near centres that provide services so they can get to them quickly and cheaply.

I live in Chisholm. I love Chisholm. I am very proud of living in Chisholm. I chose to live in Chisholm. We are about to put another 20-odd units on the corner of Goldstein and Hambidge crescents in Chisholm. It is on one bus route. There is perhaps a second bus route within walking distance, but it is not particularly close to the shops if you do not have a lot of money to spend on bus fares. It is not particularly close to a lot of services. Members living in that area include a member in Fadden, a member in Macarthur, a member in Chisholm and a couple of other members from nearby, and they know a large percentage of the population in that part of eastern Tuggeranong rely entirely on their cars because they cannot do the things they need to do to support their lifestyle and their families and their occupations and their interests on the bus. That would apply to public housing tenants as well, in fact, probably more so.

There is a well-documented thing called forced car ownership, which is defined as the involuntary choice low income families have when owning or operating cars because no other transport options are available but they need the accessibility a car brings. Forced car ownership is a real risk to these public housing tenants who are being relocated to the outer suburbs of Canberra where it is difficult to provide public transport within reasonable walking distance of households.

We asked the government, Madam Assistant Speaker, as you would remember, where these people are going, and the answer was they are going to Nicholls, Monash and Chisholm, all well-known inner suburbs of Canberra! It is funny that the government's own transport plan for Canberra 2012-31 says that in some areas on the fringe of suburbs the circuitous street layout and hilly topography can make it difficult to provide public transport within reasonable walking distance of some households and make the car an easier travel option. We all know for many suburbs that is absolutely the case. You have to question what the government is doing to ensure public housing is located close to public transport and key services. No doubt we will have the response, "Yes, these are all close to bus routes," and well they may be, but it is about time. If you have to be in Civic during the day and you are coming from Chisholm—I have to admit I have not caught a bus from Nicholls into Civic recently, but it is a similar distance from Chisholm to town—it takes time and it can be difficult to get connections.

We are taking a large number of people, many of whom have lived for a long time particularly on Northbourne Avenue but in other areas as well—such as Strathgordon Court that Mr Gentlemen was just talking about in his statement—away from their families and friends. They will be taken away from their doctors and other medical support and specialist services they may need. They will be moved away from educational institutions they may be studying at. Who knows, they may be moved from their church infrastructure, their favourite herbal medicine outlet, their butcher or their friendly newsagent, and put somewhere else and they do not have a say. They are being moved because we have a government that has not managed its budget properly. We have a government that has not managed housing properly and we have a government that has an overriding commitment to a light rail, a tram—let's call it what it is, a tram—for political reasons because it did not do the work before it decided on the route.

This is what happens when you have a government, for instance, that has not paid particular attention to the economy and diversified the economy for other streams of income. It is dependent on land sales. This is largely a land-based economy because Labor over 15 years has led it that way. It loves the profits of land-based taxes. You only need to look at the way your rates are tripling to know that. Mr Barr proudly announced that conveyances had been abolished, but this year they grow from \$220 million to \$260 million in the outyears in the budget papers. It is a magic tax.

This government has not paid attention to the economy. That is the stark reality. It is dependent on the next land sale for whatever it can get for it without taking into account the long-term use of the block of land and the real value to the people of Canberra from that block of land. As a consequence, the people who are resident along Northbourne Avenue are being moved so the land-based government under the land-based Chief Minister can make another land-based sale so it can live off the profits of the land instead of properly diversifying the economy.

Minister Burch just tabled the 2015 arts strategy framework. It is funny—I think the document is on the desk—because there is a tabling statement the minister forgot to give. Perhaps that is because the minister did not want to have a debate about such a thing as an arts strategy because, of course, arts is one of the big drivers of the diversification of economies and there is not very much mention of it in the 2015 arts framework. Why am I surprised?

It is important we make sure that public housing tenants are not disadvantaged. It is important to locate public housing in the ACT close to public transport routes to avoid public housing tenants experiencing transport disadvantage, which leads to social exclusion, as you well know, Madam Assistant Speaker, and I acknowledge your work in your previous life in this sector. If you are separated from where you have become accustomed to being, where your family and friends more than likely are, where your social and support services are more than likely located and where the things that you like and keep you safe are, this can lead to social exclusion, and that is not something we want to occur.

Again, Madam Assistant Speaker, as well you know from a previous occupation, some public housing tenants have disabilities. There is a need to locate public housing in the ACT close to public transport so that these tenants can more easily access key services so they can get more easily to their medical appointments, whether it be to see the doctor or to go to a therapy service or support service of some kind. As I have said, I love Chisholm, but for some people that distance further away from the centre of town—and it is about 20 kilometres if you come down the Monaro Highway from my place to the Assembly—makes it difficult and it will cost them more. It will certainly cost them more in time and will make life more difficult.

It will be interesting to hear from the Minister for Housing when she speaks—I assume she will—about the criteria the government has in place for selecting sites for public housing. We hear about the salt and peppering, but one gets the distinct impression that the government is just quickly getting on with the job of decanting tenants from these three sites so it can get on with the job of building its tram instead of having a long-term view and a long-term plan and a structure to that plan to ensure that the territory gets the best return on this land and, more importantly, that the residents will get suitable of accommodation. I have great faith that the standard of accommodation will be fine, but the location will make a difference to those for whom, in many cases, life is already a bit tough. Being moved without any say in it will make life more difficult for these folk. It will be interesting to see whether the minister can give us a list of criteria the government applies when it makes these decisions.

As you know, Madam Assistant Speaker, transport disadvantage is common in outer urban areas. Transport disadvantage is a result of a range of intersecting factors, and that includes poor public transport infrastructure, a higher proportion of low income households, and the need to travel further distances in order to get to a workplace, services, activities or friends. Young mothers and sole parents are particularly vulnerable to transport disadvantage. For these groups, transport difficulties can play a key role in increased social inclusion, which leads to a diminution of their wellbeing and their lifestyle.

This is an important issue. It will be interesting to hear what the government has to say about it. It will be interesting to see what other sites are chosen. We had Minister Gentleman's speech about some of the other locations that are to be changed so they can be redeveloped. It will be interesting to see what the government means by "salt and peppering". Is it a finely ground sprinkle of salt and pepper or is it rock salt and whole peppercorns scattered so you are moving clumps of clients to other concentrations? This is an ideal opportunity to get the balance right, to get the type of accommodation right and to get the location right so we make sure these tenants get access with ease to the things that matter—transport, health services, education, special services they require and, most importantly, their family and friends.

MS BERRY (Ginninderra—Minister for Housing, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Community Services, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Women and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Social Inclusion and Equality) (4.06): Thanks to Mr Smyth for bringing the MPI forward

today, and I welcome the discussion around housing policy and around our unprecedented public housing renewal program. Insofar as there is general support for the principles of our approach to public housing, I do welcome the input of the Canberra Liberals in the debate and I also note Ms Lawder's positive comments yesterday around the release of the evaluation of reforms to the homelessness service system.

Each of us understands the diversity of our public housing community and the complexity of issues facing the sector more broadly and I also like to think we share a belief in providing access to the best possible transport and other services for all Canberrans. This is certainly the government's commitment.

Let us take a look at the 2015 ACT budget where \$496,000 is provided for flexible bus services, catering in particular to ageing people and those with a disability, \$264,000 for the Nightrider bus service, rolling out access to Canberra's one-stop government service shopfronts, major health investments, north side and south side, and \$160 million for school upgrades across the ACT. These investments are offering benefits to our public housing tenants across the city and of course also to those in private dwellings.

With this in mind, there is some risk in a broad statement like that in Mr Smyth's MPI which presumes to know what public housing tenants want or what is best for them. I know it has been a long time since Mr Smyth was housing minister but I do want to remind him of some of the comments he made back in 1999, which was a long time ago. I will remind him of them anyway:

The perfect case is Tuggeranong, where we have some of the longest waiting lists. Contrary to public opinion that all public housing tenants want to live in the CBD, in the centre of Canberra, or in north Canberra, some of our longest waiting lists are in Tuggeranong. We address the public housing waiting list by looking at the mismatches that we have between stock and applicants' needs and make sure that we can meet those needs where we can.

People on the waiting list apply for a certain suburb or a certain street. They want to be housed in an area that they are very specific about. We have to simply wait until accommodation becomes available and then they are housed. So you need to treat the figures on the list with some wariness, but at the same time Mr Osborne's question perfectly highlights the dilemma that we face in housing, in that the old stock does not meet the needs of the modern housing tenant.

In this case Mr Smyth is implying that he knows best what housing tenants want. He did in 1999 but he seems to have changed his mind.

I have spent a lot of time this year making the point that as we, the government, renew the ACT housing stock we are doing so in true consultation with our tenants, talking with them, listening to them and acting on what they have to say. This is something I have done at numerous tenant barbeques and information sessions since becoming minister.

It is also one of the core functions of the linking into new communities task force and the Housing ACT joint champions group. The assumption about location just does not hold true. Some people want to be in more outer suburbs, close to family, to particular schools or perhaps to recreation centres. Just like all Canberrans, many have cars. Just like all Canberrans, public housing tenants also use active transport like walking and riding bikes. And just like all Canberrans, they have access to private transport as well and, therefore, might not consider public transport among their highest priority.

The government's public housing renewal program reflects exactly this evidence. We are committed to improving the quality of the public housing portfolio and breaking down concentrations of disadvantage and that is why over the next four years we will replace 13 large multi-unit sites along the Northbourne Avenue corridor and in other key locations across Canberra. As we work towards 352 replacement dwellings in the next two years—1,288 in total—the preferences of tenants are central to this consideration. Relocation options are being sourced from the entire public housing portfolio, including newly constructed housing to meet preferences wherever possible. As I mentioned, the LINCT task force has been established to oversee these activities and, from indications so far, tenants have expressed wishes to live in areas such as Gungahlin, Belconnen, Molonglo and also to stay close to the Northbourne Avenue corridor.

Membership of LINCT includes government officials, housing and community service providers and the ACT Tenants Union. It is supported by the transforming communities partnership which has similar representation and will also include tenant representatives from the affected properties. LINCT and the TCP exist to support tenant engagement in the relocation process and to ensure that the needs and preferences of tenants determine where they relocate to. Each tenant is being invited to indicate their housing preferences and the areas in which they would like to live. As I said those tenants who have already advised their preferences have indicated a wish to live in all parts of Canberra. The new housing will be provided on a smaller scale and be made available throughout the community. It will continue the salt-and-pepper philosophy, which has been central to the model here in Canberra.

Already new sites for public housing have been identified in Monash, Nicholls, Coombs, Amaroo, Moncrieff and Chisholm, which I was pleased to visit a couple of weeks ago, along with my colleague Minister Gentleman, to meet with builders, locals as well as some public housing tenants that came along. They will complement the existing distribution of the public housing portfolio which, I remind the Assembly, is more than 11,500 properties spread across most of our suburbs.

The government is working to ensure that the housing offered to tenants is close to community services, shops, medical services, employment opportunities, public transport routes and schools. An important element of our local schools is to ensure that families and children can get to and from school easily and safely. Locating public housing close to schools, while at the same time putting in place infrastructure to support children walking or riding safely to school, is important in achieving this. We are designing the new housing stock to ensure that it is sustainable and economical to live in, operate and maintain, is accessible, adaptable and better able to meet the different needs of future tenants.

Right across the housing spectrum, the principles of equality and inclusion remain very strong in our government's commitment. Our public housing system has a proud history of helping those who are doing it tough to be contributing members of our community, and this will continue.

Equally, the government will keep looking to innovate and seek solutions to the challenges of homelessness and housing affordability. For example, the exciting new Common Ground development in Gungahlin includes support services on site, as does the new project, independence disability accommodation, in Latham and Harrison. The government's public housing renewal program is an ambitious initiative that will help ensure that public housing better meets the needs of our tenants.

What I would welcome is an equally strong policy commitment from the opposition, one which goes beyond the usual rhetoric. If they do not want old public housing to be renewed then what are their plans for it? If they do not like the locations the government has identified for new public housing stock, what are their preferred sites? If they would terminate our asset recycling agreement with the commonwealth, together with the capital metro contract, then let the people know. The Assembly can be confident that the government's commitment to following through on our commitments in housing is strong and ongoing. By extension, it provides a major pillar of a strong and inclusive community heading into the future, a continuation of the vital role housing has played in Canberra establishing itself as the most livable city in the world.

As the evaluation released yesterday shows, the government's investments and policy platforms are continuing our strong record in this area and I welcome the opportunity to speak to them this afternoon.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo—Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, Minister for Justice, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Transport Reform) (4.15): I welcome Mr Smyth bringing this matter to the Assembly this afternoon. It is positive to see the Canberra Liberals talking of the importance of a better connected Canberra. This MPI in particular, with its focus on both public housing and public transport, has those two areas which are very close to the ACT Greens' heart. I am therefore happy to be having this conversation this afternoon.

As Mr Smyth is well aware and as Minister Berry has articulated, the largest public housing renewal program the ACT has ever seen is currently underway. This program will create more public housing across the entire territory and provide much more suitable and sustainable housing for our current and future tenants. The renewal program will see a reduction in the concentrations of disadvantage that we have seen in some of our larger multi-unit properties and increase the scope of the existing salt-and-pepper approach to social inclusion in the placement of new or replacement stock.

This program is not without its challenges, as some suburbs of Canberra will see an increase in social and public housing developments. But it is important to state from the outset that public housing tenants, just like everyone else, have lives, jobs and family commitments and engagements right across the different parts of Canberra.

I support the redevelopments being dispersed in different parts of the city in a way that recognises the needs of our tenants who are not a homogenous population. By that I mean they should not be defined by their tenancy arrangements but rather as individuals with individual needs, and I think Minister Berry spoke to this well. Her observation about the fact that the housing list for Housing ACT is the longest in Tuggeranong I think underlines that.

Certainly my experience when I was Minister for Housing before Minister Berry was that when we first moved to have tenants move out of the first of the Dickson towers—it was our first major effort and we took it slowly; we had about 20 tenants there and they went all over Canberra—they asked to go all over Canberra, they asked to go to Woden, they asked to go to Belconnen, they asked to go to a range of places because of family connections or school connections or a host of individual reasons. And I think it is really important to recognise that is the philosophy that is behind these relocations. There is an acknowledgement that we need to do something about places like ABC flats, north of the city, or some of the areas along Northbourne Avenue. They are substandard accommodation. There needs to be change and the important thing is: how do we do that change in a way that is fair to the tenants, meets their needs as well as meeting the bottom-line requirements the government needs to deliver on?

I would hope that Mr Smyth recognises that in this debate, despite his federal colleague Mr Hockey's views that poor people do not drive much, people are to this government more diverse and unique than such throwaway, stereotypical lines.

As the Assembly would be well aware, I have a passion for public transport and a better, more integrated transport system that will reduce people's reliance on cars, wherever practicable, and this is very important in this debate. To achieve this it is indeed important to consider the placement of public housing close to public transport and key services but there needs to be a sophistication to this issue in line with my previous comments regarding tenants' unique needs.

This could see new housing built in areas that are close to group centres and schools but a little further away from town centres. This could see housing being constructed in new suburbs such as Coombs and Wright that do not yet have the full scope of amenity that the older, more established suburbs have. But it is not about pushing people who live in these properties out to the fringes of our city or leaving people vulnerable to social isolation.

Another factor that has come up and that is interesting for public housing tenants is that often single mothers with small children actually want to go to the outer suburbs where the new houses are being built because there is a level of social connection for them, in the fact that there are many other families like that going into those areas—families with young children. Single mothers seeking public housing or single fathers, as would be the case—more often, single mothers—say they actually want to be in some of those new suburbs because there are people their age with children of the same age as their children in those areas. So to say that they are best placed on Northbourne Avenue is not true and certainly does not reflect their desires or their expectations. And that was certainly the implicit message in some of Mr Smyth's comments today.

I have talked many times about the vital role that transport connections play in our city. Good transport brings people closer to services and closer to each other. An integrated transport network such as a light rail system that integrates well with buses or good pedestrian and bike networks that link people into public transport have a vast impact on the way a city works and the way people can live in a city like that.

I am confident that this government are focused on trying to achieve that and we are taking very good steps in that direction. Light rail of course is the most obvious example and the one that has had a lot of discussion in this place, and I would once again like to draw the Assembly's attention to a media release of 30 June last year in which the now Chief Minister and I stated quite clearly that cabinet had just endorsed four key points when it came to public housing.

The first was accelerating the renewal and redevelopment of ageing public housing stock. The second was responding to the needs and preferences of tenants along the proposed Northbourne Avenue redevelopment sites by providing accommodation within an 800-metre corridor, including Flemington Road, in the inner north and the city where possible. The third point was growing social housing through new partnerships, innovation, intelligent design, public-private partnerships and specific project budget bids that align with government priorities. The fourth was maintaining the salt-and-pepper approach to public housing in existing suburbs and expanding this approach to public housing in new and developing areas.

It is clear that light rail stage 1 will create a fantastic transport corridor. Work is occurring already along Northbourne Avenue through the \$20 million allocated to TAMS to connect surrounding areas into that transport corridor. Research shows that the travelling population appreciates the clear and fixed nature of light rail much more than it does buses and that catchment for people walking to light rail is generally 800 metres to a kilometre. This contrasts with the bus catchments which are in the order of 400 to 500 metres. The ACTION bus network will also be reworked to integrate into the light rail corridor, connections will be made as close to seamless as possible, and a single smart card will work for fare payment on both buses and light rail.

Beyond this integration, members will have noticed—and certainly people in the community have noticed—that network 14 brought bus services to the developing areas of Coombs and Wright, for example. Those services were in place early in the development of the suburbs, which is critical to helping to change people's transport habits. The patronage on these services has grown strongly and they are becoming quite popular as more and more residents move into these suburbs.

This vision of public transport integrated into the fabric and planning of the city is not a vision shared by our Liberal Party colleagues. Their vision of transport, it seems, is one of endless reliance on private car travel. They overlook the fact that this is typically a severe disadvantage to people who live in public housing or people who are already disadvantaged. It is a recipe for social exclusion, for congestion, for pollution, for growing expenses, for an inhibited economy and is generally a way to erode the attractive aesthetic of Canberra and replace it with the gridlocked rat race of Sydney.

I support Minister Berry's very strong language that she is listening to the needs of tenants as these redevelopments roll out and am heartened by her genuine commitment to achieving more and better housing stock. The ACT Greens will continue to support increased public housing, better public housing and an enhanced public transport system so that we do have a situation where those tenants who are living in accommodation that is suitable for them and more residents of Canberra have better access to public transport more often than is currently the case.

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for Planning, Minister for Roads and Parking, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, Minister for Children and Young People and Minister for Ageing) (4.24): I would like to talk a little bit about the MPI's relationship to public transport in this debate. Worldwide, integrated transport networks shape the way cities grow and prosper. Integrated transport networks generate economic opportunities and jobs and they are a catalyst for creating vibrant and attractive urban environments. The government knows the importance of public transport and is investing, through a range of visionary policies and projects, to make our city a better place to live, work and do business.

Like all major Australian cities, car use climbed in Canberra in the latter part of the 20th century. This has led to growing congestion, transport disadvantage, greenhouse gas emissions, air and noise pollution and sedentary lifestyle diseases like heart disease and diabetes. Canberra has the highest average travel speeds and lowest level of congestion of any major Australian city. However, our population and traffic congestion are both growing, with congestion growing at a faster rate.

If we do nothing, by 2031 it is estimated our roads will have a greater traffic congestion, resulting in longer travel times, less productive work hours and health risks associated with less physical activity and the stress of commuting. Our transport system needs to provide options for everyone and we need to design our city so people can live where the best public transport is. Knowing where major public transport corridors are can help guide our decisions about the location of social and affordable housing to ensure people with the highest need for public transport have access to the best public transport.

Low density urban form combined with a lack of access to good transport options can lead to social isolation. There are parts of our city where high frequency public transport may be desirable but can be difficult to deliver at high frequencies due to circuitous road networks and very low density. A compact city supported by quality urban development will both support mass public transport on major corridors, both roads and public transport, and help to make active travel the obvious choice for local trips.

Mobility is a key enabler of social inclusion. Individuals with limited access to transport options are likely to have difficulty accessing work, travelling to places of education, accessing health services, or participating in social activities. Vulnerable groups in the community such as children, the elderly, low income householders and people with disabilities and cultural minorities have more reliance on public transport options. With a large baby boomer population in the ACT, and it is expected to rise by 170 per cent by 2056, access to a range of transport options beyond private vehicles will continue to be a priority for a city that supports a more livable community.

Transport for Canberra is the key guiding document for the direction of transport in Canberra until 2031. It aims to create a transport system that puts people first, making our city a better place to live, work and do business and a more accessible place where it is easy for everyone to get around. Transport for Canberra also outlines the government's actions on public transport, parking, vehicle movement and active travel—walking and cycling—to achieve the government's transport mode share targets through a range of key projects and policy development.

A key objective of the transport for Canberra policy is to ensure public transport services reach those with the highest social need for transport. To achieve this vision of a transport system that is attractive, reliable and sustainable, the ACT government is rolling out policies, commissioning feasibility studies and progressing infrastructure projects along the major transport corridors.

Building an integrated transport network will help to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Canberra's transport network. Canberra's future network will include both buses and light rail, with light rail being considered in those parts of the city where buses no longer have the capacity to meet growing passenger demand. Buses will provide vital feeder services to support the rapid public transport network. Bus rapid transport will complement and build demand for the light rail network. Walking and cycling networks will also be enhanced as part of the network, improving access to transport hubs, town centres and other key destinations.

As an important part of an integrated transport network, the ACT government is developing a light rail master plan to consider light rail corridor options as part of a long term transport plan. Potential corridors will be assessed against a range of social, environmental and economic criteria, demand forecast modelling and of course community feedback.

The Capital Metro Agency is working with the Territory and Municipal Services Directorate to ensure an integrated and effective public transport service is provided to the Canberra community. Integration with the existing bus network is absolutely critical to the success of the capital metro project and is a key factor in expanding capital metro's reach beyond residents living within light rail transit corridors. Major interchanges for transfer between the two modes will occur at Gungahlin town centre, Dickson and the city.

The capital metro light rail will also be fully integrated with the ACTION bus fare structure and ticketing system. This means that customers of light rail will be able to use the same card and transfer between light rail and bus under the same rules that apply to the existing ACTION bus network. Capital metro will comply with the national disability standards for accessible public transport. The platform and light rail vehicle will be the same level at all stops for ease of access, with dedicated spaces for wheelchairs and prams once on board.

It is with strategic location of social housing which is well connected to public transport that the public housing renewal program has been guided and most recently facilitated through the territory plan processes. The key factors for undertaking those

variation processes on the sites have been guided by connectivity with open space, public transport distribution and environmental principles, amongst other things. This is how the Environment and Planning Directorate has been contributing directly to the public housing renewal agenda.

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (4.31): I thank my colleague Mr Smyth for bringing on this important MPI today. I think we all acknowledge the importance of public housing and the importance of locating it close to transport and key services. When you are experiencing homelessness or when you are able to move into a public housing or social housing property, it is self-apparent that you have arrived at that point for a number of complex reasons in your life. This means that it is extra important that people are able to access the service and support they need. Apart from a few notable and good examples, it is impossible to provide services on site in a home for most people. When you have complex perhaps mental health needs, disability needs et cetera, it can be difficult to access the services that you need. A good public transport system is vital close to your home.

Certainly many people also have a car, but we know it is becoming increasingly expensive to run a car in Canberra with increased fees for drivers licences, car registration as well as parking. Mr Smyth has already spoken a little about transport disadvantage and that it is more common in outer urban areas. For the ACT, when we are thinking of new public housing properties it is important not to just grab the nearest available vacant land but to assess whether it is appropriate for the needs of the people that you are trying to assist.

I will not labour the point—we have already heard about allowing public housing properties along Northbourne Avenue to run down until this point—but what I think it is also really important for us to remember is that this is not about the number of properties, access to transport, access to services; it is about people. I will give the example of my constituent Mark, who I have written to, I think, a number of consecutive housing ministers about. He has a 12-year-old son with a rare degenerative disease and he has been on the waiting list for a public housing property in Tuggeranong for quite some time. In the meantime his son cannot live with him.

This is one example amongst many. When I say “many”, let me tell you about the number of people who are on the waiting list. As at 3 August—yesterday—there were 806 people on the transfer list. But with the waiting list, the number of applicants on the housing register was 2,166. There are 98 waiting for priority housing. The average wait time for priority housing is approximately six months. As someone who has worked previously in the homelessness sector, I am alarmed by these statistics because the chances are these people will either experience homelessness or they are teetering on the brink of homelessness with all the stresses and strains that that brings with it.

There is a waiting list and a transfer list. We already have two lists. What we heard about during the estimates process—I will read an excerpt from the transcript—is that we have two lists, the waiting list and the transfer list. I continued a bit of questioning on this. In fact there is another list, and that is the people who are management-initiated transfer or an out-of-turn transfer, such as those people in the public housing properties along Northbourne Avenue. So, in addition to the 2,166 people who have

been on the waiting list for priority housing on average for 238 days or approximately six months, those waiting for high needs housing have been on the waiting list for approximately two years. Standard housing people have been on the waiting list approximately two years and three months. But wait; there is another list. All those people who are moving out of the flats and the properties on Northbourne Avenue will be moved out, most likely ahead of all those people who have been on the list for years, because of other priorities this government has. I am not going to get distracted and talk about them, because what is important here is those people who need the government to focus on supporting them to provide public housing and to make sure—*(Time expired.)*

Discussion concluded.

Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Amendment Bill 2015

Debate resumed.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Attorney-General, Minister for Health, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Capital Metro) (4.36), in reply: I thank members for their support of this bill this afternoon. There are a number of points worth making about the implementation of the Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Act 2012 and this amendment bill today. This bill builds on the success of the EEIS which has operated since January 2013. To date the EEIS has delivered above expected outcomes on each of its objectives. An independent review of the EEIS found that the scheme has encouraged efficient energy use, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced household electricity bills and increased opportunities for priority households. As such, the review determined that there would be significant advantages in continuing the scheme beyond the legislated end date of 2015.

This bill delivers on the recommendations of the review as well as the subsequent stakeholder consultation and analysis. It continues the EEIS through to the year 2020 and provides for a range of minor changes to allow it to continue to maximise the benefits of energy efficiency in the ACT economy.

Continuing the EEIS is also a key element of the government's climate change strategy. We have world-leading targets to reduce the territory's greenhouse gas emissions and by the year 2020 we anticipate the ACT will have reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 40 per cent on 1990 levels and by 2060 will achieve carbon neutrality. The government's climate change strategy AP2 sets out a clear pathway and actions to meet these targets with a focus on a range of measures including energy efficiency.

Extending the EEIS therefore continues to position the ACT as a leader in the clean economy. While science tells us that the need to act on a changing climate and on carbon emissions has never been greater, the ACT is still a leader nationally and, indeed, internationally. We have demonstrated through our renewable energy targets what can be achieved in the transition to a low carbon future and how it can lead to a more diversified ACT economy.

Since the EEIS commenced in January 2013 more than 50,000 Canberra households have participated in the scheme. It is worth noting that a suburb like, for example, Isaacs has had one of the highest participation rates, with over 53 per cent of households participating in the scheme, and over 50 Canberra suburbs have a participation rate above 30 per cent. This is vindication of this market-based mechanism to drive energy efficiency and save households money on their electricity bills.

I made clear at the time that this legislation was first introduced that I wanted the government to move beyond a scheme that simply provided a limited number of grants to a very small number of households to improve their energy efficiency and instead wanted a scheme that would reach tens of thousands of Canberra households to save money on their electricity bill. I am pleased to say that that objective has been achieved through this legislation. Instead of reaching just hundreds or maybe a couple of thousand households, we are now reaching tens and tens of thousands of households, and we are saving each and every one of those households on average around \$1,600 over the life of the energy saving measures being implemented in those households.

More important than that, we are also reaching tens of thousands of low income households. This is very important because people on low and fixed incomes are the households that struggle the most when it comes to paying their energy bills. So they are the households that benefit most from energy savings and energy efficiency.

When we look at the total number of participating households to date, we know that over 550,000 energy saving items have been installed, saving around 440,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions since the scheme commenced in 2013. This includes the replacement of over 465,000 incandescent light globes with energy efficient ones and, as a result, approximately 10 tonnes of inefficient lights have been removed and the components recycled. Over 43,000 door seals have been installed, keeping the hot air in during winter and keeping it out in summer. More than 85,000 standby power controls have been installed, preventing that wasteful use of standby power, and we have seen over 1,500 old, inefficient fridges and freezers retired, their environmentally damaging gasses removed and the components recycled. This is a tremendous effort and a significant scale across so many Canberra households.

Momentum is also building for the latest initiative that has been brought about by the energy efficiency improvement scheme. Many members will have seen the advertisements from ActewAGL for their downlight upgrade offer. Since ActewAGL expanded their lighting activities through this program in June, they have installed approximately 25,000 LED downlights in the first month. The new LED lights they are installing carry a lower fire risk than the hotter quartz halogen lights they replace and they will last for up to 10 years following installation.

The EEIS is also creating jobs in the ACT economy. There are 35 full-time equivalent staff and contractors delivering this program on behalf of the electricity retailers, and that includes 11 electricians. The government expects this number to continue to grow as the EEIS is continued as a result of this bill.

It is worth highlighting that the scheme review of the EEIS reported that one-quarter of participating households also undertook further energy saving activities and improvements beyond what would have otherwise occurred in the absence of this scheme. The review has also confirmed the efficient operation of retailers in the scheme, with only four per cent of the overall scheme costs representing retailers' overheads. The review concluded that there is advantage in continuing the scheme because of the multiple benefits in reducing cost of living pressures for households, reducing energy use and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It also complements the government's focus on reducing the greenhouse gas intensity of the electricity grid. Continuing to reduce energy usage will reduce the costs associated with electricity use and it will reduce the amount of renewable electricity that we will need to source in order to meet our 90 per cent renewable energy target.

The Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Act places a direct obligation on retailers selling electricity in the ACT to meet an energy savings target. Under the EEIS, tier 1 retailers deliver energy savings by undertaking eligible energy saving activities. The tier 1 retailers are also required to ensure a proportion of energy savings are achieved in the low income priority households. Smaller tier 2 retailers can meet their energy savings targets either in the same way as tier 1 retailers or they can pay a contribution directly to the government in lieu of that. It is worth noting that ActewAGL has consistently exceeded its energy savings obligations under the EEIS. There are also currently 10 tier 2 electricity retailers who have so far opted to pay the energy savings contribution instead of delivering the activities directly.

The amendment bill and the proposed targets in it will see the EEIS continue at a similar level of ambition. This means that it aims for similar annual reductions in electricity and gas usage as targeted in the first three years of the scheme. It also aims for a similar pass-through cost to consumers. It is worth noting, however, that the ACT's success in proactively delivering on its 90 per cent renewable energy target means that the metrics used to calculate energy savings have changed since the act was first passed. In particular, as we reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with electricity production, the energy savings required to achieve the same quantity of abatement increase.

The significance of this is demonstrated by the change in the number of tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent greenhouse gas emissions attributed to the consumption of one megawatt hour of electricity. From 2013 to 2015 the average emissions factor projected for the ACT was 0.89. Increases in the level of renewable energy generated mean that the average emissions from 2015 to 2020 are expected to be 0.4. After we achieve 90 per cent renewable energy by the year 2020 the emissions multiplier is expected to be steady at around 0.1. As a result, other key metrics of the EEIS are shifting to ensure we incentivise the right activities. But the net result is a scheme with a similar pass-through cost to current levels. So households and businesses should not see any increase in energy bills as a result of extending the EEIS and they will continue, of course, to see all the savings.

It is worth highlighting this particularly in relation to the comments made by Ms Lawder. First of all, continuing the scheme is expected to deliver additional

savings to the ACT economy of around \$40 million in net present value terms. This is actually a measure that does not add costs into the economy; it delivers savings for the economy—that is, it frees up economic activity for other things because of reduced energy use. That is the first point to make. Secondly, households themselves also directly benefit. While Ms Lawder's comments were focused on the pass-through costs, she failed to recognise that there are aggregate lifetime bill savings for the residential sector. These are estimated at over \$106 million in present value terms across the household sector as a whole. So even when you factor in the pass-through cost, there is a net saving for households. These are, of course, issues not identified directly by the opposition in their comments today.

This bill also supports harmonisation with energy efficiency schemes in other jurisdictions. It will allow the ACT administrator to register approved abatement providers. This will help identify opportunities for efficiency and harmonisation between the ACT's energy efficiency improvement scheme and like schemes in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia.

This amendment bill will deliver significant benefits to households and to small and medium enterprises. It will drive down electricity costs in households, in particular in the low income households, and it will provide energy savings to small and medium enterprises. It will also meet important environmental objectives by reducing the ACT's greenhouse gas emissions and helping the ACT to meet its 40 per cent greenhouse gas reduction target. Finally and most importantly, it will help with the ACT's transition to a low carbon economy whilst looking after those who are most in need. It is a classic example of the way smart energy use benefits the economy, benefits the individual household, benefits the environment and benefits those on low incomes. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

Water Resources (Catchment Management Coordination Group) Amendment Bill 2015

Debate resumed from 4 June 2015, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (4.50): I am pleased to speak today on the Water Resources (Catchment Management Coordination Group) Amendment Bill 2015. The bill is for an act to amend the Water Resources Act 2007 and the Water Resources Regulation 2007. The purpose of the bill is to establish the ACT and Region Catchment Management Coordination Group under the act. This group is to have an advisory function to the Minister for the Environment. I note at the outset that we will

support this bill today, but I would like to express some concerns about the minister having absolute discretion in appointing the representatives, and I will expand on this a little more later.

As I mentioned the bill proposes amendments to the act. The bill will add a new part 7A to the act. The bill relates closely to the objects of the act, which include ensuring that management and use of the water resources of the ACT sustain the physical, economic and social wellbeing of the people of the ACT while protecting the ecosystems that depend on those resources; protecting aquatic ecosystems and aquifers from damage and, where practicable, to reverse damage that has already happened; and ensuring that the water resources are able to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

The purpose of the bill is to establish the ACT and Region Catchment Management Coordination Group. Catchment management deals with the management of the geographic area of a river and all its streams and tributaries that drain or flow into that river system. The group will include representatives of the ACT and the surrounding region, namely the local government areas of New South Wales. The group has an advisory function, and will assist on a coordinated basis catchment management in the ACT and the streams that flow into and out of the ACT and therefore surrounding New South Wales. Under the bill the capital water catchment region means the region made up of areas within the boundaries of the following councils: Cooma-Monaro Shire Council, Palerang Council, Queanbeyan City Council and Yass Valley local government area.

As I mentioned earlier, I would like to express some concerns about the new sections 67E and F, which give the minister absolute discretion in appointing a representative of the community's interests in water catchment management, and the chair of the group. While I understand the intention of having this discretion in appointment, the fact that there is no fixed term of appointment may give the minister the opportunity to remove from the group people who express dissenting opinions. I hope that this arrangement will not detract from the transparency or impartiality of the group.

The opposition support coordinated catchment management in the ACT and streams that flow into and out of the ACT, and therefore the surrounding New South Wales region. Ensuring we have clean and healthy waterways for future generations of Canberrans is essential, and we will be supporting this bill today.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (4.54): I welcome the debate on this bill in the Assembly today. I am passionate about the health of our waterways and have worked on raising the profile of the issue of water quality in our lakes for some years. I remember first discussing it in my office with my staff back in 2009-10, a time when the political debate was very much focused on water quantity issues and the building of a certain dam but when it was becoming obvious to us that water quality was starting to impact on the lives of people in the ACT.

The first place of obvious concern was Lake Burley Griffin, as we were facing lake closures on a regular basis. Events on the lake were being cancelled, and even recreational kayakers were being warned off as algae warnings were a regular

occurrence. We met with the NCA and discussed at some length what options they thought were available to them, and we met with water experts and were told that the issues were long term, systemic, and required multifaceted and cross-jurisdictional cooperation. It was not just what was going into the lake from both industrial and residential premises on a regular basis; it was what had already settled into the bottom of the lake over many decades of nutrient-rich inflows. None of the solutions were cheap or easy, and few of them were guaranteed. Some were mooted technological quick fixes. All of the solutions required the coordination of people across jurisdictions and across interest areas.

In 2011 I initiated an independent inquiry into the health of ACT lakes through a motion in the Assembly, and the environment commissioner's lakes inquiry was started, focusing on but not exclusively looking at Lake Burley Griffin. The terms of reference focused on investigating the state of the watercourses and catchments for Lake Burley Griffin, including possible improvements for managing water quality and the appropriateness of the current protocols for lake closures; identifying the causes of lower water quality, including possible resource implications of addressing them; jurisdictional implications for water quality management of the lake; and the implication of these findings for the ACT's other major recreational waterways such as Lake Ginninderra and Lake Tuggeranong.

Some of the key recommendations that came out of that report focused on governance for the lake, acknowledging that governance arrangements needed to include the ACT government, the New South Wales government, Queanbeyan and the federal government through the National Capital Authority. The recommendation called for a catchment management agreement that outlined strategic objectives for the integrated and coordinated management of the lake and catchments, but acknowledged the challenges of the multi-jurisdictional catchment management and the lack of clarity about who was responsible and who needed to be consulted.

The ACT Greens took a policy to the ACT election on the health of our waterways, and in this we extended our focus to other lakes in the ACT—indeed, shifting our focus to the catchment itself and calling on the ACT government to access the funds being made available by the federal government to protect the Murray-Darling Basin catchment and improve water quality. This initiative was then included in the Greens-ALP parliamentary agreement.

I commend the environment directorate and Minister Corbell on the work that has been done since that time to secure the funding agreement with the commonwealth and to commence the exciting project that we can now fund through the allocation of these resources—\$85 million of federal money with the co-contribution of a further \$8.5 million of ACT funds. The terms that have been placed on the funding by the federal government have limited the expenditure to infrastructure projects that will improve the quality of water in the Murray-Darling catchment, but there are more than enough ideas that can be funded through that bucket of money.

The ACT contribution has a little more flexibility about how it can be spent, and already it is being used to support the very important work being undertaken by Waterwatch to do community monitoring of the water quality in the catchment.

Initially six priority catchment projects were identified: Lake Tuggeranong, Yarralumla Creek, Fyshwick, lower Molonglo, upper Molonglo, and west Belconnen. Each of these is intended to showcase best practice solutions for different scenarios and challenges; solutions that can hopefully be replicated both across the catchment and across Australia in the future.

Over the past 18 months work has been undertaken to identify over 150 potential projects over the six catchments. Options have included everything from wetlands and ponds to gross pollutant traps, carbon filters, sediment curtains and floating wetlands. The project team have recently commenced further community consultation on these options, with workshops across Canberra last week and this week and an online survey being undertaken following the letterboxing of all Canberra residents. It has been very exciting to see the work that was committed to in the parliamentary agreement now coming into the public consultation phase.

Today we are here to pass a bill that will put into the Water Resources Act the mechanism by which the governance for the catchment will be coordinated. The bill will establish a catchment management coordination group which will bring together stakeholders from across the relevant jurisdictions and ACT directorates. The coordination group will be headed by an independent chair and will include a community representative. It will include directors-generals from Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, the Environment and Planning Directorate, the Health Directorate and, of course, the Territory and Municipal Services Directorate. It will also include the commissioner of the ESA, a representative of the National Capital Authority and a representative of the New South Wales government agency that has responsibility for water catchment. Under section 67E(1)(g) the minister may also prescribe other members, and a regulation has been tabled with the bill that prescribes representatives of surrounding local councils in New South Wales, the New South Wales local land service and a representative of Icon Water.

The group will serve the function of advising the minister on matters relating to water catchment management in the ACT and the catchment region. The group will advise the minister on priorities for water catchment management, actions or strategies to build partnerships to improve catchment health; coordinate investment with regard to water catchments; and advise the minister on the likely impact of proposed developments or events in the catchment, as well as actions or strategies to address the impacts of such developments.

The catchment coordination group that is being proposed today is not exactly the catchment management authority that the Greens had in mind when we took this issue to the election, but we agreed there were significant hurdles in negotiating a catchment management authority that had its own decision-making power and its own budget, especially across a number of jurisdictions. There could also have been a significant time delay had the ACT proceeded with such a negotiation. We need to acknowledge that securing funds for a catchment management authority would have been difficult, and that the funding that is currently available in the short term sits with the ACT government in a formal agreement with the commonwealth.

I am really pleased the group includes an independent chair as I think that this will certainly enhance its credibility and bring new issues to the table. Perhaps also the right person will bring people out of their jurisdictional corners and assist the group with navigating the best interests of the catchment, and that is what has been sadly lacking, along with just some basic coordination. I am also pleased that the minister agreed to include a community representative on the group. One thing we have learned over the past few years is that the community have a strong and ongoing interest in the health of our waterways. People are passionate about their local lakes and creeks, and they invest considerable time and effort in helping to protect them. We need to include the community in this group to ensure that we continue to hear what the community has to say and to respect the significant work the community invests into our waterways.

The bill establishes a formal annual reporting mechanism to the minister, and annual reports are required to be tabled in the Assembly. I note that section 67 states that in exercising its functions the coordination group must try to encourage early and effective information sharing between members of the group and any relevant agency or community group. I encourage the coordination group to adopt a culture of transparency and cooperativeness from the start as I believe there are stakeholders who are keen and interested and who want to be actively engaged in debates about our catchment. I hope there will not be a situation where we simply get one annual report and that is all we hear but that there is that level of ongoing discussion and engagement. I am sure that is the intent with the group, and I look forward to seeing that come to fruition.

There is no doubt that the establishment of this group is a huge step up in regard to the cross-jurisdictional coordination of actions occurring in our catchment, and I look forward to hearing that it is making a difference. The ACT cannot direct the actions of our jurisdictional partners in this regard, but we can invite them to participate and ask for their cooperation as we seek to solve some of the problems that face our waterways. I believe those other jurisdictional representatives will be pleased to participate, although it is going to be very important that we listen to what they have to say and value their contributions to the discussions.

In regard to the basin priority project, there are clearly going to be some ongoing challenges ahead. For one, the ACT is going to need to give consideration to the issue of ongoing funding for maintenance of infrastructure, both old and new, and also ensure that new infrastructure delivers both the best value for money and improvements in water quality and amenity.

The \$85 million that has been allocated is nowhere near enough to undertake all the projects that could improve water quality in the ACT, so it will be important for the money to be spent judiciously. It will also be important to take the community on that journey, and I am heartened to hear that consultation with interested community groups has been ongoing and that consultation with the wider community is being undertaken. The next few years are an exciting time for the ACT's waterways. This bill will help deliver better outcomes for our waterways, and I am pleased on behalf of the ACT Greens to support it today.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Attorney-General, Minister for Health, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Capital Metro) (5.04), in reply: I thank members for their support of this bill. This is an important bill that puts in place the government's arrangements we need to drive forward coordinated catchment management for our lakes, our ponds and our waterways across the ACT and into the broader catchment across our borders. I am very pleased with the support the Assembly is giving to these arrangements today. I make the observation that the appointment issues Ms Lawder has raised are no different from the appointment to any other advisory body set up by legislation. I assure her that the conduct will be the same as it is for any other advisory body.

In relation to the delivery of better catchment management, this advisory body sets the groundwork very well so we can continue to deliver on improved catchment management across the broader region and as it affects the ACT directly. Mr Rattenbury is right to highlight the very significant steps that are now being taken to plan for and deliver improved catchment management infrastructure to improve water quality here in the ACT. It is a project I am very proud of and the work that is being done by the Environment and Planning Directorate is of the highest standard. I look forward to seeing that work come to fruition in the next 12 months. Today all I need to do is thank members for their support of this bill.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Repeal Bill 2015

Debate resumed from 4 June 2015, on motion by **Mr Rattenbury**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR COE (Ginninderra) (5.07): The opposition will be supporting the passing of the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Repeal Bill 2015. The bill repeals the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Act and begins the process of winding up the trust. In its place, a new fund, the ACT road safety fund, commenced on 1 July this year. This fund will continue the work of the trust and continue to deliver beneficial outcomes for all road users.

The safety trust was established by this Assembly in 1992 with the establishment of the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Act. The trust was established as a charitable trust with the purpose of, amongst other things, promoting and stimulating research into and investigation of road safety; implementing accident and injury countermeasures; and assisting in the care and rehabilitation of persons injured or traumatised as a result of road accidents.

When first established in 1992, the trust was provided with a \$10 million contribution from the NRMA. However, since 1998 the trust has been funded by a road safety contribution paid when vehicles are registered in the ACT, with the NRMA matching the contributions paid.

Throughout its history, the trust has made many contributions in support of its aims, with over \$20 million being allocated to over 350 projects since the trust was established. Most notably, a \$750,000 grant from the trust helped to found the Dorothy Sales Cottages in Hughes, a facility which provides care to those who have received a brain injury as a result of a road accident. Other projects funded by the trust include a \$43,000 grant to support, develop and distribute materials on road safety to ACT preschool and primary school students; a \$35,000 grant to develop safer cycling strategies in the ACT and safer interaction between cyclists and other road users; and an \$11,300 grant to help support safe driving practices when going to and from the snow. Many other well-known road safety measures, such as the road ready program, which allows new drivers to receive their L-plates, have also benefited immensely from the trust.

The trust has only been able to operate thanks to the hard work and devotion of the trustees. As the trust begins to be wound down, I would like to thank all those who have served as trustees and have helped to ensure that using the roads in and around the territory becomes safer for all concerned.

In conclusion, the opposition will be supporting the bill today.

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for Planning, Minister for Roads and Parking, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, Minister for Children and Young People and Minister for Ageing) (5.10): I, too, speak in support of the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Repeal Bill. While the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust is a real success story, I agree with Minister Rattenbury's reasons for bringing the arrangement to an end. We simply cannot have a situation where the government is involved in a partnership with a single insurer; it is clearly not consistent with encouraging competition or the principle of ensuring a level playing field for all insurers.

However, I would like to put on the record my thanks to the trust for the positive work that it has carried out in the last 23 years. The NRMA road safety trust was created in 1992, with original funding of \$10 million provided by NRMA Insurance. It represented surplus third-party insurance premiums arising from lower than expected insurance claims during the 1980s. In the 23 years since its inception, the trust has funded over 400 projects, many of which have assisted the government in its management of road safety, seen in our more recent projects and developments.

The funding programs have had a key theme of working with vulnerable and at-risk drivers and road users. In recent years, the trust has targeted funding towards children's education programs, new driver training initiatives, older driving training programs and cycling safety initiatives.

The trust has also had a working relationship with key research bodies, including the leading universities and the Australian new car assessment program, ANCAP. The relationship with ANCAP has allowed the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust not only to work on the outside factors of driving but also to ensure that only the safest possible cars are sold in Australia. The trust, recognising the need for experts in the field of road safety, began to support postgraduate students who wished to work in the area. Due to this support, 10 students have been assisted with postgraduate scholarships, seven of whom have been successful in completing their degrees. The remainder are currently enrolled. The achievement in this academic area continues to grow and develop, and we can see the success in the vehicles that we drive today and the care that we are involved in in an accident.

As Minister for Roads and Parking, I have a particular interest in infrastructure studies, and I would like to quickly use this time to refer to reflections on the work of the trust. The first is the research study on reducing motorcycle trauma in the ACT undertaken by the University of New South Wales. This study looked to improve motorcycle safety in the ACT by improving awareness of road safety issues, perception of risks amongst motorcyclists and innovative infrastructure treatments. Another interesting project supported by the trust was the 2012 study by Monash University on the potential application of shared space principles in urban road design. This project included analysis of crash data from existing shared space implementations around the world and investigated the potential impacts of road culture on the success of shared spaces. Many of the recommendations made by Monash for best practice implementations of shared space designs are features of the government's Bunda Street shared zone.

The NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust was only intended to be a temporary arrangement. Nonetheless it is sad to see it now coming to an end. We now move forward with the ACT road safety fund; I look forward to seeing this new arrangement continue the legacy of the trust through the advancement of road safety for the ACT community.

Like Minister Rattenbury, I would like to put on the record my thanks to those who have served as trustees over the life of the trust. These people have undertaken their roles with passion and dedication to the community. I give a big thank you to Professor Don Aitkin, the longstanding chair of the trust, and all those who have served on the trust over the years, including the trust secretariat and the ACT government's partner in the trust, NRMA Insurance. I am pleased that the legacy of the trust will be continued into the future and I look forward to the contribution the fund will make to road safety here in the ACT. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo—Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, Minister for Justice, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Transport Reform) (5.14), in reply: I am pleased to speak today in support of the bill and I welcome the comments from members.

As I mentioned when I presented the bill on 4 June this year, the NRMA road safety trust is based on an arrangement between the ACT government and NRMA Insurance

and is a statutory public charitable trust. The trust's contribution to improving road safety in the ACT has been significant and highly valued by the ACT government and ACT community. However, with the entry of additional CTP insurers to the ACT market, it has been necessary for the government to consider the implications for the trust arrangement. While that arrangement was appropriate when NRMA Insurance was the ACT's only CTP insurer, it is not consistent with encouraging competition or the principle of ensuring a level playing field for all insurers in the CTP market. Following discussions with insurers, the government decided that the trust should be ceased and new arrangements for funding road safety initiatives established in its place.

This bill repeals the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust Act 1992. It is a necessary step to enable the trust to wind up its operations. Following the repeal of the act, the cessation of the NRMA-ACT Road Safety Trust will occur over a period of up to three years, in which time the trust will continue to manage and meet existing commitments for current grants and other projects, and undertake other requirements to cease the trust, including allocation of any residual funds.

To support these arrangements, the bill includes amendments to the Road Transport (General) Act 1999 to provide transitional measures which preserve sections 5 and 6 of the repealed act, the specified periods beyond the commencement of the repeal act. Section 5 declares the NRMA road safety trust to be a valid charitable trust established for public charitable purposes. This will avoid any doubt as to the trust maintaining its charitable status until its cessation.

Section 6 of the repealed act provides indemnity from legal liabilities for the trustees, the NRMA, the territory and any person acting under their direction. This section is preserved for a further 15 years after the act's repeal. The 15-year expiry will allow trustees to undertake the necessary decisions to cease the trust within a three-year period while also providing the minimum protection of 12 years once the trust ceases operations. This is a requirement which stems from the limitation provisions contained in the Limitation Act 1985. This will ensure that the trust's activities can be carried out effectively without restrictive constraints imposed by potential legal actions that might otherwise arise.

Repealing the act is one step in ceasing the trust arrangement with NRMA Insurance. The other steps required to cease the trust are the discontinuation of funding contributions from the ACT government and NRMA Insurance and the distribution of any residual funds of the trust. As I mentioned when the bill was introduced, the ACT government funding of the trust was set up under the Road Transport (General) (Road Safety Contribution) Determination 2003, which provided for a \$2 levy to be paid when a vehicle is registered in the territory. The NRMA matched this dollar for dollar with \$2 from insurance premiums paid to NRMA Insurance. I can advise the Assembly that the road safety contribution determination has been revoked, with NRMA Insurance also ceasing its funding of the trust from 1 July 2015.

The final step in ceasing of the trust will be to deal with the distribution of any residual trust funds. Under the deed of trust, the expenditure of remaining trust funds is, in the first instance, a matter for the trustees. However, any residual funds will

need to be distributed in light of the trust's principal objective—to enhance road safety for the benefit of the ACT road-using community. I understand that the trust is currently considering options for distribution of the residual funds.

As a result of a clause in the trust deed, no residual trust funds can be paid to either NRMA Insurance or the ACT government. The trust is running a 2015-16 grant program for short-term projects, which will utilise some of its existing funds. The outcome of this grants round was announced last month, with just under \$700,000 being allocated to 13 road safety projects. The ACT road safety fund commenced on 1 July this year and will build on the good work of the trust, including the provision of an annual grants program. Like the trust, the fund is being funded by a road safety contribution, which is paid when a vehicle is registered in the ACT.

Specific road safety funding arrangements, like the trust and now the ACT road safety fund, help to support the achievement of road safety objectives. As a community, we cannot afford to ignore the need to improve road safety. Each year in the ACT, on average, we lose 11 Canberrans and see over 700 injured on our roads. Nationally the figure sits at around 1,200 deaths and 35,000 injuries, with a cost of approximately \$27 billion to the economy.

There are many issues that we are passionate about in this country, but when it comes to road safety we are still too casual. That is not a position which this government is prepared to accept, and I would like to use this opportunity to remind the Assembly of our ultimate aim, vision zero—meaning zero deaths on ACT roads. It is ambitious, but it is not out of the question, especially during the life of the current generation.

It is clear that the trust has made an important contribution to road safety in the ACT. I would like to again acknowledge and thank NRMA Insurance for their valued partnership with the ACT government and their commitment to enhancing road safety for the ACT community over the past 22 years. Once again, I would also like to put on the record my thanks to those who have served as trustees over the life of the trust. In particular, I would like to thank the current trustees for their strong commitment and dedication to improving road safety in the ACT. This includes Professor Don Aitkin, who has served as the chair of the trust for the past 14 years, and the other current trustees, Ms Kerry Fitzgerald, Mr Ian Edgell, Dr Angus McIntosh and Dr Karl Alderson. I would also like to thank Ms Linda Cooke for her continued support of the trust through her role as the secretary and manager.

I am pleased that the legacy of the trust's work in road safety research and programs will continue through the establishment of an ACT road safety fund, and I look forward to continuing to work with the wider community to convince drivers that one road death in the ACT is one too many. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

Adjournment

Motion (by **Ms Burch**) proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Sport—racism

MS BERRY (Ginninderra—Minister for Housing, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Community Services, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Women and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Social Inclusion and Equality) (5.21): I would like to make some comments on the national debate that has occurred around the treatment of Adam Goodes. Obviously, the news that he has felt the love of his fans and is back in training with the Swans and likely to take to the field this weekend was great to read.

I was one of probably thousands of people who sent a supporting message to Adam last week, and no doubt the groundswell of public support has helped him make this decision. It was moving to see how strongly the AFL and much of the broader community rallied behind him over the weekend. Let us hope that this episode of racist behaviour is now over. But even with that being so, this conversation has come so far that it exposes some of the darker feelings and some of the fears which run through parts of the Australian community. It has, very sadly, shown some of the limits of our understanding and our empathy. It has questioned our self-confidence and our willingness to truly open ourselves up to strong and equal Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures in Australia today and therefore to true reconciliation.

Perhaps most of all, it has reminded us non-Indigenous people how we fail to grasp the magnitude of the intergenerational pain which affects so many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. It is not confined to the old, the poor or the remote. The legacy of discrimination and dispossession lives on among all ages and classes, and it will do so among children yet to be born.

Recent history is paved with governments wanting to reduce the inequality and injustice which persist for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians—and making too little progress, time after time. Where gains have been made, they have often rested on the leadership of prominent Aboriginal people, using their standing to reach out to others in the community to offer support or mentorship and inspire pride and confidence. Last year Adam Goodes was honoured as Australian of the Year because of his exceptional record in doing these things, yet somehow we have recently got to the point where he has been booed and jeered on the football field in a systematic way.

This has been amplified through some media commentators eager to pass judgement and, of course, the open slather of social media. People have been at pains to argue that, far from being racial, the booing is personal, as if this is somehow more defensible, as if to attack someone for the way they express their cultural identity can be separated from the culture that they are expressing. Whatever the motivations, the impact of this behaviour is clear, not just on Adam Goodes himself but on Aboriginal

and Torres Strait Islander people across the country who feel the sting of racist attitudes in Australia today.

I will endeavour not to speak on anyone else's behalf, tell people how they should feel or claim to understand what I cannot—as so many non-Indigenous people have presumed to do. Instead I have looked to the comments of those who can understand—Warren Mundine, Nova Peris, Michael O'Loughlin, Stan Grant, Michael Long and others. Their experiences point to the fact that history is repeating. A section of the football community has been put out of its comfort zone by a proud Aboriginal man willing to be outspoken about his culture and has reacted against it.

For the media commentators so keen to write this off as trivial, I suggest that they are the most threatened by this kind of statement. It is okay for us to be put out of our comfort zone sometimes. It is inevitable. There are many uncomfortable truths in the history of black and white Australia, but we have to learn to acknowledge this reality if reconciliation stands a chance—not react against it, especially not through boos while standing faceless in a crowd. As we try to progress a national conversation towards an agreed way to recognise the first Australians in the constitution, we have got to do a whole lot better.

Real social progress tends not to be made unless advocates are willing to risk making others feel uncomfortable. I pay tribute to Adam Goodes and other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians who are prepared to do so. It is leaders like him who are some of our country's greatest assets in the cause of reconciliation if only we are willing to embrace them.

ACT Telstra business awards

MR WALL (Brindabella) (5.26): On Friday, 17 July I had the pleasure of attending the 2015 ACT Telstra business awards along with a strong contingency of local businesses up for awards on the night. We were joined with alumni of the ACT business awards, with winners of previous years. I would like to commend all the businesses nominated in each category and the diverse number of local businesses represented on the night. In particular, I would like to congratulate the award winners this year.

The award winner for the start-up award went to Alliance Leasing, founded by Michael Lindgren. This business offers an innovative approach to novated leasing and strives to assist employers to attract and retain staff. The judges commended Alliance Leasing for its clear vision; great competitor analysis; and strategic and targeted employment plan, where they choose to employ former sports talents for their strong teamwork ethic, which has delivered great dividends for the business.

Winner of the microbusiness award went to Barmco Mana Partnership, which is a local business created in 2008 to service both government and private clients in the management of building projects, specialising in large-scale construction projects. Barmco Mana Partnership's past projects have included the Nishi building and the Doris Blackburn building. It has also completed work on several Calvary hospital projects. The judges commended Barmco Mana for its strong operational excellence, processes and procedures and a clear presence in Canberra.

The medium business award was awarded to the Synergy group, which was established in 1999, specialising in accounting and consulting services for government agencies. The Synergy group is one of the fastest growing consultancy firms in Canberra, having grown from just two founding partners in 1999 to a team of over 70 staff in just 16 years. This business, according to the judges, has a very strong growth plan, is a trusted and solid company and has a great recruitment strategy, with continuity of work, strong management, a strong marketing plan, staff retention and a great cash flow.

The final award winner for the evening was Red Robot, who won the small business category and were also named the 2015 Telstra ACT business of the year. Red Robot has previously won design awards in both Sydney and Melbourne for innovative design and has become Australia's largest commercial photo booth supplier, with products such as iSnap Social, which harnesses the power of social media and product branding, and other fully mobile devices, such as Atom. This company has attracted international attention for its innovative products and has supplied not just local but international organisations with its innovative and customisable products.

It is a credit to not just local businesses that won an award category but all those that were selected as finalists in the awards for this year. The application process to be nominated for a Telstra business award is in excess of 60 pages long; it looks at not just profit or cash flow but also management systems, the potential of the business, succession planning, staff support and advertising, to name just a few. The process highlights not just the quality of the winners but also the quality of the finalists in each category. I think it points to the fact that the ACT business sector is doing very well in some areas.

I would like to wish all the winning businesses good luck as they represent the ACT at the national awards to be held in Sydney on 20 August. Finally, I would also like to thank Telstra for their continued support of small and medium size local businesses, not just in the ACT but across Australia.

Sport—racism

DR BOURKE (Ginninderra) (5.30): I too rise tonight to talk about Adam Goodes and offer him my support. When the crowd harassment reached a crescendo in Perth a few weeks ago, Adam Goodes finally said he had had enough. He has brought this shameful booing to national attention. The range of reactions and comments has varied from the life affirming to the naive, the deliberately offensive and the outright racist.

The constant booing has had its intended depressing effect on the target and given us an insight on how far we still have to travel on the path to reconciliation in this country. It is even more depressing that in 2015, if Adam Goodes, under enormous pressure and with all the attention focused on him, does play this weekend, and the crowd do not boo him, we might celebrate it as a great victory.

I applaud all the efforts to counter the harassment of Goodes and all those speaking out against racist harassment, including the fans at the game who risked having a yobbo mob turn on them. But it is a tragedy for race relations in the country that the bar is now set so low that we might see it as a great moment if a crowd does not constantly boo one of our greatest Aboriginal sportsmen as he displays his skill and courage.

Some say they boo because they do not like the way he plays. Yet he has won the highest award, the Brownlow award for best and fairest, twice. The constant booing intensified when he identified a spectator yelling racial abuse at him. It was not of Goodes's choosing that she was a 13-year-old girl; he reacted to one of the many offensive taunts—as anyone might who, say, had a rock thrown at their car and wanted to complain about it.

Some say he should harden up. Well, he wears his heart and his race on his sleeve. He is who life has made him. We know that there are a million excuses and evasions as to why footy crowds are booing him, but at heart we know that the core of it is racist and it is designed to crush and humiliate.

Some say it was his dance that upset the mob—that it was too aggressive for an Aboriginal man to perform in front of white people. Footy is rich in the metaphors of violence. It is in the lyrics of the club songs, the hyperbole of sports journals. Even a team is called the Bombers. But when an Aboriginal man displays his culture within the context of a sporting success, suddenly it is too aggressive for comfort.

Some people do need to toughen up. But they are not on the football field. I like to cite Cathy Freeman's 400 metres victory as a great moment of reconciliation. Black and white Australia came together in a shared achievement. She symbolised that reconciliation by proudly carrying the Aboriginal and Australian flags of her heritage. The mutterings by some about her flying the Aboriginal flag were drowned out by the majority who were thrilled by her achievement.

At a deeper level, we can celebrate our diversity and our many cultures and peoples that make Australia great. We need to say well done to Adam Goodes. We are proud of you and your skill and courage on and off the field.

DonateLife Week

MR DOSZPOT (Molonglo) (5.33): A week ago I spoke to a Canberra constituent who gave me quite an insight into the predicament of many in our community. The constituent, now in his 40s, is on dialysis awaiting a kidney transplant. He first started dialysis at age 12 and received his first kidney transplant when he was 14. That transplant failed when he was 22, and he again continued dialysis, until he was 29, when he received a kidney from his father. However, that transplant failed 10 years later. He is currently on dialysis again, awaiting a kidney transplant.

There are many others in our community in such circumstances, and that brings us to the importance of DonateLife Week, which began on Sunday, 2 August and will

finish next Sunday, 9 August. National awareness week provides a timely reminder to all Australians of the need to discuss their donation decisions with loved ones and to ask about and know their donation decisions. It is a week dedicated to having a chat, a chat that can save many lives in our community. Family discussions and knowledge of donation decisions are vital. The majority of families say that having discussed and knowing the donation decision of their loved one made it much easier to support donation proceeding. Rarely does a family decline donation if they know of the deceased's wishes.

An excellent article by Belinda McKeon in today's *Canberra Times* tells the story of one such family—the Taylor family. Marge Taylor and her son Michael have been family friends of ours for years and I, along with many in our community, have been impressed by their dedication to preserving Annette's memory and their encouragement of other families to have the conversation with their loved ones about considering registering as potential organ donors. Marjorie Taylor's daughter, Annette, was the first organ donor in the ACT. Annette died in 1975, just prior to her 12th birthday. A few weeks earlier she had discussed organ donation with her mother. When Marjorie was told by doctors there was no donor program in place, she asked to ring her boss, who happened to be then Prime Minister Gough Whitlam, to ask for his help. Eventually hospital staff realised Marjorie's determination and that she meant business, and Annette's kidneys were donated to two grateful recipients.

In a conversation with Marge's son Michael today, Michael underlined Marge's strong desire that she would like a change in the system—to the opt-out system rather than the opt-in system we now have—and for governments to legislate so that donors' wishes cannot be overturned by next of kin.

We salute Marge and the Taylor family for their dedication and constant championing of DonateLife Week. The DonateLife Week campaign is part of the Organ and Tissue Authority's broader community education efforts supporting the national reform program to increase organ and tissue donation rates in Australia.

Netball World Cup

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo—Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, Minister for Justice, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Transport Reform) (5.27): I will speak tonight about the Netball World Cup, which gets underway in Sydney this coming week on 7 August and goes until 16 August. The competition launches at Sydney's Olympic Park with preliminary rounds between the 16 competing teams, including New Zealand, England, South Africa, Malawi, Samoa, Uganda and Jamaica. The Australian Diamonds go into the competition as not only the host nation but as the reigning world champions, the current number one ranked side and the most decorated nation in Netball World Cup history.

The Diamonds begin their campaign on Friday when they take on Trinidad and Tobago's Calypso Girls, followed by Barbados on day two, ahead of the much anticipated clash against world number two ranked side, the Silver Ferns, on Sunday. I am certainly looking forward to attending some of the matches over the coming weeks.

I understand the Jamaican team has a Canberra connection with former Australian coach Jill McIntosh the team's technical director. Jamaica has been conducting a short training camp in Canberra ahead of the event, culminating in a match with the Canberra Darters this afternoon at the ACT Netball Centre, bringing a small part of the Netball World Cup to our Canberra community.

I understand it has been a sell-out event, and fans will no doubt be enjoying some great netball. Right now while we are in the Assembly, they are out there at Lyneham with one of the world's best netballers in action, Jamaican goal shooter, Romelda Aiken, taking to the court. Having one of the best netball teams in the world playing our ACT team is a real boost to local netball both for the aspiring young players in the stands or the senior athletes on the court getting a taste of the intensity of playing a world-class side.

The ACT has a strong and passionate netball community and the territory continues to invest in both grassroots netball participation and elite netball development. On any weekend during the winter season you will see thousands of young children out on the courts and parents on the sidelines cheering them on at Arawang, Belconnen, Tuggeranong, Canberra and south Canberra. The sport's peak body, Netball ACT, receives \$70,000 per annum in operational support through the sport and recreation grants program to help develop and promote the game while also fostering the elite pathway for local players. Netball ACT plays a key role in working with the district affiliates to improve coaching and officiating while supporting entry level participation for the next generation.

Netball ACT partners with the territory and Netball Australia to deliver a development program through the ACT Academy of Sport. Twenty-two athletes are currently supported through the ACTAS program, providing a stepping stone from junior local representative selection and state level programs into the elite pathway, including junior national representative teams as well as the Canberra Darters. Work has recently been completed to upgrade outdoor netball facilities at Charnwood and Stirling. Funded by the ACT government, the works are valued at \$800,000 and \$200,000 respectively and include new court bases, acrylic surfacing, fencing and lighting at Charnwood, with resurfacing, lighting and fence repairs at Stirling. The assistance of Netball ACT in coordinating works was greatly appreciated, and already these facilities have proven a wonderful benefit for our grassroots participants. A second suite of court and lighting works for facilities at Calwell, Deakin and Lyneham estimated to cost around \$1 million will be delivered in 2015-16.

Netball's continued popularity can be witnessed on the courts of Canberra every weekend. In recent years it has also been abundantly clear from the sell-out crowds at the arena every time the Diamonds have come to town just how popular the sport is with games against England in 2014 and the mighty Silver Ferns in our centenary year. I conclude by wishing the Diamonds well in the 2015 Netball World Cup. Let's hope the home team can keep the cup here in Australia.

Greenhills Centre

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (5.41): This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Greenhills Centre at Stromlo. It is towards the Cotter and is next door to the Scouts ACT Camp Cottermouth. On 28 March I attended their 50th anniversary celebrations along with federal member for Canberra, Gai Brodtmann MP. Greenhills Centre was started by a group of volunteers of the Presbyterian Fellowship Association in 1960. It was the humble beginnings of what became the Greenhills Centre. It started with the grant of 13 acres by the government and the purchase of surplus weatherboard and fibro dormitories, kitchen, bathrooms and laundry for up to 80 people, for which they paid £350. It cost another £1,500 to transport and rebuild these at Greenhills. Members of the community volunteered to connect water and sewerage to the site and grade the ovals. It was then devastating when vandals smashed 120 window panes and poked holes through the fibro ceilings.

At the official opening on 27 March 1965 there were male and female dormitories for 80, a new bathroom block, dining room for 100 people and a new kitchen. This had all cost less than £10,000, or £100 per bed when comparable centres had cost £250 to £400 per bed. It was a testimony to the hard work and dedication of the volunteers.

These buildings, with gradual improvements, served the centre until the devastating bush fires of 2003. Later a two-bedroom cottage was built for a manager/cook at a cost of \$7,000 borrowed on a 25-year loan from the government. Sir Richard Kingsland, secretary of the department of the interior, formally opened the cottage and was one of a number of senior officers of all departments who took an interest in the centre over the years.

The name "Greenhills" was taken from that of an 1874 homestead, the ruins of which lie on the grounds. The owner of this homestead, Richard Moore, farmed much of the Cotter and Queanbeyan areas, and the original Greenhills had been the centre of district social life, hosting dances, afternoon teas, hare drives and farming meetings. During the construction of the original Cotter Dam, the Moores also ran a post office and store for the workers.

The facility became so popular with camping groups, mostly younger people, that a public appeal for funds was launched and enough money raised to build another two blocks with beds for another 40 people and ensuites for each dorm. Sadly, this was all wiped out by the 2003 fires. The centre was rebuilt in 2006 with 66 beds and a hall with a capacity for 120 people. The Greenhills Centre now offers accommodation, meals and conference facilities for large and small groups. My understanding is that it provides around 20,000 nights of accommodation per year, largely to school groups visiting from interstate.

Greenhills is on the banks of the Murrumbidgee River with beautiful views up the Cotter valley to the Brindabellas. It is situated close to Casuarina Sands, the Cotter Dam, Mount Stromlo Observatory and Stromlo Forest Park and has been used by many young people to explore Canberra from that base.

I acknowledge the past board chairperson, Barry Howe; current chairperson and previous secretary, Harold Small; the original founder, Max Hill OAM; one of the stalwarts for 50 years, Reverend Alistair Christie; and the executive director and all board members and staff of Greenhills both now and over the past 50 years. You can find out more at greenhillscentre.com.

Lions Club Gungahlin

MR COE (Ginninderra) (5.45): I rise tonight to talk about the Lions Club of Gungahlin. Gungahlin Lions club forms part of the Lions Club International group, which aims to serve the community through supporting people with a disability, community greening and fundraising for worthwhile causes. Lions clubs are involved with many community projects, and there are over 1.3 million people involved with Lions worldwide. Lions conduct vision and health screenings, build parks, support eye hospitals, award scholarships, assist youth, provide help during disasters and are involved with many other projects that make a difference to local communities right across the world. Gungahlin Lions meet twice a month in Nicholls, as well as being involved in many activities in the community.

Members may be aware that Lions are involved with programs relating to eye health. The Lions eye health program aims to prevent vision loss and blindness by promoting early detection and timely treatment of eye diseases. The program was launched in Australia in 2000, and it has proved very popular with Lions clubs around the country. Lions also run the recycle for sight Australia program, which is part of a worldwide eyeglass recycling program. Thousands of pairs of used spectacles, sunglasses, new frames and other equipment have been recycled through this program. The glasses are regraded and distributed to Lions clubs, Rotary clubs and other humanitarian organisations for distribution to people in need at no cost. In 15 years the Australian program has delivered 2.5 million pairs of glasses to countries all over the world.

Lions also hold an annual youth of the year program. The youth of the year quest is an opportunity for young people between 15 and 19 to experience an interview situation and practise their public speaking skills. The program aims to encourage student interest in leadership and the qualities required to take an active and constructive role in the community.

The Lions Club of Gungahlin is involved in many aspects of our community, and some of these include the scouts and the Dick Smith foundation. They have regular barbecues at Magnet Mart to raise funds, they support Greening Australia, Red Cross, Hope in a Boat, Lions Youth Haven, Karinya House, the Visual Independence Foundation, the Gungahlin College scholarship, and much, much more.

I congratulate all those involved in the Gungahlin Lions club. In particular, I acknowledge the past executive, including the president, Lion Mick Brice; the immediate past president, Lion Steve Holm; the club secretary, Lion Kerry Graf; the club treasurer, Lion Glynis Whitfield; and the membership chairman, Lion Keith Cox. I also acknowledge supporters of the club and members who were involved in the recent changeover dinner, including Gary Lymbery, Tony Steer and Beverley von Stein.

I congratulate and welcome the incoming board of directors for 2015-16. They include the president, Graham Erickson; secretary, Kerry Graf; treasurer, Debbie Hansard; the first vice president, Keith Cox; the second vice president, Stephen Flegg; second year directors, Mick Richard and Glynis Whitfield; the first year directors, Chris Murphy and Tom Graf; the tail twister, Danny Howard; the lion tamer, Sue Chambers; the immediate past president, Mick Brice; and the membership chairman, Keith Cox.

Finally, I note that the club are looking for a storage facility in Gungahlin. They need a place to park their trailers and store their equipment. If any member of the Assembly or anyone reading *Hansard* knows of such an opportunity in the Gungahlin area, please let me or the club know. For more information about Gungahlin Lions club, including details of their latest projects and upcoming events, I encourage all members to visit their website at www.gungahlin.act.lions.org.au.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.49 pm.